

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

[Volume 5]

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

9th Sitting

2 p.m.

Thursday, 17th June, 1971

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Speaker

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

Members of the Government

People's National Congress

Elected Ministers

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

The Honourable P.A. Reid,
Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture (Absent — on leave)

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

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

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

The Honourable Miss S.M. Field-Ridley,
Minister of Education

The Honourable B. Ramsaroop
Minister of Trade (Leader of the House)

The Honourable D.A. Singh,
Minister of Housing and Reconstruction

(Absent)

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

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

Appointed Ministers

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

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

The Honourable H.O. Jack,
Minister of Mines and Forest

Dr. the Honourable Sylvia Talbot,
Minister of Health

Parliamentary Secretaries

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

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

Mr. W. Haynes,
Parliamentary Secretary, Office of the Prime Minister.

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

Mr. J.R. Thomas,
Parliamentary Secretary, Office of the Prime Minister

Mr. C.E. Wrights, J.P.,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Works, Hydraulics and Supply

Other Members

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

Members of the Opposition

People's Progressive Party

Dr. C.B. Jagan, (Leader of the Opposition)
Mr. Ram Karran
Mr. R. Chandisingh
Dr. F.H.W. Ramsahoye, S.C.
Mr. D.C. Jagan, J.P., (Deputy Speaker)
Mr. E.M.G. Wilson
Mr. A.M. Hamid, J.P., (Opposition Whip)
Mr. G.H. Lall
Mr. M.Y. Ally
Mr. R.D. Persaud, J.P.
Mr. E.M. Stoby (Absent)
Mr. R. Ally
Mr. E. L. Ambrose
Mr. L.M. Branco
Mr. Balchand Persaud
Mr. Bholu Persaud
Mr. I. R. Remington, J.P.
Mrs. R.P. Sahoye
Mr. V. Teekah (Absent –on leave)

United Force

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

(Absent – on leave)

Independent

Mr. R. E. Cheeks

OFFICERS

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

The National Assembly met at 2 p.m.

[Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*]

Prayers

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SPEAKER**Leave to Member**

Mr. Speaker: Leave has been granted to the hon. Member Mr. Sutton for today's sitting.

PUBLIC BUSINESS**MOTIONS****Financial Paper No. 3 of 1971**

"Be it resolved that the Committee of Supply approve of the proposals set out in Financial Paper No. 3 of 1971 — Schedule of Supplementary Provision on the Current Estimates for the period ending 30th June, 1971, totalling \$6,000,000.

[**The Minister of Finance**]

Assembly in Committee of Supply.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Hoyte): I certify, in accordance with paragraph (2) of article 80 of the Constitution that Cabinet has recommended the Motion relating to Financial Paper No. 3 of 1971 for consideration by the Assembly.

Question proposed

Mr. Ram Karran: I note the silence of the hon. Minister of Finance on this item and wonder why there is this departure from normal procedure.

We have before us a documents requiring Parliament to pass the sum of \$6 million allegedly to meet the interim award to public servants. I wish merely to observe that in an earlier exercise of this kind the Opposition had drawn Government's attention to the unusual manner in which this thing is being done and to the injustices that prevail among a large section of

Government employees, namely the casuals and those who are not in regular employment. In this manner the Government is really cheating a large number of people who are deserving of a higher pay but cannot get it because of a technicality, namely, the fact that they are not permanent employees inasmuch as this payment refers only to those who are permanent

We need to go a little further than this. As I observed in another debate yesterday, in the Budget Speech of 1969 the then hon. Minister of Finance — they change often, perhaps to get out of the difficulty of meeting the demands of the people—said in very clear terms that revision of salaries would take place in the year 1969. Up to now there has been no revision.

The Government said that revision would come after the so-called "job evaluation" exercise and that payment would be made on the basis of job evaluation in October 1970. October of 1970 passed and no payment was made. The Government then spoke about February 1971. In February 1971 no awards were made. The Government then said that in May 1971 it would pay on the basis of job evaluation. Up to today, 17th June 1971, there has been no payment. Instead there is this Financial Paper to award \$6 million, which might look like a large sum but what does it offer? To those in the lower brackets, 7 per cent interim relief; and 3½ per cent to those above a certain income. [**Mr. Hoyte:** "Cheddi said not a cent more."]

The hon. Minister refers to a slogan which the members of the Government coined after the Guillebaud recommendations came out. I wish once again to set the record clear in so far as the so-called "Not a penny more" phrase is concerned. This Government is doing worse than that. When the Commissioner from the United Kingdom came here he made recommendations for fantastic increases for Permanent Secretaries and people in that category. His recommendations were changed by the then Government to the advantage of the daily paid and lowly paid workers as well as the B and C scales.

My friends who sit on the other side of the House were the ones who were agitating with the civil servants at the top for payment of the full Guillebaud recommendations, but the Government of the day, which was a working class Government, sought to see that justice was

done at the bottom rather than give large salaries to those at the top and rob the people at the bottom.

The hon. Minister has the files. He knows that Guillebaud recommended a very small sum of \$2.75 as a daily minimum wage and that was changed by the P.P.P. That is a fact that is known and when the members of the Government seek to distort the truth the public will know them for what they stand.

Here again we notice that they have been forced to follow in the footsteps of the P.P.P. and to make larger awards at the bottom and small awards at the top. That is exactly what the P.P.P. sought to do at the time of the Guillebaud recommendations, but our quarrel here is not with the percentage. That is not relevant to the discussion. What we are quarrelling about is that, having made a solemn promise in this House, having made provision for funds to be raised for the payment of increased salaries and wages of civil servants, the Government has betrayed itself. It has failed to carry out its solemn promises and three years later it is coming and saying, "We are not going to pay increased salaries and wages as we said in 1969 even though provision was made to raise the money from the taxpayers to pay. We are going to give another interim award." The Government says this even though this interim award denies a large number of people who are working with the Government because they are casuals and not regulars. These people are being robbed. The hon. Minister must know that if they are worth \$5 a day and this interim award catches up somewhat with \$5, then these people are being denied. Therefore, the Government is working under false pretences.

I wish to make a more substantial point concerning the attitude of the hon. Minister with respect to the presentation of this Financial Paper yesterday. He said that the civil servants have accepted the proposals, but one section of the Government employees has not accepted the recommendation. With a "take it or leave it" attitude the Government is going to have this amount passed by the House. I assume that the Minister is going to push it down the throats of those people who have rejected this award.

As a person who has been in some way associated with trade union practice I know that these things are negotiated but yesterday the attitude of the Minister, who is on record as having slapped a police officer – I think he also slapped somebody who is in this Chamber – was “Take it or leave it”.

That is the thing I am complaining of Police Officers and policemen do not have a trade union and that is why the Government ought to treat with them in different way. I have argued – and members on this side of the House have argued – that the job evaluation exercise is a red herring merely because Government does not want to meet its commitments. That is why it has brought us to this fantastic idea of a job evaluation exercise.

What is the Government going to evaluate? More particularly, what is it going to evaluate with respect to the policemen? *Vis-à-vis* what? During this long period of gestation, the period during which this job evaluation exercise has been going ahead, nobody on the Government side has been able to get up, inside our outside of this House –we know that very often they do business outside of this House – to say exactly what is this job evaluation exercise, what is going to be done and how it is going to affect the salaries of and conditions of work for Government employees.

For the sake of argument, let us say that in the case of the ordinary civil servants there is some possibility that the job evaluation exercise can be useful. How is it going to affect the policemen? What procedure has the Government gone through so as to be able to come to a decision with respect to the amount that is going to be paid to these people percentage wise or otherwise?

The policemen have a Federation, as we know. It is not a trade union. People who are not policemen, people who are special constables, cannot join a trade union although my friends on the other side were shouting themselves hoarse during another administration saying that these people ought to have trade union rights. Today they seem to have changed their minds or to have made a decision different from the one they made in those days.

How did they arrive at these percentages with respect to the Police? The policemen today have a very difficult task. *[Interruption]* The point I wish to make is that the policemen have a more difficult task, especially after 1962, when a good number of them particularly those expatriates, were in collusion with the British Governor and the leadership of the People's National Congress sought to undermine the then Government and to destroy it. But they have succeeded in doing it for the time being. But this will not last forever. *[Interruption]* We do not believe in over-throwing, that is your policy and philosophy. But overthrowing does not last. They have destroyed that Government and the policemen today want to find the same situation that existed in 1962. That is what makes it difficult for the policemen.

A member of the Teacher's Union said in Berbice the other day, he made it very dear, that the people cannot get the work done. That is true in the Public Service, in the Police Force and everywhere else. I am saying that the policemen today find it more difficult because of the large number of thugs that these people have trained and left in the streets, people who made their living during that period by choking and robbing, even by raping. Could you imagine that, sir? There are many prominent people in the P.N.C. who pester him that is why the Prime Minister cannot find enough time to do his work. He has got to deal with criminals, he has got to talk to the policemen to release this one and that one because people in high positions and their children are involved in everyday criminal life. They cannot deny that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member Mr. Ram Karran's insinuation against the hon. Prime Minister that he interferes with the course of justice is improper.

Mr. Ram Karran: Had the Prime Minister been here I would have called names, but he is not here and I bow to Your Honour's ruling, that he is too busily engaged with this type of activity.

The large number of criminals that the police have to handle are not ordinary criminals; these are sophisticated criminals. Besides that — and this is a significant point — the police cannot pursue these criminals. They know who these people are but they cannot. When the white man was here and was head of the Police Force, inspectors and so on, Mr. Slater could have afforded to catch the criminals and hang them because when his activities were over he went

back to England in retirement so they could not have pursued him; he did not have his family here. But these boys are born here, they have their families here, they have to do a job. The fact that they have to think of their families and themselves makes it difficult for them to catch these criminals because they are more sophisticated than those in the 1940s.

Policemen need higher pay; people are not going to take risks unless they are properly remunerated. People are not going to leave their wives and children at home unprotected to go and hunt down criminals and then go home to find that their wives and children are raped and abused. This Government ought to take these things into account

The Government should be realistic; and the hon. Minister in initiating this paper did not say anything. He is a man of action; he likes to slap. Let us hope that when those of us on this side of the House have taken our seats the hon. Minister will get up, if he can, and tell us when this exercise is going to come to an end so that we can have in our minds an idea when the civil servants and the policemen, government employees generally, are going to be told that on this day you are going to have the salary increases as have been solemnly promised, as I said before, by the hon. Minister of Finance in 1969.

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

Mr. Lall: Your Honour, today we are supposed to discuss some economics in trade unionism. Why does one ask for increases in wages and salaries? This is the first and foremost question we have to ask ourselves. The answer is either (1) the cost of living has gone up or (2) there has been a decrease in the value of our dollar. These two important points have to be viewed from a trade union point of view. All of us have to centre our mind's eye on them and ask ourselves this question: Why is it everybody is asking for increases and more increases in wages and salaries? Mind you, sir, it is not only the public sector but the private sector also. The reason is that from 1964 the cost of living in this country, beyond the shadow of a doubt, has gone up tremendously, as I said yesterday, (1) because of the devaluation, (2) because of the 3 per cent defence levy, and (3) because of the E.T.B.

We were told that under the supervision of the External Trade Bureau the cost of living would be reduced tremendously, but we have seen things in the reverse. Instead of the cost of living being reduced, it has risen tremendously since the establishment of the E.T.B. Mark well, Your Honour, I am not pointing a finger at the Government because it made an excuse in this House after the introduction of the E.T.B.

2.50 p.m.

The Shipping Department carried up the charges for shipping; the producers abroad carried up the prices for their commodities; lo and behold, how are the Guyanese people to live? By your telling them that the outside people carried up the charges for shipping and the prices of their commodities? Telling them is one thing and giving them an increase is another thing. To give them an increase is to deal realistically with the problem. Let us come to brass tacks as far as the increase is concerned. *[Interruption]* Your Honour, I am craving your indulgence. Please ask the hon. Prime Minister to stop heckling and to listen.

The Prime Minister: I apologise.

Mr. Lall: As I have said, since 1964, the cost of living has gone up by 24 per cent. Let us examine how much per cent of increase the workers in the public sector have received from 1964. Let them answer this question. The hon. Minister of Finance said yesterday that when the police asked for 15 per cent interim relief, they were unreasonable. **[Mr. Hoyte:** “I said so yesterday?”] I am subject to correction. I make an apology. I take it that the hon. Minister of Finance will agree to pay the police an interim relief of 15 per cent. I thank him in advance.

I have said that the cost of living has risen since 1964, by 24 per cent. We have a sliding scale, and I agree with the Government that a person receiving an amount below \$428 per month should receive 7 per cent, but, sir, I am saying that the Government should further regrade. I agree with the 3½ per cent increase for those persons who are receiving above \$428, but I am submitting that those persons who are receiving below \$250 should have 15 per cent, and those who are receiving below \$150 per month should have an interim relief of 25 per cent because, as

I see it, the poor man is lucky to have more children. They have more mouths to feed; therefore, I am appealing to the Government for further regrading of these people's salaries.

In 1969, when I spoke during the Budget Debate, I said that the jobevaluation exercise was only a pretext to further delay the increase in wages and salaries of the workers. Here we have a comment by the P.S.A. reported in the *Evening Post* of 24th December, 1969, at page 20;

“Government bids to hold publicservice to ransom – CSA

“Pay claims delayed indefinitely”

and I read:

“ ‘There is evidence that another attempt is being made to hold the Public Service to ransom and this is being done by the government, an employer that ought to set the highest standards in good industrial relations practice,’ the Civil Service Association said in this month’s issue of its news bulletin.”

Perfectly correct, Your Honour. The Government as an employer should set an example and then you will have the employers in the private sector to follow suit

“In 1967, after two years of negotiation on our pay claim, government made the proposal of a compaction of salary scales with a view to providing immediate relief. After months of waiting we were told that the exercise for compaction is impracticable. We redoubled our efforts, then came another proposal from government, the Collins Commission to report in six months.”

This is the second excuse.

“It took the Collins Commission 13 months to report. Out of the whole report Government has implementedone recommendation with the greatest alacrity. That recommendation is the Job Evaluation exercise, and we have been told by the Public Service Ministry that the exercise would be concluded by April 1970.”

In 1969 the civil servants were told that the exercise would be completed by 1970 and today they are told that it will be concluded in 1973. [**The Prime Minister:**“Talk about the police; the civil servants agree.”]I did not say this. The civil servants have said that the Government promised that job evaluation would be completed by 1970. Now in 1971 the Government is saying that the exercise will be completed in 1973

What are we to understand? Does the Government think that it is dealing with little children?The Government should realise that it is dealing with adults who cannot make two ends meet. It should hurry up with consideration of the recommendations by the Collins Commission and see to it that those recommendations are implemented.

I do not wish to go deeper into this argument. There is great dissatisfaction in the Civil Service today. Every day one reads in the newspapers that some civil servant is charged or some fraud or the other committed. Why? There is dissatisfaction. Pay the civil servants properly and let them do their jobs. We cannot have disgruntled civil servants and expect them to be efficient.

No one can deny that things are getting tougher every day so far as the cost of living is concerned. To travel from one place to another one has to pay more. The cost of clothing and foodstuff has increased; rentals are higher. The landlord now does not rent a house unfurnished. He furnishes it and the rent is then \$250 a month. Poor people cannot get a house to rent. A furnished room, 10ft. x 10ft, is rented for \$60 a month.

The Government should grapple with this situation and do something quickly. This is like powder in a keg, waiting to be exploded. I am warning the members of the Government. I said yesterday that this might not be the advice they wish, but it is the advice they need and we are giving it to them whether they like it or not.

In conclusion, I am asking the Government to reconsider its stand as far as the police are concerned, because it must understand that policemen are not stationed in one place. They have to move from place to place and their families cannot go with them. While they pay board and lodging in one place they have to support their families elsewhere. Consideration should be given to these factors and the Government should review its position as far as the policemen are

concerned. It should also review its position so far as daily paid employees are concerned, the \$4 per day employee. As I have said, those who are getting below \$150 per month should receive a 26 per cent increase.

I do hope that the Government will heed our advice and do the best it can to alleviate the hardship suffered by the working masses because of the high cost of living.

The Chairman: The hon. Member Mr. Singh.

Mr. M. F. Singh: Mr. Speaker, for far too long the Government has been playing around with the salaries of Government employees, including the police. Guyanese have a good expression for it: they call it, “playing ducks and drakes.” The hon. Minister knows very well that what I am saying is true. For years now the Government has been dragging its feet on the just claims of its employees for better wages. Everyone knows that the cost of living has skyrocketed within recent times in spite of all we hear about the E.T.B., in spite of the protestations of the hon. Minister of Trade to the contrary. Yet all that the Government employees have been hearing is talk of “job evaluation.”

Job evaluation has been used as the excuse to deny Government employees the increase in salaries which they so richly deserve having regard to the rising cost of living. For years we have been hearing about job evaluation. We keep hearing of a deferment and a further deferment. What conclusion can we reach except the inescapable conclusion that the Government has been deliberately using this to deny the just claims of its employees?

We now have the proposal for an interim relief of \$6 million. But there is still gross dissatisfaction in spite of all the protestations of the hon. Minister to the contrary, in spite of his assurance that certain sections of the Civil Service have accepted this proposal, in spite of all the invectives being used in this House, in spite of all the viciousness which we hear sometimes spouted in this House.

One must realise the disadvantages of having a dissatisfied Public Service. How can the Government function properly with a dissatisfied Public Service? A Government depends on its employees to function efficiently and properly. These people are dissatisfied. They cannot use

the strike weapon as other workers can use it. They are at a disadvantage and the police are in a special category in this respect. No one can doubt the importance of a satisfied police force in a democratic society. The force maintains law and order. If the force is dissatisfied, then there is bound to be trouble.

The members of the police force have a grievance and they are, as I say, in a special position. They are not as fortunate as civil servants. Their salaries, their conditions of service, are not as favourable as the salaries and conditions of service of civil servants. Sometimes they work without thanks. Sometimes they work under very difficult conditions. At times their work is unrewarding, yet they cannot shirk it. They cannot, as I have said, have recourse to the strike weapon. Surely they are entitled to some special consideration! Surely the Government should not lightly brush aside their just claims!

I urge the Government to give special consideration to their case. I urge the Government to reconsider their claims. This is very important if we are to maintain the rule of law in this country, if we are to be dependent on the police to keep a society in which people can walk the roads without fear. If this is to be, then special consideration must be given to the police force.

Perhaps one of the reasons why there is so much talk about choke and rob in Guyana is that we have a dissatisfied police service and, indeed, a dissatisfied Public Service.

I want to urge the Government to stop the political manoeuvring, to stop interfering in the Public Service and Police Force. Do not let members of the Government say that this is not happening. All we have to do is to read what Mr. Semple the Vice-President of the Public Service Association said. We would then realise how serious the situation is. We would then understand that there is gross dissatisfaction among public servants in general.

I want to ask the Government to stop dragging its feet in respect of the job evaluation exercise. Let us get the matter settled once and for all. Many years have passed since it started and all we can hear is that the final report on the job evaluation has been deferred.

We can only move forward in this country when we clear up such things as job evaluation. This is the only way we can end the frustration and disillusionment which at present exist. I urge the Government to do something to bring this matter to a fruitful and satisfactory conclusion.

The Chairman: The hon. Member Mr. Cheeks.

Mr. Cheeks: Mr. Chairman, I wish simply to draw Government's attention to the predicament of a body of men and women about whom we hear very little when occasions like these arise and all Government servants are receiving a cost of living allowance. I should like to make it clear that although I am at present employed at one of the colleges where the teachers receive aid from Government, I cannot be speaking for myself because I am too old a man to qualify. I wish to point out that when those cost of living allowances are being paid out to Government servants and quasi-Government servants, the teachers in the aided secondary schools do not fall in the category so that they might receive the same percentage if they do receive that allowance at all.

I think it was last year that the Government paid certain cost of living increases to the various Government workers. In the case of the teachers in the secondary schools who are indeed just as important as, if not more important than, the primary school teachers, because they are putting out the finished product and so very much depends on them, what happens is this: The salaries of the teachers are divided into two parts, one part is paid by Government and the other part is paid by the school. Government pays over its proportion of the increase which is paid to the teachers but in most cases the schools claim that they cannot afford to pay any increase at all. There are many schools where up to now the teachers have not received the proportion of the increase which was supposed to be paid by the school. The same thing is going to happen on this occasion.

I do not want to confuse issues. I am not speaking about myself because there are some schools which have the capital and credit and they can get money from the banks and will borrow and pay their staff. But there are others whose Principals and Boards cannot get money to pay teachers and up to now the teachers have not received payment of the increases for last year.

This must Cause a great deal of dissatisfaction; their teachers are working under a grouse. The Boards have asked Government — atlas& I know of two — to allow them to increase the fees charged so that they will be able to pay the teachers this increase which has been paid to everybody receiving a wage or salary from the Government. I understand that the Boards of those schools have even offered to submit to Government all their books — in fact, to submit to any kind of investigation that the Government chooses to carry out so that It will be realised that these schools cannot afford to pay these increases. Nothing was done; the requests have been turned down; they cannot raise the fees, and the teachers in these aided schools go without this necessary cost of living increase. Just that point I wish to make.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition (Dr. Jagan): Sir, in the press and over the radio we have been reading and hearing that in the United States of America the sins of the Johnson administration are now catching up with them. It seems that in Guyana, too, the sins of the P.N.C. are now catching up with them. [**The Prime Minister:** “That is not right. Johnson’s sins are catching up with Nixon; Jagan’s sins are catching up with Burnham. You must keep the analogy perfect.” *[Laughter]*

For the last week, the *Graphic*, a mouthpiece of the Government, has been appealing to the Police particularly to be reasonable, and at the same time it has been appealing to the Government to be considerate for it says that the Police Force is a part of the security forces of the country. No doubt the *Graphic* is fully aware of the fact how the Government received this mandate — from dead people and jumbies voting at the last election.

The Government is aware of the fact that there is a great deal of discontent in this country, inside and outside of the Government services. For this reason it attempted for a few years now to enact an anti-strike law, but the contradictions which have developed and sharpened in Guyana have forced the Government to backtrack and now the Prime Minister says, “There will be no anti-strike measure so long as I am Prime Minister,” when only a few months ago his colleague the Minister of Labour was enunciating that the Government will go ahead with the

law. Failing to enact because of pressure, because of the growing contradictions, it is now falling back on what it calls an incomes and prices policy.

If we take it for granted that the public servants cannot strike, if we take it that the Government itself is unable to make a law to ban strikes, one would assume that the Government will fall back on the other yardstick — incomes and prices policy which it wants to put into practice. It has been demonstrated through its own figures that the cost of living has jumped by 25 per cent. These are official figures, but we know that like everything else in this country, even these are cooked up, like proxies, like this, like that.

3.25 p.m.

Why is it that the Government, which has promised to revise salaries for many years, is not accepting the yard-stick of cost of living to make equitable payments to civil servants, police, and also teachers at this time?

The Government falls back and tries to attack us, as the Minister of Finance did a little while ago, by making innuendoes, making assertions to the effect that we are merely making these points and referring to us as the newfound friends. And then we heard the old tune, the lie, which even the hon. Prime Minister repeated. [*Interruption by the hon. Prime Minister*] I do not deny that I said so but the distortions which you give it are what is more important and makes it a double lie.

Since you continue to repeat it, I will explain, just to put the record straight. When my colleague was speaking you said, "Give us the facts; give us the figures." Now when I want to give the figures, you say, "Stick to the Motion." The Gorsuch Commission recommended fantastic salary increases for what are called super-scale salaries. No increases for middle-bracket civil servants and a minimum wage of \$2.70 per day for unskilled workers. What did the P.P.P. do? The P.P.P. increased the minimum wage from \$2.70 to \$2.75. That is the record. [*Interruption*]

The minimum wage went up from \$2.52 to \$2.70 by Gorsuch and we raised it by an additional 5 cents. This is how you all try to fool the people, but they will catch up with you.

Where the slogan of “not a cent more” came in, was in respect of the super-scale salaries, where we took the view that we could not grant increases to the very top civil servants when nothing was recommended for the middle bracket. [**The Prime Minister:** “That is not true,”] He says that it is not true. Let him go back and look at the record. [*Interruption*] Let me inform these ignoramuses why they struck. They are dealing with a different historical period. They are confusing Guillebaud with Gorsuch. They struck on the Gullebaud recommendation, which came out in the latter part of 1961. That is why they struck.

The T.U.C., which joined them in striking, passed a resolution four years ago, calling for a minimum wage of \$5. What have they done? Giving a 13 per cent increase to the ordinary man cannot meet, today, the conditions under which the ordinary man has to live, because while they measure the cost of living, they do not take into consideration black-market conditions and exorbitant rentals which people have to pay. Clearly, sir, the Government should pay a minimum wage of at least \$5 and if the Government's colleagues in the T.U.C. are called in, the Government will have to pay a higher sum.

The Government, since 1969, was talking about the necessity of raising more money, not only for defence purposes as the Minister was so careful to point out to us yesterday, but also for the purpose of paying civil servants. Had the job evaluation been completed at the time when it was supposed to have been done, the Government would have had to fork out much more than it is now prepared to fork out. Not only much more but it would have had to pay for the years 1969, 1970, which it is now escaping from, and that is why civil servants and others held the view that the Government is insincere, it is merely dragging its feet and playing for time. It does not want to pay. [*Interruption by the hon. Prime Minister*] If you do not accept, the bully boys will get at you. You will lose your job. You will not get promotion. What else can they do in the conditions of today? These are the conditions prevailing today in Guyana.

There is one other thing and that is with respect to the pensioners. The Government should realise that those who are living on pensions have small pensions which were calculated when the dollar had a different value. I should like to know from the hon. Minister whether it is

17.6.71

National Assembly

3.25 – 3.35 p.m.

proposed to increase the Pensioners' allowances and, if so, what is to be the percentage for that category.

3.35 p.m.

Therefore, we would like to ask the Government to expedite this job evaluation exercise and not to allow it to drift on to 1973, as we have just heard, because that would be the means of the Government robbing the public servants of what is really due to them and, in fact, long overdue.

The Chairman: The hon. Minister of Finance

Mr. Hoyte: Your Honour, it was painful to listen to the interventions by the hon. Members of the Opposition with the shining and solitary exception of the hon. Member Mr. Cheeks, because what we have seen here is really a descent to the very nadir of political morality.

I had to say yesterday that there is a constitutional presumption of literacy on the part of the Members of the Opposition and so long as they sit on their seats that presumption remains irrebuttable. For that reason, I have to come to the conclusion that they were merely trying to use a situation which ought to be above politics to gain cheap political capital and notoriety.

First of all, my very good friend, the hon. Member Mr. Ram Karran, despite his exiguous intellectual equipment, must understand the Standing Orders. He sought, in his play to the gallery, to give the impression that I ought to have risen and made a speech when the matters to be considered started today, when he knows very well that that is not the procedure and that we go straight into Committee of Supply and members who wish to speak get up and speak. When I tabled the Motion on Tuesday last I did make an introductory speech explaining the contents of the Financial Paper and setting out Government's position.

The main point laboured by the hon. Members of the Opposition was centred around job evaluation. May I say first of all that the Public Service Association itself accepted that job evaluation could not be completed this year. Government has said time and again that this is

not a Government exercise This is something which is being done by the public servants themselves and the Public Service Association conceded to the Government in the course of negotiations that the magnitude of the task was not appreciated at the time when it was first undertaken; so there is no problem with the Public Service over job evaluation.

The Public Service Association accepts that job evaluation must be completed before the exercise of general salaries revision is undertaken, so that the statements made by hon. Members who spoke in this debate pointed to the fact that they do not understand, and that they were taking up lances on behalf of people who would not so have requested them and who would not have requested them to come to this honourable House to show how very uninformed they were.

With respect to our good friends, the members of the Police Force, we pointed out to them in the course of negotiations that an allowance of 15 per cent could not be met this year because of the overall financial situation and this was made quite clear to every staff association when it met the Government team for the first time.

When our friends from the Police Force met the negotiating team, it was quite clear that they had a number of problems which they wished to have resolved. For example they wanted the team to go into the question of salaries revision and the report of the Collins Commission. The team was not mandated to deal with that and it was not a salaries revision team. We sought to explain to members of the Association that, although we were sympathetic with their claims, we were not in a position to deal with them.

Every staff association had some peculiar problem which it wanted the negotiating team on the Government side to resolve. We had to make it clear to every staff association that we were not competent to deal with those particular problems; and indeed, it seemed to us that most of the problems would have to be considered as part and parcel of the wider issue of a total restructuring of salaries in the Public Service. I think that everybody accepts that position and everybody appreciate the position.

Hon. Members of the Opposition – again for cheap political capital – sought to say that we should pay, as I understood them, the police a higher percentage allowance than the rest of

the public sector. It is obvious that Government cannot do that. Government could not differentiate between sectors; Government could differentiate vertically, but not laterally. And therefore until there was a total restructuring, until one looked at all the anomalies and ironed them out, one could not interfere with salaries structures as such.

We heard the solicitude, the newly-found solicitude of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, a man who said “Not a cent more” to the Public Service, for the Police Force. This P.N.C. Government has never turned a deaf ear to the pleas of the Public Service; it has never said “Not a cent more” and will never say “Not a cent more” to the Public Service.

The Public Service came in quest of relief. The Government conceded that the public servants were entitled to relief and, within the framework of the funds which were available to the Government, after very hard negotiations with the various staff associations, Government arrived at a figure which in all the circumstances was fair and reasonable.

I do not wish to take up time dealing with the asinities which came from even the hon. Leader of the Opposition. For example, he makes a statement like this: The cost of living has jumped by 25 per cent. What nonsense! Has jumped by 25 per cent during what period?

I wish to say in conclusion that this Government is sympathetic to the claims of the Public Servants, has always been sympathetic and will continue to be sympathetic. The Public Servants understands and accepts that as soon as this complex exercise of the job evaluation is completed – I repeat, it is nothing that Government can expedite; Government is not involved – the Government will meet the staff associations to restructure the entire salary scales and give consideration to new conditions of service for the Public Servants.

Question put, and agreed to.

Assembly resumed.

Mr. Hoyte: I beg to report that the Committee of Supply has approved the proposal set out in Financial Paper No. 3 of 1971. I now move that the Assembly doth agree with the Committee’s Resolution.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion carried.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 23(1)

Mr. Hoyte: Your Honour, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 23(1) be suspended to enable the Assembly to deal with the Motion on the Order Paper at the sitting.

Mr. Jagan: Do I understand that Your Honour has given the Minister permission to move this Motion today?

Mr. Speaker: Under Standing Order 83.

Mr. Jagan: Normally notice of a Motion has to be given before. The Minister cannot expect to give us notice of a Motion today and expect it to be debated unless the Speaker gives him permission [**Mr. Hoyte:** "Show the rule."] I do not have to show you the rule. I am addressing the Speaker. Your Honour, I would say that this Motion should not be debated today. Proper notice has not been given for the debate of the Motion.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Finance are you seeking my leave under Standing Order 83?

Mr. Hoyte: Yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is now proposed.

Question put and agreed to.

Standing Order 23(1) suspended.

GUARANTEE OF LOAN TO GUYANA BAUXITE CO., LTD.

"Whereas On the 1st day of June 1971, the National Assembly by Resolution approved of the Government of Guyana guaranteeing the repayment of a short-term loan of four million dollars (U.S.) to be made by the Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A., to the Guyana Development Corporation for a period of twelve months in relation to the takeover of the Demerara Bauxite Company, Limited;

And whereas subsequent to that Resolution the Guyana Bauxite Company, Limited, has been incorporated and registered on the 3rd day of June, 1971, and it is the purpose of the Government of Guyana to vest in that Company the assets of the Demerara Bauxite Company, Limited, acquired by the State pursuant to the Bauxite Nationalisation Act, 1971.

And whereas the Guyana Bauxite Company, Limited, is to be made a party to the said loan of four million dollars (U.S.) to be made by the Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A.

Be it resolved that the Assembly approve of the Government of Guyana guaranteeing the repayment of a short term loan of four million dollars (U.S.) to be made by the Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A. to the Guyana Bauxite Company, Limited, jointly with the Guyana Development Corporation, for a period of twelve months in relation to the takeover of the Demerara Bauxite Company, Limited." [The Minister of Finance]

Mr. Hoyte: Your Honour, my good friends on the opposite side are being difficult for no reason. This Motion was in fact already debated on the 1st of June in this honourable House. On that occasion the Assembly approved of a guarantee for a line of credit established by Chase Manhattan Bank in favour of the Guyana Development Corporation.

3.50 p.m.

As hon. Members know the Guyana Development Corporation was really the entity designated to hold the assets of the Demerara Bauxite Company after nationalisation if no

company had been established by that time. Since the approval of this Motion on the 1st of June, 1971, the Guyana Bauxite Company, Limited has been established; so we now have a corporate entity which can take over the assets of the Demerara Bauxite Company. All this Motion seeks to do is to give the guarantee not merely in relation to the line of credit for the Guyana Development Corporation, but for the G.D.C. and the Guyana Bauxite Company, Limited.

Mr. Ram Karran: Sir, very briefly I should like to make a few observations. The hon. Minister told us that the Motion has already been passed. He said a little while ago that you cannot come back you have to come back six months after, but he says that the Government has guaranteed this loan, but the company has come back and said, "Look we want a guarantee also from the Guyana Development Corporation -[*Interruption*]"

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, will you please permit the hon. Member to proceed.

Mr. Ram Karran: My information is that this has to be done, because the Government has been forced to agree to make available to the Chase Manhattan Bank to make concessions for it on information which is not even available to this House and which the Demerara Bauxite Company has never made available to anybody. [*Interruption*] Well we do not want to compare the Demerara Bauxite Company, Limited with the Government. If the hon. Prime Minister doubts that this is so, let the agreement be placed before House. [**Mr. Hoyte:** "What agreement?"] The agreement in relation to the Chase Manhattan Bank and the Government of Guyana! But sir, as the saying goes, "There is more in the mortar than the pestle." Government seems to be hiding something and I would urge very strongly that if there is nothing to hide let it give us some information as to what is the agreement between this Bank and the Government.

You will remember, sir, that we were very critical of the Government that the Chase Manhattan Bank which is virtually the mouthpiece of the big American capitalists, should come and give assistance to the Government of Guyana when the Guyana Government is nationalising assets belonging to North America. We were very suspicious and are still suspicious of it. My most recent information is that the Guyana Government has allowed itself to betray the interest

of nationalisation, to betray the interest of the Guyanese people, to betray the interest of its own philosophy and to be giving information to the Chase Manhattan Bank, which information can well be used to put this country in a very difficult position, ALCAN being what it is. [Interruption] Yes, you are betrayers of the people for years. You are a complete sell-out. Bring the agreement and let us see it.

Dr. Jagan: Sir, when this matter was debated we were made to understand that the Chase Manhattan Bank was doing this out of business considerations, which is good business. I should like to ask the Government whether, as is the normal practice on occasions like this, it is simply an overdraft arrangement. We were just told that it is not an agreement, it is an overdraft. This is what the Prime Minister was saying from his seat in reply to my colleague. [**The Prime Minister:** "I did not say it officially."] If this is not a contract with conditions which we have not seen and it is simply, as the Prime Minister indicated from his seat, an overdraft arrangement, if this is not a deal with imperialism, and this is removed from imperialist manoeuvres, then I should like to know if the Government has offered the other banks operating in the country the same opportunities.

We put our cards very clearly on the table. We said it was strange that the biggest bank in Guyana, the Chase Manhattan Bank, would come to the rescue of a Government which claims to be anti-imperialist. We see something sinister about this. If we are wrong and the Government says that this is simply good business, I am asking whether the Government has dealt with all the banks on a non-discriminatory basis. I remember when they were nationalising DEMBA the Canadian Government said, "We have no fundamental objection to any Government wanting to get control of its natural resources because Canada is doing it." But they said, "We want non-discriminatory treatment." If this is good business and we are told that the minimum interest is only 7½ per cent, what is the maximum? If this is such good business we would like to know if the Government had approached all the other banks. Because as I understand it, Governments, like business, have a floating overdraft with all the banks. [Interruption by the hon. Prime Minister] The Prime Minister says that it is not the banks. In the P.P.P.'s time the overdraft was

17.6.71

National Assembly

3.50– 4 p.m.

with the two imperialist banks in the country, Barclays and Royal; now there are five. Do we understand that the Government of Guyana is discriminating against the small fry and going to the mother of imperialism and giving favours? I should like the Government to state clearly whether it offered or approached the other banks in this country to help in this difficulty as we understand it, which now confronts the Government.

4 p.m.

If so, what was the response of the other banks operating in Guyana?

I read an editorial in the *Evening Post*, last week I think it was, where it was reported that the points raised by the P.P.P. Opposition seemed to have some merit, but the editorial justifies it on this ground, that the Government has been saying that the banks are not co-operative, they are anti-national and therefore Chase Manhattan, in the goodness of its heart has come along to show its generosity. If Chase Manhattan is now trying to ingratiate itself with the Government, does it follow that we are going to leave all the financial transactions of this country – *[Interruption]*

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. Prime Minister please desist from interrupting the hon. Leader of the Opposition!

Suspension of Standing Order

The Minister of Trade [Leader of the House] Mr. Ramsaroop: If the hon. Leader of the Opposition is winding up, I would move the suspension of Standing Order 9 to allow him to speak for 15 minutes more.

Question put, and agreed to.

Standing Order 9 suspended.

GUARANTEE OF LOAN TO GUYANA BAUXITE CO., LTD.

Dr. Jagan: I am very serious about this question. If our assumptions are wrong, that there is no sinister motivation in this deal - I am arguing on the two premises, one that it is good business, and as the *Evening Post* tried to justify the loan on the ground that the banks may be trying to ingratiate themselves since the Government has indicated that it wants to miniaturise all banks - on either ground it seems to me, if it is good business, then all the banks should be given the opportunity to participate in this good business in a non-discriminatory manner. Secondly, if the banks have been under attack and they want to show their good intentions by helping out Guyana, then, the opportunity should be given not only to Chase Manhattan to show its good nature but this should be done to all the banks of the country.

Indeed, one would think that a Government such as the Government of Guyana, short of funds, wanting more funds for developmental purposes, would want to get as much money as possible and therefore, it would have approached all the banks. My information is that this is not so and I should like the Minister not to enter into a long tirade of attacking at the personal level, which is his habit - [*Interruption by the hon. Minister of Finance.*] You always descend to that level and that is why I refer to it. Let him answer the question simply, whether the Government has approached the other banks and if so, what was the response.

Mr. Hoyte (replying): The hon. Leader of the Opposition wishes to know whether the Government had dealt with all the foreign commercial banks on a non-discriminatory basis. The answer to that is an unequivocal yes. It is a question of Government finding itself in difficulty. I did try to explain and I hope that hon. Members of the Opposition understood on the 1st June, 1971, when we debated the first Motion in a straight business transaction involving a line of credit. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has himself been engaged in business and would understand what a line of credit is and would understand the nature of the guarantee which Government has undertaken. I ask this honourable House to approve.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion carried.

Mr. Speaker: The sitting is suspended for half an hour.

Sitting suspended at 4.06 p.m.

4.45 p.m.

On resumption –

Debate on foreign policy

“Be it resolved that this National Assembly approves of the Foreign Policy of the Government of Guyana and the action taken by the Government in field of Foreign Affairs.” [**The Prime Minister**]

Mr. Speaker: The sitting of the National Assembly is now resumed. The hon. Attorney General and Minister of State.

The Attorney General and Minister of State (Mr. Ramphal): Mr. Speaker, I should first like to apologise for being the occasion for delaying the resumption. I was on an overseas call on the business that concerns this Motion, the business of Guyana’s foreign relations.

Guyana’s external relations are never very far from the surface of the proceedings of this House; whether it be in the course of debates on the President’s Address or on the Budget or on the annual estimates or estimates for supplementary appropriation we manage throughout the parliamentary year to focus on the international scene and to debate Guyana’s foreign policy and the conduct of our foreign relations.

Nevertheless we believe it to be good from time to time to set aside a special day for a debate on foreign affairs simpliciter when we can give an account to the House of the Government's stewardship in the field of external relations and invite the endorsement of the House of the polices we have been pursuing.

In seeking that endorsement I trust Mr. Speaker, that it is not too much to hope that the level of this debate can rise above partisan considerations of domestic politics and mistaken notions of the relevance of international posturing and proceed with a sense of realism about the international scene on which we are obliged to play a part, however modest it may be. If we approach our deliberations in this way I have little doubt that we shall discover ever-widening areas of accord among ourselves and achieve that consensus which ought to be in the underpinning of a national foreign policy.

The international scene continue to be dominated by the pressures of superpower politics and there is a very real danger of the world's affairs being determined by what has been described as an ever-narrowing directorate of major powers. That directorate was, of course, a concept that was written into the Charter of the United Nations at San Francisco in 1945 in the form of Permanent Members of the Security Council invested with a veto. Then the directorate was five. Today, it is still five in formal terms; but in reality is it really any more than two – the United States and the Soviet Union?

Whether we are dealing with the now age-old problem of disarmament or with the new problems of outer space; whether we are searching for urgent solutions to the recurring crises of the Middle East or attempting to establish in advance of crisis a just regime for the utilisation of the resources of the seabed and the ocean floor, in whatever area of international activity of significance that we are concerned, is it not the case that we face a common factor of superpower influence, an influence which derives today as much from technological superiority as from military strength?

In that situation, no state anywhere in the world, at least of all a small developing country, can ignore these realities except at the peril of devising a foreign policy and conducting its foreign relations in terms of a wholly imaginary world in which its efforts will be futile as its assumptions are illusory.

Today, it is true, the super powers have forged out of the necessities of survival a measure of accord over important areas of international politics; but it would, I think, be a mistake to believe that the old rivalries are ended or that peaceful co-existence has somehow blossomed into a marriage of love, or, indeed, even into a marriage of convenience. We are not, therefore, yet in sight of a resolution of such vexing problems as disarmament nor, by the same token, do we yet stand committed to a tyranny of power because the areas of manoeuvrability at the international level that are open to states other than the super powers, and more particularly to the small developing countries, while they may be a few and may never, in fact, be spacious are not entirely closed. The options we have may not be many but they have not disappeared altogether. This is the scene that confronts all countries in the 1970s and the differences between all the rest of us other than the super powers are differences of degree rather than differences of kind. The result is that throughout the world the foreign policies of the Governments are being dictated and controlled by these realities.

Perhaps the most dramatic example of this search for an enlargement of the options is that unfolding in Europe at this very moment as the Six grow into the Ten and when, as economic integration in Europe moves gradually but relentlessly towards political unity, the Foreign Ministers of Europe sit down to work out a common approach to the pressing issues on the international agenda. Inevitably these same considerations must affect the developing countries, the smaller countries, to an every greater degree and our need for unity and our need to achieve some measure of solidarity in our approach to international problems is, I suggest, so much more vital and so much more urgent.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, the principle of non-alignment lies at the very centre of the policies the Government has pursued and why we have exerted such a major effort to play a part within the Group of the Non-Aligned Countries. The policy itself – the policy of Non-Alignment – is one we have adumbrated from the very outset. The role we have played within the Non-Aligned Movement is, I think, the best and most tangible evidence of the seriousness with which we have pursued that policy and the success which has attended it. Today, the Non-Aligned Movement embraces 53 Member-countries and another dozen or so attend its Conferences in the capacity of observers. The result is that nearly one-half of the Member-States of the United Nations have thus identified themselves with the aims, the objectives and the programmes of Non-Alignment. The difficulties of securing cohesion among so large a group and of achieving coordinated action at the international level can never be under-estimated and it would be idle to pretend that we have achieved that measure of unanimity in commitment which is necessary if we are to achieve optimum influence as a group; but we are united – 60 odd countries are united – in the goals and in the objectives of non-alignment and we are beginning to evolve procedures for action that hold out a real promise of success.

The Lusaka Conference of 1970 was undoubtedly the most successful of the Non-Aligned Conferences. It was characterised by a new appreciation that Non-Alignment must be more than the mere assertion of political independence – more than a mere theoretical freedom from constrain in devising national programmes and pursuing international policies – that it must, in fact, provide the means for securing that measure of economic independence without which the assertion of political non-alignment can be reduced to mere rhetoric. Nowhere was this better expressed than by President Nyerere of Tanzania at the Preparatory Meeting in Dar-es-Salaam in April 1970 which my colleague the then Minister without Portfolio attended and I should like, sir, to read into the records of this debate some of the words used by President Nyerere as he articulated what might indeed be the new philosophy of non-alignment at that Preparatory Meeting.

“The fact is,” he said, “that our political independence depends upon the degree of our economic independence, as well as the nature of our economic development depends upon our political independence. These things are interlinked in the modern world. And because of that inter-independence, our economic relationships with one another, and individually with the Great Powers of the world, are matters with which the Non-Aligned Conference must be concerned.

For it is through these questions of trade and of aid that our action in world affairs can be influenced, if not controlled...

Yet, I repeat; we cannot respond to these facts by denouncing all aid, all foreign investment, and all technical assistance. In so far as these are essential to our development, and cannot be replaced by a re-allocation of our internal resources we each have to seek for them, and accept them, on the best terms we can get ...

But in economic matters we non-aligned states, as a group, can help ourselves and can reduce the danger to any one of us. Economics is not the same as defence. We can help to bolster our freedom from economic domination by working together, by co-operating for our mutual benefit ...

It is this question of economic self-reliance and economic co-operation which I believe must be given special consideration at the next Non-Aligned Conference. We shall undoubtedly reiterate the truths which we have already spoken – about the need for real action against colonialism and racialism, about the need for nuclear disarmament about the importance of supporting the United Nations, and so on. But this time our meeting must do more. It must recognise that freedom and economic backwardness are incompatible in the modern world. And it must work out a combined strategy for overcoming the poverty which now endangers the real independence of every member nation ...

Those were the guidelines that the distinguished President of the Republic of Tanzania offered at the preparatory meeting.

And so, indeed, it turned out at the Lusaka Conference where the emphasis was on the need to secure economic justice for that two-thirds of the world's population which remain underfed, under-housed and under-educated despite the unparalleled scientific and technological achievements of our times. We recognised, moreover, at Lusaka that a major international effort would be required by the Non-Aligned Countries and, beyond them, by the developing countries because there are a few of the developing countries not yet in the Non-Aligned Movement, if this objective was to be secured. Self-reliance at the national level was an important starting point, and there was so much emphasis on this; but group action at the international level was the essential prerequisite for success. Thus it was in the declaration of Lusaka we called upon the United Nations and both expressly and implication, pledged ourselves –

“To employ international machinery to bring about the rapid transformation of the world economic system particularly in the field of trade, finance and technology so that economic domination yields to economic co-operation and economic strength is used for the benefit of the world community; to view the development process in a global context and to adopt a programme of international action for utilisation of world resources in men and materials, science and technology benefiting developed and developing countries alike.”

That was the essential commitment of the declaration on economic activity approved by the conference at Lusaka. To the achievement of these objectives the Government is firmly committed and to these ends in relation to this matter is our foreign policy directed.

5.05 p.m.

Already there has been a significant increase in activity between Guyana and other Member-States of the Non-Aligned Group. With Yugoslavia we have already concluded an Agreement for Technical Assistance; with India we are at this moment finalising an Economic and Cultural Agreement – *[Interruption]* - that is precisely the sort of irrelevant posturing that I was talking about and pleading, obviously in vain, that we might eschew in the course of what I had hoped would have been an enlightening debate – with the countries of East Africa we are

actively canvassing the establishment of new trading patterns which the Government hopes will open up new trading relations between developing countries directly without the third countries acting in a broker capacity.

Our involvement in the Non-Aligned Group is both real, positive and is becoming increasingly intimate. All of this was demonstrated when we were unanimously elected at the Lusaka Conference to be rapporteur of that Conference, a distinction which we are too modest to profess and to expound about, but which was a very real credit to a young new country, new to Non-Aligned Movement but about whose sincerity and dedication there was not a shadow of a doubt among those present at Lusaka. *[Applause]*

That Conference was followed by official visits paid by the Prime Minister to the East African Commonwealth countries of Zambia, Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania and to the Kingdom of Utopia; and, later still, in January of this year, by similar visits to Ceylon, India and Yugoslavia.

Those visits were more than an exchange of courtesies between friends. They represent the forging of close links between Guyana and those countries – and I am sure the significance of the identity of those countries will not be lost on the House – which have been playing a paramount role in the Non-Aligned Movement. I think the Government may fairly claim that Guyana today occupies a place of respect and, therefore, a place of respect and, therefore, a place of importance within the Non-Aligned Group and that our political leadership in the form of the Prime Minister occupies a place of prominence in the Council of Non-Alignment.

The work that was done on those official visits to East and Central Africa as well as the visits to Asia and Yugoslavia has been followed up with consistency and with energy by our Mission at the United Nations, a Mission which is charged with the responsibility of pursuing ceaselessly, the promotion of the objectives of the Lusaka Conference and the securing of that measure of solidarity at the United Nations which is so essential to the success of the declaration of Lusaka.

Our Mission in New York occupies a key place in our diplomatic work in the cause of non-alignment; but we have found the need for a more direct and continuing link with the leadership in Africa and in Asia. Financial considerations restrain us from establishing full scale Missions in the appropriate capitals; but I am glad to say that we have been able to devise arrangements which will permit us to make a modest start in this direction. Within the next few months we hope establish a small Mission in Lusaka which will be headed by an acting High Commissioner and, in co-operation with Caribbean Colleagues, we hope to do likewise at around the same time in New Delhi. In both cases we shall continue the arrangement for non-resident High Commissioners; but I hope the House will agree that while respecting the inevitable financial constraints we will be taking a necessary step in expanding our diplomatic activity into these two areas which are of such importance not only to our cultural heritage, but to our economic and political future.

Very much the same line of reasoning that commits Guyana irresistibly to non-alignment enjoins on us support for the United Nations and for all the efforts of the World Organisation to ensure the practical realisation of the principles of the Charter. We have, therefore, attached great value to our work at the United Nations which our representatives have been carrying out with such distinction in discharging Guyana's obligation and I, believe, in making Guyana's modest contribution but, above all in pursuing Guyana's national interest.

Understandably, it has not been our aim to diffuse our energy over the entire area of United Nations activity. We have concentrated instead on those matters before the General Assembly and on those agencies of the United Nations that are of the most immediate relevance to our interests and our policies. We have avoided posturing and shunned sophistry. We have not lacked courage in speaking out nor intelligence in achieving what is attainable. We have, I believe, earned the respect of the world Organisation and have therefore maximised our influence and our capacity to promote Guyana's national interests.

It might be helpful, indeed it might be instructive, if hon. Members could be made aware of some of the work with which we find ourselves so closely involved at the level of the United Nations. Currently, we are members of UNCITRAL, that is, the United Nations Commission on

17.6.71

National Assembly

5.05 – 5.15 p.m.

International Trade Law and of the important Committee for the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and the Ocean Floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. UNCITRAL is a national jurisdiction. UNCITRAL is a 20 –member Commission set up by the General Assembly to further the progressive harmonisation and unification of the Law of International Trade a law which at the moment works onerously against the developing countries by reducing or removing legal obstacles to the free flow of international trade.

5.15 p.m.

The Committee on the Seabed, under currently enlarged terms of reference is concerned with preparing for a new Conference on the Law of the Sea – these may sound exotic issues but I assure hon. Members that in the outturn of history they can be of the most vital importance to our lives – to be convened in 1973, a draft treaty embodying an international regime for the area and resources of the seabed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction taking into account the equitable sharing by the states in the benefits to be derived therefrom and bearing in mind the special interests and needs of the developing countries.

This very important Committee, of which Guyana is a member, is also required to deal with a broad range of issues affecting such matters as the regimes of the high seas, the continental shelf, the territorial sea, the contiguous zone, fishing and conservation of the living resources of the high seas, the preservation of marine environment and scientific research. I need hardly emphasise the value and the relevance of this work on which we are so actively engaged.

These are not the only Committees on which we have found ourselves called upon to play an intimate and a positive role. Ever since its inception in 1967 Guyana has also been a Member of the Council for Namibia and we are presently Chairman of the Travel Documents Committee of the Council whose purpose is to enable refugees of Namibia to travel abroad in order to acquire the skills necessary for the development of Namibia once that country has been physically released from the illegal administration of the Government of South Africa.

For some time now, also, Guyana has been a Member of the Special Committee on the question of Defining Aggression and, more recently, has been appointed to the important

Committee for Programme and Co-Ordination which looks at the whole range of U.N. economic and social programmes with a view to assessing their potential effectiveness, determining priorities among them and evaluating the capacity of the existing U.N. organisation structure to co-ordinate and implement such programmes with optimum efficiency. This is a Committee that lies at the very heart of the planning of social and economic activity by the United Nations and its agencies.

The work of these Committees is highly specialised but it is perhaps sadly the case that a similar measure of specialisation is developing right through the entire range of United Nations activity. Both with a view to giving hon. Members some indication of the burdens that fall upon our Foreign Service and more particularly upon our Mission at the United Nations and an indication of the changes that are taking place at the international level in the character of international issues, it might be useful if I gave some indication of the subjects that came up for consideration both in Committees and in the General Assembly itself at the last Session, the 25th Session:

The situation in the Middle-East.

Peaceful uses of the Seabed and the Ocean Floor.

The Breadth of the territorial sea.

Peaceful uses of outer space.

General and complete disarmament.

Chemical and bacteriological disarmament.

Suspension of nuclear tests.

Peace-keeping and the strengthening of international security.

U.N. relief for Palestine refugees.

Questions affecting UNCTAD UNIDO UNITAR UNDP.

The Second U.N. Development Decade.

Problems on human environment.

Permanent sovereignty over natural resources.

Human rights questions.

Freedom of information.

Care of the elderly and aged

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination and religious intolerance.

Implementation of the declaration on the grant of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

Apartheid.

Namibia.

The territories under Portuguese administration.

Southern Rhodesia.

Activities of foreign, economic and other interests in Southern Africa.

Youth.

Narcotics.

The U.N. Budget.

The work of the International Law Commission.

Principles of International Law concerning friendly relations and co-operations among States.

UNCITRAL.

The question of the Definition of Aggression.

Review of the United Nations Charter.

The Vienna Convention of the Law of Treaties.

Review of the role of the International Court of Justice.

Rationalisation of the procedures and organisation of the General Assembly.

And this is a selection merely from the 100 plus items of the 1970 General Assembly Agenda – most of which we cannot in Guyana's interest altogether ignore.

All this is in addition to the work of the General Assembly itself commencing with the General Debate and continuing with debates on the recommendations coming from the Committees or on matters entrusted to the Assembly directly. Our Mission in New York is strengthened by Headquarters staff during the Session of the General Assembly; but the volume and complexity of the work that is done in New York is rapidly assuming unmanageable proportions for most of the smaller countries. In the age in which we live, however, there is likely to be no lasting answer to this problem. We must continue to make our contribution in those fields which are of most immediate importance to us with all the energy and expertise at our command. Our record so far has been good and I have every confidence in the calibre of the Diplomatic Service which we have developed since independence.

But while the United Nations runs the danger of being buried under a volume of documentation in the relentless pursuit of the objectives of the Charter, it faces an altogether different problem in relation to its universality. The problem of China has vexed the United Nations from its inception. Within recent years the debates in the General Assembly on the China question have become increasingly ritualistic. Resolutions have been put forward which lack credibility in terms of the true desires of our sponsors and on occasions votes have been cast in support of those resolutions only because their rejection was difficult over these years for small countries to steer through these resolutions a settled and consistent course based on principle.

Guyana's approach to the question has been conditioned by two factors. We have been impressed all along with the essentiality of the People's Republic of China being represented in the world body. The United Nations cannot function effectively if there is any serious breach of the principle of universality in its membership. It will cease to be the world body that it is supposed to be. It cannot function realistically when a Government that represents 800 million people is through one device or another, excluded from its membership.

But we have been impressed also by the need to acknowledge the rights of other members and, in particular, to uphold the principle that the organisation's universality leans also against the expulsion of members. It is for this reason that we had, in earlier years, given affirmative support to the resolution that the matter be regarded as an important question and, therefore, one requiring settlement by a two-thirds majority. As the resolutions have become increasingly formalistic, and it became clear that no resolute effort was being made by the major powers, including some of those major powers who voted in support of the admission of the People's Republic, to break the impasse – this recurring impasse each September – we abstained first of all on the Albanian resolution and then on the American resolution.

This is the position we reached at the 25th Session of the General Assembly. It is a position which we have no difficulty in defending and for which we feel called upon to make no apology. Since it is not possible to anticipate the form in which the matter will arise at the 26th Session, it is equally not possible to indicate any precise voting pattern. I think it important, however, that we should make it clear where we stand on the issues that are involved. *[Interruption]* Let me attempt to say clearly to the House where the Government stands.

First of all, we believe that the People's Republic of China is now seriously interested in taking its rightful place in the United Nations. This has not always been so, and the changed position represents a material factor in our thinking. Secondly, we believe that the People's Republic ought to be a member of the United Nations and is entitled to the seat in the Security Council now occupied by the Nationalist China, that is, it is entitled to one of the five seats reserved for the Permanent Members. Thirdly, we believe that the realities of international existence preclude any other position than that Taiwan is now a separate State – a State, indeed,

of some 12 million people. We believe that this State, no less than the great Republic on the mainland, ought, itself, to have a place in the world organisation though not, of course, to occupy the China seat in the Security Council. I am using words with care and I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition is paying attention.

5.30 p.m.

Whether all this can be secured will depend to a large extent on the way in which the matter is presented at the 26th Session. We hope that a serious effort is already underway by the major powers to ensure a realistic presentation of the issue in a way which will permit the solutions which we hold to be just. But Mr. Speaker, international no less than domestic politics is the art of the possible and I would be less than candid if I did not say to the House that if at the 26th Session we are forced to have no other course on the basis of the principles I have outlined than to ensure that the People's Republic of China – and the 800 million people which its Government represents – occupies its rightful place in the United Nations and its seat as a Permanent Member of the Security Council [*Interruption*]

This year, Mr. Speaker, is International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Its proclamation as such by the General Assembly is indicative both of the relentless efforts that have been made by the United Nations ever since 1945 to combat racism and the acknowledgement that those efforts have not been enough. The object of the commemoration of the year in this way was, therefore, to intensify the struggle against the elimination of racism, of apartheid, of racial discrimination in all forms and to alert the attention of the people everywhere to the need for practical action implementing the numerous declarations and conventions which so many Governments have subscribed but which, alas, Governments and individuals alike all too frequently either ignore or more positively disregard. Much of the work of the United Nations has quite rightly been concerned with the problems of racism and the often related problems of racism and the often related problems of self-determination.

To these efforts, both within and outside the United Nations, Guyana has made a positive and unflinching contribution. I have already adverted to the prominent role we have played and

are playing in the Council of Namibia. At this very moment, a senior officer of the Ministry of External Affairs representing Guyana on the annual visit of the Council to various parts of Africa in pursuance of the Council's mandates, and at this moment also our Legal Counsellor in New York is in Yaounde in the Cameroon Republic where he is presenting a paper at a United Nations seminar dealing with measures to be taken at the national level for the implementation of United Nations instruments aimed at combating and eliminating racial discrimination and promoting harmonious race relations. The seminar is itself being organised as part of the programme for the observance of International year and Guyana has been chosen as one of the 32 countries specifically invited to participate.

The struggle against apartheid and racial discrimination is, of course, waged on many fronts. In the United Nations itself it is carried on relentlessly in the debates on apartheid, on Rhodesia, on Namibia and on the Portuguese Territories of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau. But we have long recognised that much more is needed than resolutions and that indeed a more tangible demonstration was needed of our own commitment to this international struggle for human dignity.

This we have now given in the form of our financial contribution to the Liberation Movements in Southern Africa – a commitment which, as hon. Members know, we pledged at the Lusaka Conference and which we honoured there in 1970 and we have again this very week honoured once more for 1971 on the occasion of the O.A.U. meeting taking place in Addis Ababa. As a multi-racial society, we know all too painfully the virulence of the cancer of racism and as we take steps at Hon. Member to excise it from our own society, so that the international level we have played our part with all the means and resources at our disposal to eradicate it from those remaining enclaves where racial bigotry and racial hatred have been made the touchstone of national policy. The conduct of our foreign relations will continue to be informed by our resolute opposition to all forms of racial discrimination and intolerance and by our tangible support for all practical measures aimed at its total elimination.

At the United Nations, as I have reminded the house before, we function as a Member of the Latin American Group. This association has been important to us in bringing us closer to the

countries of Latin America with whom we are destined to work with growing intimacy. For a time our troubled relations with Venezuela had cast a cloud over our relations with Latin America generally and retarded the forging of those links of friendship and co-operation that must be developed between the English speaking countries of the Caribbean and the States of Latin America.

Today, however, the 17th of June marked the end of one year since the Protocol of Port of Spain was signed and there has been much on the credit side flowing directly from that deed of reconciliation. The Protocol has been in operation throughout the 12-month period. Indeed, so well and effectively has it worked that I was able in my address to the General Assembly last October to report the execution and operation of the Protocol and to place on record my expectation that it opens up fresh possibilities of friendship and co-operation between Guyana and Venezuela.

We can take pride too in the fact that the Protocol has represented an achievement for the methods of the conference table at a time when the work needs to be reassured that peaceful procedures still offer the best possibilities of conflict resolution. Those who doubted then the wisdom of this course will, I hope, be ready now to withdraw their reservations and to join with us in building on the foundation, which the Protocol has laid, a lasting future of good and fruitful relations with our neighbours in Venezuela.

5.40 p.m.

Within the last few months the intent of the Protocol has found fulfilment in the visits paid to Guyana and Venezuela respectively by the Venezuelan Minister of Development, Dr. Haydee Castillo de Lopez Acosta and in return by our own Deputy prime Minister and by the Minister of Housing. In another few days our Chief of Staff and a Flag Escort from the Guyana Defence Force will join his colleagues from the rest of Latin America to celebrate with the Government and people of Venezuela the 150th anniversary of the battle of Carabobo – a battle which marked the turning point in the Venezuelan struggle for independence. It is an occasion on which we salute our brothers in the Republic of Venezuela and are happy to join with them in their commemoration of this significant date in the history of the Hemisphere.

Concurrently with the improvement in our relations with Venezuela, we have been promoting our relations with the rest of Latin America. Through our respective Missions in Brasilia and in Georgetown we have been steadily strengthening our relations with the Republic of Brazil with whom we share in tranquillity a long established frontier and with whom we are working, on those imaginative programmes of integrated road development to which the President made reference in his recent address to this House. The future of Guyana cannot but be different and our prospects of hinterland development cannot but be immeasurably advanced by a road link which would take the traveller from Georgetown, on the Atlantic Caribbean Coast, through Lethem, Boa Vista, Manaus and Brasilia and then onwards to Lima on the Pacific Coast of South America and on to Rio De Janeiro on the southern Atlantic. Within five years that prospect which I know must, to some hon. Members, seem something of a fantasy, that prospect will have become a living reality in our lives. It must continue to be a part of the conduct of our foreign relations to make this reality an augury for the peaceful and prosperous development of Guyana and for the enrichment of the lives of our people.

Gradually, also, over these years, we have been forging links with the Colombia we have recently welcomed their first Consul-General in Georgetown and we are at the moment engaged in discussions with Peru and with Chile out of which I hope will emerge new and important patterns of association. But we must proceed slowly with the expansion of our diplomatic activity, matching our scarce human and financial resources of our most urgent needs. To those who may be impatient, let me be reassuring – the entire Hemisphere is our horizon, and the journey has but begun.

At the institutions level, we are already playing an active role in those hemispheric agencies of immediate relevance to us. This, for example, we have recently participated in the Annual Session of the Economic Commission for Latin America held in Santiago, Chile, and we were represented in an observer capacity at the first General Assembly of the O.A.S. in Costa Rica and at the annual meeting of the Inter-American Development Bank. From the Costa Rica meeting there has emerged a new concept of Permanent Observer status to the O.A.S. – a development which we will be following closely in the months ahead. The O.A.S. itself has been changing greatly in recent years, - in no respect moreso than in relations with the United States.

We must continue to follow these changes with great interest, conscious always that the patterns of our future relationships must inevitably draw us ever closer to the Republics of Latin America.

Our relation with Suriname also has been the subject of much endeavour. Through the good offices of the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago initiative taken early in 1970 produced in June of that year a Joint Declaration by the Prime Ministers of Guyana and Suriname out of which has come an Agreement concluded on November 7th last for the establishment of a Standing Guyana/Suriname Commission. The Commission is charged with exploring ways and means of effecting co-operation in matters of common interest between Guyana and Suriname in the economic, social and cultural fields and of peacefully resolving all outstanding difficulties and situations which might endanger friendship and good neighbourliness between the two countries.

The Commission is actively at work. Indeed, only yesterday a meeting of a technical sub-committee of the Commission reached agreement on their recommendation regarding the establishment of a ferry service between Springlands and Nickerie. Earlier still, agreement had been concluded on an improved telecommunications link between Georgetown and Nickerie. This very afternoon we had the pleasure and the honour of having with us in the Chamber the Deputy Speaker of the Parliament of Suriname. In these practical ways we are developing an entirely new basis for our relations with Suriname – one which I venture to think will prove to be durable and of mutual advantage.

Our oldest links are those with the countries of the Commonwealth and, indeed, with the Commonwealth itself. They are links that have proved lasting despite the many changes, some of them of a fundamental nature, in our political and constitutional relationships. In many ways the new Commonwealth, whose cementing agency has been mutual co-operation and benefit, has been a stronger and a more viable institution than the old Commonwealth linked, as it was, principally by sentiment. But the new Commonwealth has within recent years faced many turbulences and none of them more serious than that which it faced at Singapore in January of this year. Only time will tell whether we have effectively weathered that particular storm. Much will depend on the courses of conduct on which the British Government might hereafter embark.

17.6.71

National Assembly

5.40 – 5.50 p.m.

The Singapore Conference was not a happy Conference; but it was perhaps a measure of the value of the Commonwealth connections that the differences between most of us and the British Government and the problems that they posed for the survival of the Commonwealth were the occasion of immense effort on the part of all delegations to preserve the Commonwealth institution.

5.50 p.m.

One of the most successful developments at the Commonwealth level has been the establishment of the Commonwealth Secretariat; for the Secretariat, with its officers drawn from the four corners of the Commonwealth, including Guyana, is effectively enlarging the areas of practical co-operation between Commonwealth countries. The range of Secretariat activity is already impressive. We were all, I think, impressed when at Singapore its Secretary-General, Mr. Arnold Smith, provided us with the statistics that there are in existence no fewer than 250 Commonwealth institutions and organisations bringing together groups and persons of related interests.

The range of this activity is increasing steadily. A good example of it is the recent establishment of the Export Market Development Fund set up as a result of the Singapore Conference with the purpose of promoting the development of the export trade of the developing members of the Commonwealth. Like the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Co-operation this is tending to give a new dimension to Commonwealth relationships and can only serve to strengthen the institution at a time when it badly needs such reinforcement.

I have left the end, Mr. Speaker, my observations on our relations with the Caribbean. As the President has already stated in his Address to this House at the opening of the Sessions, relations with the Commonwealth Caribbean retain their place of special importance in the Government's policies which will continue to be directed towards the goal of an economically independent and viable Caribbean nation. To deal adequately with our relations, our hopes and our aspirations for the Caribbean would require us, Mr. Speaker, to have almost another debate. And so, perhaps, it should be for our relations with the Caribbean are really no longer a part of our foreign relations.

Let me merely say this. We are entirely serious in our commitment to a dialogue which will permit us to explore all the possibilities of unity in the region – not limited to the forms of economic integration. We are entirely serious when we express our concern about a continuing metropolitan presence in the Caribbean which Associated Status permits – a concern which will only be heightened if in any part of the area, such as the state of St. Kitts/Nevis/Anguilla, the character of that presence were to be altered by unilateral action which deprived it of its consensual basis. We are entirely serious when we say that the realities of separatism today are placing a ceiling upon the limits of economic integration and that we may not be able to make significant progress in this direction unless we come to grips with the essentials of political unity.

For the time being, however, we must press on with the programme of integration. We must make the Free Trade Area more effective and we must move it along up the integration ladder. We must reach agreement on the Common External Tariff. We must produce a harmonised system of fiscal incentives for foreign investment. We must rationalise industrial development and through a policy, we must endeavour to ensure an equitable distribution of the gains of development.

In all this we are greatly assisted by The Commonwealth Caribbean Regional Secretariat and by its dedicated Secretary-General and officers. They, at least, keep alive the hope of the Caribbean that ways can be found so that the people of the region may achieve a meaningful identity as West Indians and the regions as a whole a new self-respect through economic independence.

We have just ended, Mr. Speaker, the first five years as an independent member of the international community and, therefore, the first five years of responsibility for Guyana's external relations. They have been difficult years in many respects. They have been pioneering years for all who have been engaged on our external affairs, whether at the Ministry in Georgetown or at our Missions abroad. But they have been years of challenge and therefore years of stimulating experience. They have been years of learning and I believe, Mr. Speaker, they have been years of achievement. Above all, they have been years that should give us confidence in ourselves and in our future relations with the world community. They have been

years, Mr. Speaker, that entitle us to seek, as we do, in terms of the Motion standing in the name of the Prime Minister, the approval of this House of the Government's conduct of Guyana's foreign affairs.[Applause.]

6 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member Mr. Reepu Daman Persaud.

Mr. R. D. Persaud: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with very great attention to the paper presented on behalf of the Guyana Government by the learned Attorney-General. Indeed, I must say that some aspects of that paper show a capitulation on the part of the Government's foreign policy is concerned. I would like to say – and I am sure the Government will agree – that the Opposition has in no small way contributed to the change in so far as some aspects of the Government's foreign policy are concerned. Therefore I wish to record, though I do it from the Opposition benches, the credit that is due to the Opposition. It was clear when the hon. Attorney-General and Minister of State told the House this afternoon that the Government of Guyana has finally recognised the claim of the millions of people in the People's Republic of China and that the Government of Guyana is now satisfied that the People's Republic of China should be given its proper place in the United Nations and in other bodies.

Of course, the hon. Attorney-General must give some explanation for the change and his explanation is that China is now serious. China has always been serious, but the Guyana Government has not been serious foreign policy must never be one of compromise or one of appeasement. A profound foreign policy and while the hon. Minister of State this afternoon has told us that the foreign policy of the country must be dedicated and influenced by the realities of the situation of the world, one cannot help but make the point that the realities, so far as this Government is concerned, are based on the realities that exist in America and no other reality.

The hon. and learned Attorney-General and Minister of State would concede that this is so. He cannot do otherwise because this is the truth. The foreign policy of any Government must be influenced – I would go further and say “must be controlled” – by Parliament as a whole.

Foreign policy should not be left to the party in Government but Parliament as a whole must have a say in the foreign policy of a country so that when delegate or representative of the country goes abroad he will have the confidence, not merely of the political party to which he is serving, but he would have the confidence and the support of the country as a whole. That support can be given by Parliament which speaks for the majority of the population.

The hon. Minister of State spent a great deal of time this afternoon speaking about his Government's position and his Government's desire to fight against racism and racial discrimination wherever it exists. It was very refreshing to hear this aspect this afternoon, but I would urge the hon. Minister of State to start doing so at home for charity beings at home.

If one were to examine the Official Gazette every week one would see the discrimination in appointments. If we were to examine the number of people who have been appointed. Principle Assistant Secretaries, as listed in this week's Official Gazette, we would be able to see clear evidence of discrimination.

The Government has the right to do everything possible to present, at all international forums, an image of nationalism, an image that this Government is indeed thinking and taking into account the aspirations of all the people of this land. In so doing the Government may colour its delegation, but in reality discrimination is still existing at home in a large way.

I would call upon the Government if it is going to fight on the international scene to end racism and racial discrimination, to start first in Guyana to end all evidence of racism and end all instances of racial discrimination.

6.05 p.m.

Only recently a teacher, because he stood up for what he believed to be right, was victimised and transferred from school on the East Bank to one at Wismar. Could you imagine that, sir? I am referring to the popular figure whose name featured prominently in the Covent Garden Government Secondary School issue, Mr. Roopan. He was transferred to a school at Wismar. If this is not a clear case of racial discrimination what then is? My stand is that in order for us to have a national image at the international scene, in order for us to be able with

conviction to speak and to fight and do everything possible against racism and racial discrimination, we have to correct our own home first. I do not want to point to all the instances, but I merely make these points so that I can remind the Government of the importance of allowing every Guyanese, despite his race, his religion, or his political belief, to make a contribution to the development of this country.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy of a Government influences many things. This being so, when the Government speaks of non-alignment, we must be able to say this in fact and in reality. But just a few days before the Lusaka Conference we heard the Government suddenly announce that it had established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. Even if you are not an active politician unaware of the political realities and truth, you can come to no other conclusion but that it was an act to qualify Guyana to stand with some amount of dignity at that international level forum at Lusaka. Everyone knows this, not only the Guyanese people, but even those who participated in the Conference at Lusaka surely would be able to recognise and see this last moment manoeuvre to let it appear that the Guyana Government is really non-aligned.

One of the hon. Members from this side of the House, during the course of the address by the hon. Attorney General and Minister of State asked “What about Cuba?” One can go further and ask, “What about positive diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union where the Soviet Union can put an Ambassador to sit in our capital in Guyana and we send an Ambassador willing to send an Ambassador here but the Guyana Government has only done that as another posture for image building.

Mr. Speaker, we can cite instances where despite the fact that we have Embassies and Ambassador in various parts of the world the Guyanese people are not being represented. I was listening very carefully into the speech of the hon. Attorney General this afternoon to hear him say something about the recent declaration of the Brazilian Government of extending nearly 200 miles away from its border. What will be the result? The Guyana Government has been silent on this, and it is this aspect I want to hear the Guyana Government on. We have had several cases where Guyanese fishermen finding themselves in Brazilian waters have been arrested, their

property confiscated and they have been put in gaol. This occurred prior to the announcement and declaration that the Brazilian Government had extended its border beyond 200 miles.

There is the case of the boat "Sir Lawrence" which went into Brazilian waters. All the members of the crew were arrested, the boat confiscated and one man sentenced to 18 months imprisonment. Representations were made to the Ministry of External Affairs but up to now we have heard absolutely nothing from the Ministry or from the Ambassador representing this country in Brazil.

Through the Ministry of External Affairs the owner of the boat paid the sum of \$250 for representation. The Ministry again advised that \$1,000 be paid. Although the Guyanese owner of the boat "Sir Lawrence" made these payments his boat was still confiscated and Mr. Sukdeo has been gaoled for 18 months in Brazil. It would appear that the Ministry gave absolutely no assistance.

The hon. Attorney General and Minister of State during the course of his speech spoke of the road linking Guyana with Brazil, and he spoke of the tranquillity existing and greater integration between the two countries. Well, if there is this integration, we are to say this afternoon that our Ministry of External Affairs does not have the capacity to negotiate with the Brazilian Government for the release of one man and the return of one boat? The cost of the boat is \$28,000.

6.15 p.m.

The hon. Attorney General and Minister of State cannot tell this House this afternoon that the boat has been returned and the man freed. As a matter of fact, if we were to read publications coming from Brazil we would see that they are saying now, that if fishermen find themselves in what they declare to be Brazilian waters, they will not only be arrested, the boats will not only be confiscated, but further, they will be required to have reputable representation in Brazil before justice can be given them.

I should like to know if the Ministry of External Affairs has been in contact with Brazil so far as this issue is concerned. *[Interruption]* Hon. Members want to know why these matters should find themselves within a debate on foreign affairs. In my view, they are related. We have a large number of people who fish and who are without proper guide, geographic and otherwise. Very easily a fisherman can move away from the Guyana border into Brazilian waters which now extend for nearly 200 miles. What will be the result? The result is that he can be shot; he can be arrested; his boat can be confiscated, and he can be gaoled in Brazil. Yet the Ministry of External Affairs is silent.

As far as Trinidad is concerned, that country is very much affected. Delegations of fishermen in Trinidad have met Mr. Kamaluddin Mohammed, the Minister of External and West Indian Affairs on the issue, but the Guyana Government has done nothing so far as our fishermen are concerned

And so, in examining the foreign policy of the Government, it is absolutely necessary to recognise that what may appear to hon. Members as a small issue and a small point involves the livelihood of small fishermen at the bottom. America extends to about 12 miles from her border; Britain to 3 miles. I think Guyana is still following the British and we have extended to 3 miles beyond our border.

The hon. Attorney General spoke of the number of committees on which the Guyana Government is now sitting. Guyana is chairing some of them. What is being done to have an international code so far as this issue is concerned? The hon. Minister has not specifically pointed to the issue with Brazil. I was listening to him particularly for this point and so the time has come, in view of the recent developments in Brazil, for the Government to educate fishermen, for the Government to make a public statement that if any of our fishermen are caught within this 200-mile stretch, over which the Brazilian Government has declared it has rights, the Guyana Government is going to offer protection and, if necessary, the Guyana Government will represent the Guyanese fishermen and they will not be called upon, as in the case I referred to earlier, to find nearly \$1,500 to pay for representation.

These matters must be settled at a diplomatic level. We have precedent for this. During the colonial days when the P.P.P. Government was in office it was able to negotiate with the Venezuelan Government and get the return of fishermen's boats and also to get the Venezuelan Government to release persons who were arrested in Venezuelan water. This Government owes the nation, and this Parliament in particular, an explanation so far as this sad case is concerned.

In relation to this decree by the Brazilian Government, we must also take into account that at the moment we have two companies exploring for oil within or even beyond 100 miles Guyana. What is the position? The Minister has not touched on this issue and we, on this side of the House, would like to know the position. We have allowed two companies to explore for oil and if in fact, they were to find themselves within the area declared by the Brazilian Government, what would be this Government's stand on the issue. The Brazilian Government is now patrolling the area by air.

Further, there is the question of the European Economic Community. There is talk about these underdeveloped countries being associated states, and we read in the newspapers what Mr. Bradshaw had to say. I want to quote one portion of his statement:

“If after 1974 we are unable to sell sugar to Britain, if this quantity is reduced to any significant extent, then many of us will starve. There is no question about it and the Europeans would not bat an eye because they are concerned largely with their own welfare and we need not expect sympathy from these people.”

We would like to know what is the Guyana Government's policy so far as the E.E.C. is concerned because it is absolutely necessary for us to start thinking from now. We have been depending on sugar without thinking of any substitute if anything goes wrong, and every hon. Member knows the great contribution sugar makes to the economy of this country. It is therefore absolutely necessary for the Government to take a positive stand so far as the EEC is concerned. I refer to only one aspect of Mr. Bradshaw's statement reported in the *Guyana Graphic* of Sunday last.

The Government must have trade with those countries that are prepared to set up factories in Guyana so that the by-product of sugar can be used for many other things. The hon. Attorney General and Minister of State knows that many things from the sugar cane can be used for products that we are importing at the moment; and therefore, the Government needs immediately to look at this whole question of sugar.

Mr. Bradshaw is worried and we ought to be worried too. All the Caribbean countries that produce sugar must be worried about this development Within the E.E.C. and so hon. Members on this side of the House can see the relationship of agriculture to the Government's foreign policy. As I said, foreign policy affects various aspects of a country's economic life.

6.25 p.m.

We have not been able over the period of years that this Government has been in power to set up factories to industrialise the country so that we can cater for by-products. As a result, unemployment is growing and I am sure that the unemployment figure in Guyana exceeds 30 per cent not to mention the figure for under-employment.

The Government must look into these areas. It must examine the situation and see what Hungary was prepared to buy from us. We must start diversifying seriously to meet the world market and the world situation. We cannot remain aloof and think that we will have a good sugar production each year. Only recently Bookers has reported on its retail market in Britain so far as sugar is concerned. The rice industry has been destroyed; the sugar industry is threatened. Words cannot, as the hon. Attorney General would have said, solve the situation realistically. This is what we really want to hear from the Government: How will the Government move to establish relations whereby this country can be more free to have trade agreements or reciprocal trade with countries sympathetic to Guyana

Mr. Speaker: Time!

Mr. Ram Karran: I move that the hon. Member be given to 6.30 p.m. to conclude his speech.

Mr. Y. Ally *seconded.*

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. R. D. Persaud: As I was saying, these are the issues we wish the Government to speak on, because it is our view that the Government is sitting on two boats at one and the same time. The Government is attempting to create an image on the international scene that it is progressive and socialist and at the same time it wants to retain friendship with Governments that have for a long number of years been sucking the blood of the people from these parts

In the early stage of his speech the hon. Minister of State said that the Government's foreign policy must be influenced by super powers, but the Government is being influenced by only one super power, and that is America.

Therefore I say that this Government is not consistent in its policy and as a result of its alignment with one particular power It has failed to win greater friendship with countries that can indeed help this country in a tangible way by helping us to have more factories to industrialise the country, to create more employment so that our economic situation can be better and the Guyanese people become more prosperous.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, perhaps this is a convenient time to take the suspension for 1½ hours.

Sitting suspended accordingly.

8.06 p.m.

On resumption -

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member Mr. Chandisingh

Mr. Chandisingh: Mr. Speaker, we on this side, I am sure, listened with very much interest to the address by the hon. Minister of State outlining Government's principles and practices in the field of foreign affairs. I think that this was an opportunity for the Government, had it been its intention, particularly at this time in our development, to enunciate bold new principles and policies in our international relationships. We listened, sir, hopeful, half-expecting almost that the Government would have seen the true realities of the international situation and of Guyana's place in the context of that situation, to embark upon new policies and to break with the old neo-colonialist policies of the past.

I go so far as to say that some of the remarks made by the hon. Minister of State gave the impression that there were germs of the possibilities of a change of policy and of a progressive foreign policy. Certain of the recent developments might have led us to hope that the Government was seeing the situation in a new light. But, sir, those germs were left to dry up, if I may so put it, and we were left with the feeling that the Government is still continuing with the old policies with only slight refurbishings here and there, tinkering, so to speak, with the situation in order to present a new image, as my hon. Colleague said.

Now, the Minister of State began by saying that the Government was proceeding with a sense of realism. In this position, how does the Government see the international situation, the realities of today? The Minister of State said that the international scene seems dominated by super power politics, that in whatever area it may be, we are faced with super power influences. He was referring, of course, to the major powers in the world, the Soviet Union and the United States.

If the Government starts with this premise, if this is the premise on which it bases its principles of foreign policy, then we suggest that what flows from such a mistaken premise can have very serious consequences for the entire Guyanese nation at this time when the situation calls for something else.

I do not want to deal at length with the super power theory except to say that this theory, which is being peddled by imperialism and those who support imperialism, has always been designed to mask or to obliterate the real, essential distinctions between the so-called “super powers,” that is, the Soviet Union and the United States. It is a theory which leaves out of account entirely the question of socio-economic systems, of class content and rule, and the major objectives and directions of these two major powers in the world today, one capitalist and one socialist

This theory which the hon. Minister of State has expounded, and in which he seeks to associate the so-called “members of the non-aligned community is a misleading theory... The Minister speaks about non-alignment seeking to clothe Guyana's foreign policy under the overall cover of being a member, so to speak, of the non-aligned community of nations. But we must remember that even in the non-aligned community there are big difference between countries and their foreign policy. Some are more closely aligned or attuned with western capitalist policy; others are more closely aligned with socialist countries, but all of them are regarded as non-aligned. Therefore, I do not think that the hon. Minister of State should use the occasion of Guyana's representation at a non-aligned conference to pin a badge of progressivism on the Government's foreign policy.

I should like to refer to what I would regard as a scientific assessment of the international situation. In other words, the hon. Minister of State in presenting his Government's policy refers first of all to the super powers dominating the world. This is the central theme, the central point around which everything else flows. Is this a correct assessment?

8.15 p.m.

We would offer another assessment of the international situation. We would say that we are living in an epoch which can be characterised as the transition from capitalism to socialism, in an epoch of struggle between the two opposing social systems, an epoch of socialist and national liberation revolutions, of the break-down of imperialism and the abolition of the colonial

system, in an abolition of the colonial system in an epoch of transition of more and more people to the socialist path of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world scale. This is the way in which we assess this epoch in which we are living. This is the real content of it.

The hon. Minister of State in his remarks referred to the fact that in any major international question to be decided today the two super powers have to be involved and he also said that Guyana still has options, Guyana still has the possibility of manoeuvrability, that the situation is not closed. Here again, not starting from the correct premise of seeing the epoch in which we live, they come to wrong conclusions. It is true that in any major international situation today which has to be settled. It is necessary for the Soviet Union to be involved. Time was when, just a few years ago, this was not the position. The imperialist world dominated by the major metropolitan countries of Europe and America was able to determine the course of events, the course of development so to speak. Then with the great October Revolution of 1917, for the first time there emerged a socialist state ruled by the working class. But even at that time, until up to the end of the Second World War, socialism was still relatively weak and could not effectively influence the course of development.

But with the development of the world socialist system the community of socialist countries which subsequently took place, and the strengthening of the Soviet Union, economically, militarily, and politically and also in the field of international prestige, all of this has meant that today in this epoch in which we are living we can say that the motive forces in the world are the international working class and its main creation – the world socialist system. And this, together with the National Liberation Movement and the struggle of all the working class in other countries is what is able to influence and now determine the course of world events. That is why we find it necessary that the socialist world has to play a part. Imperialism does not have its own way anymore. That is the reason too for Guyana, as the hon. Minister of State has said, having the possibility still of certain options, certain manoeuvrability still. It is not because as he tried to put it, that the socialist Soviet Union and the capitalist United States are involved in deal to rule the world, and the smaller countries have to fend for themselves. It is quite the contrary. It

is the very existence of the Soviet Union and the world socialist system which is giving countries like Guyana the options, the possibility of manoeuvre that the hon. Minister of State has spoken about.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is in this respect that first of all we would say that the Government's whole conception of the character of the age in which we live is mistaken, either from a genuine position of not understanding the situation, or it may be that they understand the situation but still would not move in keeping with the new requirements. Assuming that premise, we ask ourselves the question: With whom do you now stand? Do you stand on the side of the forces which are the motive forces in the world today and which are determining the course of human social development? Are you on the side of the world socialist system and the National Liberation Movement which is one of the firmest allies in the move to socialism? Or are you still going to stick in the camp of imperialism despite certain developments, which my hon. Colleague referred to as image building?

I wish to point out also, as our party states, that experience has shown that it is only in close association, in close alliance, with the natural allies of the under-developed or new states, only in close alliance with the socialist world can these newly independent states succeed in breaking the bonds of imperialist ties and securing economic independence and then making the move towards building a genuinely socialist society.

There is another theory which is being put forward implicitly, if not explicitly. From what we can see also from the Government's practice and from what the hon. Minister of State said, this Government is seeking, first of all, to develop close relations with the so-called "Third World," or shall I say the non-aligned countries, that is, the underdeveloped countries for the most part. This is the area of concentrated activity in the field of foreign relations — in the Caribbean, Asia, Africa and Latin America, perhaps.

We are not opposed to this policy. This is very good for the countries which are thinking in the same way. It is good for countries that have the same problems to get together and try to

find common approaches to the problems. But we would suggest again that it would be most mistaken for any Government such as ours in an under-developed country, relatively speaking, to regard this type of association as the means by which we will be able to pull ourselves up and have the chance some day or the other of attaining to the heights of the presently developed countries.

Why is this so? It is self-evident that the non-aligned countries are themselves undeveloped for the most part. Many of these that are developing also have close relations with the socialist world and they are getting invaluable help in terms of building up their local industry, using specific raw materials and so on. Thus if we concentrate our policies only on this Third World, among the non-aligned countries, we would not be in the position to secure the necessary assistance on a basis of mutual benefit in terms of industry, machines, technical advice so that we could sooner or later build ourselves up to the position where we would not have such need. This is another sort of theory which is being put forward and which we feel is quite wrong in the context of our requirements.

I want to make it quite clear that we are not saying that the Government should not involve Guyana in closer relations with the people and Governments of these countries, but it must be seen as part of the task and that without the closest type of relationship with the socialist countries and foremost with the leading country of the Socialist world, that is, the Soviet Union our efforts are going to be wasted.

8.25 p.m.

Another theory I wish to speak against is the idea being put forward that the countries of the world can be divided between rich and poor countries. There are the rich countries and the poor countries. We come under the category of poor countries and therefore we have got to fend for ourselves; the poor must help the poor, so to speak. The rich are not going to help us. The rich have their own interests. In this again we see an attempt to obliterate the distinction as

between countries with different social systems, with different class systems, with different aims and objectives.

I have been referring to the Soviet Union and I would like to say that we on this side were very pleased with what seemed to be the beginning of diplomatic relations with the main country of the socialist world, the Soviet Union. We recall that in September last year, the hon. Prime Minister held discussions with the Soviet Ambassador in London, Mr. Smirnovsky, and they agreed in principle, according to the communique, to establish diplomatic relations. The next thing was the actual agreement to establish diplomatic relations which I believe came later that same year, and then only very recently we witnessed the accreditation of Ambassadors between our two countries on a non-resident basis.

I was actually present in the Soviet Union at the time when Mr. John Carter, the High Commissioner in London — I stand corrected, Sir John Carter — went to Moscow and was at that time waiting to present his credentials. This was a positive development, I would say. We later saw in the papers Sir John Carter laying a wreath on the Lenin mausoleum. Very good! It shows how times have changed and the realities of the situation are coming to bear upon certain people who, in the past, would never have thought that they would be laying a wreath on the tomb of Lenin.

Incidentally, I would like with your permission, sir, to refer to and to quote from page 431 of the book by Dr. Cheddi Jagan, *The West on Trial*, because it has some relevance to what we have just been talking about.

“A little later, in Thunder October 23rd, 1954, he” that is, the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Burnham, “attacked John Carter of the U.N.D.P., who had called Burnham and myself agents of the Kremlin and had said it was necessary ‘to strangle and root out for all time the traitors in our midst.’”

In reply, Burnham wrote: ‘So far as we are aware, the Soviet Union is a socialist country, and as such cannot be imperialist at the same time . . . Mr. Carter is deliberately

confusing the issues of Guianese independence and international and deliberately distorting the peaceful international policy of the Soviet Union.”

We are happy that the present hon. Prime Minister has had such thoughts in the past and we would wish, if that were possible, that his feelings about this matter are the same as they were then. In case his sentiments have changed, we would urge that the hon. Prime Minister return to the sentiments which he once professed because this would be in the interest of the Guyanese nation.

I was recalling the recent developments leading up to diplomatic relations and the accreditation of Ambassadors on a non-resident basis. Today, we also had hoped, even against all our expectations from the record of the Government, that this Government, realising the realities of the international situation, would have been able to tell us something about its relations with the Soviet Union, about its intentions, what it is going to do, how we are going to make use of this small beginning in order to really benefit from this exchange. To our great surprise and disappointment we have seen that the hon. Minister of State has, I would say, studiously avoided all reference to this matter.

One cannot say this question is a minor matter which is one of several things which have happened in the past. I would say this establishment of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union is perhaps the biggest development, the biggest change in the international relations of this Government since Independence. It ought to have been something which would have been regarded as most prominent. Why this silence? Should we come to the conclusion, as we are inclined to do that the Government has merely established these diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and is trying to utilise the prestige internationally that this would give, while at the same time, keeping the Soviet Union at arm's length and making all sorts of difficulties for the development of closer relationships?

We would hope the opposite is true but on the basis of what we have seen and not heard, we cannot come to the conclusion that the Government is really interested in genuine

relationships. Perhaps it would be necessary for the Guyanese people who are waking up to the realities, who are voicing their interest in such matters, to begin to raise their voices even more, so the Government would take heed of the Guyanese people's desires and wishes. Even recently we have seen where certain personalities are now feeling free to come out and discuss such matters, saying, "Let us trade with the Soviet Union if we have difficulties with other countries; Alcan, and so on; let us shift our policies." I am thinking, for example, of Mr. Archibald Codrington who made some remarks in a letter which was published in the press. And there are many others, but people at that level are beginning to see the need for changes. The Guyanese working people in the towns and in the countryside are becoming more aware of the need and are calling for firmer, closer relationships with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

8.35 p.m.

My time is going. Let me touch quickly on the question of trade. Only recently we were told by the hon. Minister of Trade, when there was some discussion on the External Trade Bureau, that certain firms and merchants, who were importers, have not been able to continue with their privileged position and are communicating with their suppliers in the western world. The suppliers, in turn, are raising prices and making it difficult for the Government to operate the E.T.B. and thus reduce the cost of living.

We know that a lot of the goods — foodstuff even, cloth and other things—which come from the socialist countries are much cheaper than the goods from western markets and the people of Guyana can benefit greatly by an increase in trade with the socialist countries.

This is not simply a question of getting cheaper goods. Such a policy will result, I am sure, in reducing the cost of living, but at the same time it will help to build our relationships on a more stable basis. We know that the socialist countries have planned economies. It takes time sometimes to arrange such agreements and to implement them. You do not just go and say, "Send us 10,000 cases of this. We want this and if you cannot supply now it shows you cannot supply. We shall have to go to the western world." No. You have to begin by taking the steps and

making the agreements which in a short while will enable socialist countries, the Soviet Union, Bulgaria and others, to be able to gear their economies to supply the necessities for Guyana

These changes, I think, in our foreign policy with respect to trade must begin now or we shall lag behind. I say we shall lag behind because elsewhere in Latin America — I may not have enough time to deal fully with this matter — where even, in some cases, more right wing Governments are in office, trade relations with the Soviet Union are being developed.

I have an article by A.I. Sizonenko on the U.S.S.R.'s relations with Latin American capitalist countries. The article was printed in the Soviet Union periodical *Latinskaya Amerika* No. 1 of 1971 and reprinted in the Tass Bulletin. It shows that there was an increase in Soviet trade with Latin America "From 1960 through 1969 the turnover nearly doubled." As a matter of fact, we know that the Soviet Union is purchasing from the Latin American countries even more goods than the Latin American countries are buying from the Soviet Union in return, even though there ought to be an equal exchange. But the Soviet Union is continuing to do this because it is in the interest of the development of these countries enabling them to adopt an independent policy internally and in foreign affairs

If I have time there are one or two quotations I should like to make from this article. These are statements by certain leaders in Latin America to show the importance of Soviet trade and aid. Let us take our neighbour, Venezuela. Venezuela was having some difficulty in selling her oil to the United States; the United States was using pressure, restricting quotas and soon. This is what the news analyst, Rafael Parira, of the large metropolitan newspaper *Ultimas Noticias* said:

"On the prospects of Venezuelan Soviet relations, we shall be able to trade without fearing interference prejudicing the country's sovereignty."

Then President Rafael Caldera answering questions put to him by Pravda about the future relations between the U.S.S.R. and his country stressed that:

“the most important problems for Venezuela on the question of oil is the defence of prices on it and respect for the country’s native markets.”

The quotation continues:

“In a similar vein Minister of Internal Affairs Lorenzo Fernandez spoke to a group of U.S. journalists in February 1970. He pointed out that his country was very much interested in re-establishing diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, and cited the oil question as one of the reasons. ‘We hope, he said ‘that in the person of the Soviet Union we shall find a defender of our oil.’”

And so I could go on:

“Speaking at a conference, Rafael Caldera pointed out that the re-establishment of relations with the U.S.S.R ‘is to be explained by the dynamic change of the conditions in which we live ...and has been dictated by the need arising from the fact that Venezuela is encountering problems concerning her oil market, and the regulation of oil prices on the world market, and many other problems which we need to discuss with a country affiliated with the same international organisation as Venezuela... The Soviet Union plays an important role in the contemporary world and this importance of hers induces us to have dialogue and solve questions with her without intermediaries, by direct means’.”

To conclude, I would suggest that this Government abandon the old outworn neo-colonialist policies and launch upon a bold new policy based on the principle of the reality of the situation in the world today. We can have other arrangements in addition to trade and aid, and trade should be worked out properly. You do not just go to them and say, “Look, we have a surplus of 1 million tons of bauxite. Are you going to take it? We have so many thousand tons of rice. Are you going to take rice?” As I said, these countries have planned economies and if you go to them like that they are certainly not going to be able to help, and then you will turn around and say: “They are not willing to help. We had this and we offered it to them.” We have to work out proper arrangements and I am sure that this country will benefit greatly.

In addition to trade and aid, industrialisation and so on, I would venture to suggest once more that this Government should take the opportunity to develop closer relations with the Soviet Union and to extend this relation to the cultural, scientific and technical spheres. Perhaps we should even arrange an exchange of Parliamentary delegations. I am sure that many hon. Members, on the opposite side in particular, would find such an exchange most instructive and educative and it would help the whole country. We said that we should have delegations of trade unionists from the bauxite industry to visit and see their counterparts, to see workers' participation and how control is effected in practice in the Soviet Union. I am not saying that they will accept everything they see. We are not calling for this, but we shall then have better understanding in our relationships.

The hon. Minister of Health, for example, has recently announced that the Government intends to investigate the possibility of training doctors here. We have been calling for this for two years now and we can get assistance if this Government really intends to develop friendly relations, not relationships in which they stab the socialist countries in the back and then say, "Help us!" and if no help is given they say: "They are not willing to help us." That means that you are not sincere. This type of relationship I am not talking about.

We can get all the assistance we need. We see how formerly backward republics in the Soviet Union like Uzbekistan have developed to the point where they now have more doctors per 10,000 of population than the more developed countries. There are places like America and some countries like Bulgaria, which I visited recently and which was one of the most backward countries in Eastern Europe 26 years ago. You should see the way in which it is progressing in terms of industrialisation.

I should like, once again, to suggest that this Government — if it is really concerned with the national interest — should move immediately to change its policies and establish very close relations with the socialist world. We are not suggesting that it should break entirely all relations with the western world. Not at all but this change is necessary.

If, as I said before, the Government seems disinclined to make this change, then it would appear that it is waiting for the people of this country to express their wishes, to put more pressure on the members of the Government. That may be the only way in which the Government will move opportunistically, so to speak. But, whatever may be the situation, we give this House the assurance that the People's Progressive Party, honouring its commitments, as adopted at the 16th Congress of our party, will continue indefatigably to urge the Guyanese people and to mobilise them to struggle for a real anti-imperialist policy, a pro-working class and socialist policy both in internal matters and also in our foreign relations. *[Applause]*

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member Mr. Feilden Singh

Mr. M. F. Singh: I listened with great interest to my learned and hon. Friend the hon. Attorney General and Minister of State. There is nothing basically wrong with the Government's foreign policy, but we should like to warn against what recent trends and tendencies seem to indicate to be a tendency towards deviating from this policy.

In this debate the question is asked: "What really is the basis of foreign policy?" The answer seems to be that the basis of foreign policy is the best interest of the country and, as an extension, the best interest of the human race.

Where does this best interest lie in relation to Guyana? The United Force would like to ask whether we are changing our course without being sure that the change is indeed a wise one. Let me amplify this. In the past we have been tied to the western powers, both for our trading and for protection from those who were stronger than we. From indications that we have seen recently, it seems to be proposed to substitute this trading link, which has stood us really in good stead, and this very real alliance which has protected us and, indeed, is still protecting us, for some vague association with the Third World.

Just what can the Third World do for us? Just how uncommitted is the Third World? The truth is that the Third World is committed up to the neck to orders from Moscow and Peking. That is the fact of the matter. Let us take one example. Egypt is not merely a client of the U.S.S.R. for arms, but it is indeed tied to Moscow's apron strings so much so that if Brezhnev says jump it has to jump. Indeed several of the East African countries are deeply involved with Moscow's economic policies

And nearer home, on the Continent of South America, if we turn to Cuba we will see how totally unrealistic is the policy of breaking with our friendly neighbours to the North and substituting a policy of alienation. Cuba, if she were not already ideologically committed, would probably be prisoner for Moscow for one hundred years because of her enormous debts.

This perhaps would have been excusable if life had improved in Cuba. But let us ask the question: Where is the Cuban sugar industry? It is indeed the subject of unfulfilled force by Castro and unfulfilled debt payments to Moscow and the Kremlin. From what we read the island is indeed a virtual prison camp taking orders from the Kremlin. Everything is rationed, even tobacco the second great national crop. What is the position there? It is practically unobtainable partly because of the agricultural inefficiencies and partly because of the demands of Cuba's communist friends.

Freedom we all know is non-existent in Cuba and the same story, in fact, is being repeated right here on the Continent of South America, in Chile where liberty is being trampled underfoot in the name of Marxism, in Chile where already the living standards have begun to drop. Under Allende we have read and we know that there is suppression of the Press, there is imprisonment of the Opposition and there are assassinations. We all know this and it is freely reported. If you want to say that this again is communist, is western propaganda, read what has been reported in the *New York Times* on Allende and Chile. Will they tell us that the *New York Times* has been guilty of western propaganda when they published recently what they called the inside story on Vietnam? Look at the back page of the *Evening Post* today, you will see the East and West praising the *New York Times* with respect to their exposing the Vietnam inside

story. The *New York Times* is the same newspaper which published the stories in respect of Chile and what is happening in Chile.

I turn now to Caribbean unity. Caribbean unity is indeed very laudable but there are great dangers in rushing headlong towards Caribbean unity. We feel that we should consolidate what progress is being made on the home front; and when we have everything working in order here then we move towards tackling the new stage, Caribbean unity. After all, let us ask the question: What has Carifta really done for us? Is it working properly? Has it provided employment? Has it reduced the cost of living in Guyana? To date this obviously has not taken place. It would be argued, of course, that without Carifta the deterioration in living standards resulting from rising costs and fewer jobs would perhaps have been much greater. But to our minds Carifta can only be of real benefit to us when we are in a position to manufacture and grow the articles for export within the region itself.

Perhaps it is not Carifta which is failing; perhaps it is the Government's policy which is to be found lacking. The policy here at home seems to be a policy going out of its way to discourage local manufacturers and agriculturalists — manufacturers especially. They must be certain that investment is welcome and safe, they must be assured of the home market on which they can base their export rate. Until this is done, Mr. Speaker, wisdom in foreign affairs may be negated by muddled and partisan thinking on the home front.

My hon. and learned Friend in dealing with the United Nations International Year for Action to combat Racism and Racial Discrimination said — and I think I am quoting correctly: “At the international level we have played our part well. We have played our part with all the means and all the resources at our disposal.” That is very laudable indeed on paper. He mentioned the \$50,000 given at the last Lusaka Conference and the second instalment of \$50,000 which we understand was given this week. But what about the home front? What about the position here in Guyana? We all know what the position is. Those who have eyes to see will see and those who have ears to hear will have heard that discrimination is rampant by the P.N.C. Government in Guyana.

Let us take some examples of discrimination. Take for example the rice farmers, they are still second-class citizens. They are still the people who are toiling in the sun and the rain. It is their industry. But who reaps the benefits? Who controls the industry? Non-rice farmers driving around in their flashy car and sitting in their posh offices. They are the people who are reaping the benefits. The profits of the rice industry does not go back to the farmers; it goes into the pockets of the P.N.C. boys. Is not this discrimination?

9 p.m.

Surely, it is discrimination and the most terrible type of discrimination when you are depriving these people whose industry it is and who work so hard to make it a success.

Let us take another example. We all know of the Government's employment bureau. Who controls the employment bureau? Not the civil servants. The orders come from Congress Place. Everyone in this country knows that. It is discrimination of the grossest nature and reaches the point where the only person who can get a job through the Employment Exchange is a P.N.C. man. If you belong to another party, you do not have a ghost of a chance.

What about the Amerindians? Is discrimination not being practised against them? How many times in the past have they not been promised their lands? They have got nothing except promises. They are up in the hinterland; no particular attention is paid to them. Perhaps in the tradition of the P.N.C. they will be given their lands shortly before the next elections, as a sort of bribe, to get their votes.

Let us realise that there is general discrimination and interference in the public service today. We have heard, as I said earlier, from Mr. Norman Semple, the Vice-President of the Public Service Association, at a very authoritative level, what is happening in the Public Service. He has told us about the new elite, the people who think they are not bound by any rules and regulations probably because they helped the Government rig the last elections. Those are the people who think they are above everybody else, that the Civil Service rules and regulations do not apply to them; they are the people who are causing discrimination in the Public Service today. These are the evils that need correction at home before the Government can boast of its

achievements at the international level, for in the final analysis, a country's foreign policy would be farcical if it cannot practise at home what it preaches abroad.

Dr. Jagan: Mr. Speaker, I would think that we will all agree with the last speaker, the leader of the United Force, when he said that there is fundamentally nothing wrong with the foreign policy of the P.N.C. Government. Actually this was what the previous leader of the United Force said. I have a clipping from one newspaper, the *Guyana Graphic* which quotes Mr.d'Aguiar as saying there is a financial crisis in the making. At the time Mr.d'Aguiar was in London and he was quoted as saying that:

“... the P.N.C. and the U.F. were ‘at one’ on foreign policy, but disagreed on domestic issues, particularly economics.”

It seems that from the time the statement was made to the present time, we have traversed quite a few years but indeed and in fact, as the present leader of the United Force said, we have made no fundamental change in our foreign policy. All we have done is merely window dressing to refurbish the image of the P.N.C.

This is, of course, quite understandable considering the subjective factors in our political affairs. We are not dealing only with objective factors because had we been dealing with objective factors Guyana would have definitely had a new foreign policy. The subjective factors — I refer particularly to the person of the Prime Minister — are such that the Prime Minister is on the stage and he cannot help but be propelled, at least in words, in the direction of progressive ideas and ideologies.

The Prime Minister goes to Lusaka. He cannot help but follow the lead of the progressives, if not to take the lead as being the most progressive. This is his personality. I know the old comrade. *[Laughter]* But the question of performance is another matter. When we come to the realities of the situation this is a different story. This is where the pulls and the pressures begin to exert themselves and thus we have the P.N.C. saying one thing at the foreign level at Lusaka, but at the domestic level, in Guyana, the policy does not match out within the pronouncement. Thus the United Force leader rightly can say, as his previous leader did, that on

foreign policy there is no disagreement, “we are at one”; as the Prime Minister would say, “*ad idem.*”

In order to make it appear that they are pursuing something new the members of the Government have to use phraseology such as “non-aligned” and, in order not to forge a new path they have to rationalise on the basis of what they know to be incorrect. In these days we find imperialism not only making new manoeuvres on the economic front, such as the theory of partnership but also, on the ideological front, tremendous forces are at work. I can understand my hon. friend the Minister of State being caught up in these ideological confusions, but I cannot forgive my ex-comrade the Prime Minister. He had real fundamental understanding but as he rightly said some time ago, “politics is the science of deals” and having made a deal with the United States of America to get him into power he has to go along with this policy which is dictated by the United States of America.

Now, sir, let us face the realities. My Friend Mr. Chandisingh tried to put the thing in proper perspective. [*Interruption*]

The fact of the matter is that we are dealing not with two super powers only. As my friend pointed out, we are dealing with two socio-economic systems, one struggling to maintain the status quo and one attempting to displace it. This is the fundamental struggle that is going on in the world. We are being made to understand that the Third World countries like Guyana, the so-called “non-aligned,” are now struggling for existence between the clash of these two super powers. This is first of all wrong in conception and clearly will lead to grave difficulties when translated into policy.

Third World countries have been tied to the imperialist countries. At one time they were colonies. The most important factors today in the Third World are the explosions and the necessity for social revolution. Two things are incompatible: To stand in the same relationship with the western capitalist countries and to carry out social revolution, because in the metropolitan countries all their policies, financial; ideological and everything else are geared towards maintaining their dominance, maintaining the old socio-economic structures and drawing out profits.

My friend referred a little while ago to the Venezuelan Government. There is no great change; Christian Democratic Government is not a socialist government, but Venezuela is faced with certain realities. Here is a magazine, the official organ of the Venezuelan Government, in which is stated that world-wide oil profits were 34.4 per cent in 1965, 34.3 per cent in 1966, 35.2 per cent in 1967, 39.5 per cent in 1968, 36 per cent in 1969. This is a rate of profit on investments. Iron ore companies, in 1965 the profit was 37 per cent; in 1966 it was 40 per cent, in 1967, 37 per cent, in 1968 26 per cent, in 1969 45 per cent. We have our own example of bauxite where Philip Reno said the rate of profits ranged between 26 to 34 per cent. I am not going to spend any time arguing about the nonsense the last speaker said.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think the hon. Member should make that remark.

Dr. Jagan: I am sorry to use that word. All I can say my hon. Colleague the leader of the United Force is even more confused than my friends over there.

My friend was critical of Cuba, critical of Chile. Understanding his philosophy we can understand why he says so. We understand this, but surely he must realise that Latin America and the Third World countries are powder kegs today because of these factors that *Life* magazine — *[Interruption]* As I was saying before the intervention by the Prime Minister, the net outflow from countries such as Latin America is nearly \$2 billion (U.S.) a year and this is what is contributing to the explosion. The only difference between my friends over there and over here is that they realise these facts; they say they want to make a change, but indeed and in fact they do nothing to change the situation. How are you going to change it? How are you going to change the realities of economic domination, cultural domination, ideological domination when you remain within the orbit of the imperialist world.

We had a long discourse from the Minister of State today about the foreign policy of this Government based on non-alignment. But what is non-alignment today? What is it but a mixed bag ranging from Cuba on the one hand to Indonesia under the dictator Suharto on the other hand, the rightist dictatorship. This is non-alignment. What is the philosophy behind it?

17.6.71

National Assembly

9 – 9.20 p.m.

The Minister of State told us we are developing relations with Yugoslavia and with India and with countries in Africa and we are strengthening our relations in the Caribbean with Commonwealth Caribbean countries. What about Cuba? What about China? In world terms these are also developing countries. My friend talks about starvation and rations. Russia had it too. A few years ago we used to hear about the slave camps and the starvation and the misery in Russia but we do not hear about that any more. Before the Communist revolution in China in 1949, every year there were famines. Thousands and millions used to die but that does not happen today.

9.20 p.m.

How is it this Government claims it is socialist and non-aligned with a policy of self-reliance and sacrifice and yet it is not developing relations with the socialist world; if not with the Soviet Union, then, at least, with China and Cuba, relatively underdeveloped countries? *[Interruption]* My hon. Friend says that we are developing relations with them. Where is the evidence of the development of relations with the People's Republic of China? Where is the evidence of relations with the Cuban regime? We all know that the relations with Soviet Union are mainly nominal. *[Interruption]* And so we put Yugoslavia on a pedestal. I will send you the speech that Fidel Castro made about Yugoslavia when he said that he was trying to get arms from that country and the Yugoslav Ambassador said he would have to find out first whether the United States would agree. What is Sino-Soviet except Yugoslavia which we are always talking about?

Self-reliance at the national level and group co-operation at the international level, this is what the Minister of State said. Is this something new? We hear a great deal about self-reliance, self-sacrifice. This is at the national level. Why did you not send people to the People's Republic of China, which has demonstrated over the last few years what it can do to transform a backward economy, instead of sending them to Taiwan?

Let me just read this one quotation, not from a source which can be questioned, but a statement by someone who cannot be regarded as a fellow-traveller or a Communist. I refer to

James Muir who was the Chairman and President of the Royal Bank of Canada. In the Canadian Newsletter in 1968 this is what he wrote:

“I shall give but one example, an exceptional one, perhaps, of the inexorable effect of human effort in terms of human labour. I saw the new irrigation and flood-control dam in the Ming Tombs Valley. It was practically finished, and had taken only 140 days to complete. It is over 2000 feet long, about 95 feet high, 555 feet wide at the base, and about 25 feet wide at the top. It has concrete core, upstream side is clay and the other is earth, gravel and stone. One hundred thousand were working in three shifts around the clock. All work was described as voluntary; certainly, it was unpaid. About half of the work force was provided by the army, the rest by citizens from every walk of life who go, and live and work at the site for days or weeks, as circumstances, age, health and physique permit. With little else than their bare hands, picks and shovels this colossal task has been accomplished. I stood on high ground and looked down upon this vast human ant hill. I took photographs of the scene, a shift of thirty thousand toiling people, and hoped when developed, these pictures would have caught something of the atmosphere of the drama.”

China developed not only on the basis of self-reliance, self-help, and community development as my colleagues call it, but development based on a revolutionary, anti-imperialist programme, a programme which involved breaking with the past and forging new domestic and foreign policies. That is why China has become today a nation which, in some respects, is even more powerful than some of the very large developed nations like France, and the United Kingdom; that is why it is feared to be a super power, one of the two that you were talking about.

We come now to the international level. In other words, we get the same phraseology — self-help, community development, self-reliance, self-sacrifice — but devoid of the rest of the things; and we cannot succeed without that. What about national self-help all over the country when you have rigged local government elections, and hand-picked people who do not have the confidence of the masses? How do you expect self-help when as my friend just said you practise discrimination and a policy of robbery against farmers who do not belong to your party? What are you talking about? The people in China helped to make a revolution, they backed a party. They did not win by fraud. They won because they were supporting a party, the Communist Party of China, which had their interest at heart. That is how they won.

That is on the domestic side. My friend says, “group co-operation at the International level.” What group? The Third World? We are not opposed to co-operation with other Third World countries. By all means have it. But, sir, the Government is aware that Third World countries are, by and large, in the same relationship to each other, that is, most of them are primary producers, most of them have had a socio-economic structure which made them the producers of raw materials and the markets for the manufactured goods which came from outside. Where are they going to get the capital goods? Where are they going to get the military help? Egypt did not go to the Soviet Union because of ideology but because she realised that if she had to transform her economy she had to have someone to help her and then she looked to the socialist world. This is how that relationship was established.

9.30 p.m.

That is beyond your comprehension. But do you not understand that the more countries become socialist the quicker the socialist countries will themselves develop because they can then divert the billions that they are forced to spend on armaments for constructive development? That is how you spokesmen for the imperialists, disguised as progressives, want to pose the question. That is the only difference between you and the leader of the United Force.

Your friend Colonel Nimeiry and Gaddefi have just recognised the People’s Republic of China. What have you done? People like you will become anti-communist because it suits your opportunistic tendencies.

This thesis of Third World inter-dependence and self-sufficiency is a rationalisation to remain within the western world, the imperialist world. It is a rationalisation because they do not want to go towards socialism. Having accepted western aid for some time, when the Government began to feel the pinch, instead of moving in the other direction we heard the previous Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister saying: Aid is raid. In spite of the fact that aid is raid every week we read in the newspapers that aid is coming from England, aid is coming from Canada, aid is coming from the United States; The C.I.A. agent in this country goes with the Prime Minister and all the Ministers everywhere they go. He was kicked out of the Middle East. He is right here. *[Interruption]* Do not worry with his name; you know the man.

The latest gimmick is food. The G.I.S. release which is now called *News From Guyana*, states: "Approximately \$612,000 generated by the sale of U.S. agricultural commodities will be used by them to finance agricultural development in Guyana". We have been tied up with a lot of loans with strings. Now we are getting food. I have an article here entitled: "Financial Sword of Damocles Over India". It says:

"At present U.S. holdings in Indian counterpart funds amount to about 6.5 billion Rupees, or about 18 percent of all the money in circulation in that country."

It says:

"The U.S. still clung, under the earlier aid agreements, to the formula under which about 20 per cent of all local currency payments for aid deliveries have eventually to be repaid in convertible rupees or dollars, 61 per cent remain earmarked for long-term investment inside India, mostly in the form of 40-year loans, 65 per cent are reserved for short-term credit to private business dealing with American partners, and the remainder is put at the disposal of the U.S. Government and its embassy on an ad hoc basis."

But this is the most important part, sir. Now that the United States has a grave monetary and financial crisis facing it, balance of payments problems, it is converting the rupees into dollars. Here is what it says:

"The U.S. embassy in Delhi has invited American tourists in India to change their travellers' cheque not at the local banks, but in the embassy."

To get the dollars from the tourists, give them rupees. And it goes on to say:

"Now, however, the dimension of this practice threatens to grow decisively. If the U.S. Treasury throws millions or even billions of Rupees on the open markets in Hong Kong, Singapore, Beirut, Geneva, Frankfurt, or London, that would not only drastically increase the Rupee supply abroad, but would also certainly depress the Rupee further ..."

In other words the black market value of 12 rupees to the dollar will proceed to a much more unfavourable rate.

I refer to this, sir, only to show what has happened to this country. We tend to be going in the same direction without seeing the big danger signals ahead.

I have remarked in this House already that in 1967 India had to appeal to the India Aid Consortium to defer payments on nearly \$400 million of debts which fell due and which could not be paid. If this happened, particularly with the big refugee problem that faces India now, one can imagine the colossal difficulty which will face, not only the Indian economy, but the Indian Government about which, of course, there are some questions now being asked in circles in Wall Street and elsewhere.

We refer to these, not because we want merely to make excursions, but because we want to point to facts and figures to show the Government that it is necessary to forge a new way. We are not developing any relations with China or with Cuba

My hon. Friend, Mr. Persaud, this afternoon referred to sugar and somebody said, "Tell us what you would do." There are dangers facing the sugar economy. Last night I was reading the *Trinidad Guardian*, and a Doctor from Canada was saying "It was no use going cap-in-hand all the time begging, that soon they would force you to join as O.A.T., as an associate state within the Common Market." The Doctor said we should convert carbohydrates into proteins. Trinidad, at least, made this step to Cuba. It was pointed out what is being role, the transformation of it away from sugar. It is not that sugar does not play a big role in the economy; it has its guaranteed market in the socialist world. But the Cuban Government is transforming the sugar industry, industrialising it. Its by-products are being used for the livestock industry.

9.40 p.m.

If we are non-aligned why can we not even go and see? Williams does not pretend to be non-aligned; he does not go to the non-aligned conference like our Prime Minister and make big speeches. What are you doing to justify this pretention of being non-aligned? My friend says about China "We can go to Taiwan; we can send experts and technicians but we cannot go to People's China." I was rather surprised that he said that, apparently, China for some time did not even want to get into the United Nations. For the benefit of the hon. Member, perhaps to

enlighten him, I should like to read from this pamphlet called *The American System* by John Graham — it was produced in Canada.

“In 1951 Dean Rusk told U.S. and World Report: The Chinese and communists must be overthrown and their government far from being recognised must be destroyed.”

This is the same Dean Rusk who became Secretary of State under the Kennedy administration which put them in office. Schlesinger wrote in his book that Dean Rusk in early 1963 in a stiff letter to the British urged a change in policy.

Further on:

“In 1954, the year of the Geneva conference on Indo-china, Walter S. Robinson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs said this: he stated that U.S. policy was to maintain American dominance in the Far East for an indefinite period, and that the ‘heart’ of U.S. policy in Asia was to keep alive a constant threat of military action vis-a-vis Red China,” or, in other words, ‘to wage cold war under the leadership of the United States with constant threat of attack against Red China,’ led by Formosa and other Far Eastern groups and militarily backed by the United States.”

And more recently a President of the United States, Eisenhower, made a statement on this. I quote from New York Times, September 12, 1965.

“It never occurred to me that the United States should not use atomic weapons if they would best serve the interests of the country.”

I am reading about American policy because this Government is misinforming this House and the country when it says that People’s China did not want to take a position at the United Nations. The Government is doing so because it is following the United States policy on China and is trying to rationalise its own behaviour, a behaviour which is not consistent with its non-aligned policy.

What is its policy on China except the two Chinas’ policy of the United States? The Prime Minister said at Lusaka:

“It seems to me to be both specious and unrealistic that effective government of 700 million people can on any ground be excluded from the world forum of the United Nations.”

He makes speeches like these. But the boys at the United Nations do not put this into practice. For three years they voted against the seating of People's China. The last time they abstained. Why have they abstained? Because American imperialism is now seeing that its old policy of trying to destroy China has failed and in the process America is destroying itself. So weakened is she today that she looks now with envious eyes to China and trade with China because her competing imperialist friends have not been obeying her dictates and have been cashing in on that trade. France recognised China and began trading. Canada refused to toe American line and traded wheat, flour, trucks and railway engines to Cuba and to China. How farcical it is! It is clear that the United States is in a serious plight today and thus the ruling class in America is forced to change its policies.

I have a statement from the Bank of the Minister of Finance, the Chase Manhattan Bank. There is a nice map here with some beautiful diagrams. These people have so much money they give away a lot of very valuable things. U.S. share of oil exports falling. At the end of the war the United States had about 34 per cent of world trade. According to this diagram, in 1963 it was over 17 per cent; now, it is a little over 15½ per cent. Therefore the question of recognition of China has now become a practical question for the United States of America, a necessity. [**Mr. Hoyte:** “You are now getting down to the core of politics.”] This is not the core of politics; this is the reality of politics. [**Mr. Hoyte:** “For Russia and everybody else.”] If America is doing this because of the reality of politics it seems that the least you can do to help the poor starving people of this country is to try to follow an independent course. When Lord Home was Prime Minister the Yankees told him not to sell buses to Cuba but he sold buses because this was in the national interest of Great Britain. But what are you doing?

9.50 p.m.

The point is that the balance of forces are shifting towards socialism, and the reality of this is thus demonstrated in the fact that the ruling class of the United States today is having to

change its policy. We are not in the same position as the United States. As I pointed out, even countries which do not call themselves so, pretend to be non-aligned. Britain, France, Canada, they are in practice following more of a non-aligned policy than you are practising. This is the reality of the situation.

My friend says "What about the Soviet Union?" We have a motion in this House for the Government to recognise the People's Republic of China and to kick out Formosa. The Soviet Union stands in the same position as we do. Do not worry with whether it is formal or informal; the question is vote. Why do you not vote? Do you have to consult the United States first, and when they tell you to vote "yes," you vote "yes", when they tell you to abstain, you abstain. The abstention is becoming necessary now because America wants this position. Therefore, the puppets have to begin changing their position.

Let us truly consider what is the interest of this country. Foreign policy cannot be divorced from domestic policy, and if you are going to forge a new domestic policy, as you claim, if you are going to break the socio-economic structure created by colonialism you need simultaneously to forge a new foreign policy. But there is no evidence of this at all.

When the Minister of State suggested that we were going to have a special debate on foreign affairs and that therefore we must not deal with it during the debate on the President's speech. I was really expecting something new to come forward. As I sat here, I kept waiting and waiting, hoping that something new would come out. Where is the new foreign policy?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Leader of the Opposition we will need a Motion if you are to continue.

Suspension of Standing Order

Mr. Ramsaroop: Your Honour, I move the suspension of Standing Order 9(1) to enable the debate to continue.

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate on foreign policy

Dr. Jagan: The fact of the matter is that all countries which have sought to break from the socio-economic structure inherited from colonialism have had to look to the socialist world and to develop new relations with this part of the world. Let us take any theatre of operations in the Far East, where Korea and North Vietnam were trying to develop something new. We have seen the attempts of imperialism to destroy those countries and those regimes. But, because of the help which they got – military help, economic help – they were able to sustain these assaults and to maintain power. In the Middle East, the U.A.R., in Syria, in other countries we have seen the same sort of thing, where these countries, in their confrontation with imperialism had to turn to the socialist world. In Africa we have seen, in more recent times, the same trend. And we must not fail to notice that those leaders who headed Governments that wanted to be truly non-aligned — I refer to the Sukarno Government, to the Nkrumah Government, who wanted to build socialism, who wanted to make real changes — were undermined and destroyed.

The lesson is there for all to see. We had the most recent example of Uganda. It is clearly demonstrated that these half-way measures will not succeed. There is ideological confusion of the masses, as we see from the Government side, and from the third political party. This also is a help for the imperialists.

We would hope that the Government, if it truly wants to do what it says, that is, to bring socialism to Guyana, would learn from the lessons of the failures of some of the progressive leaders of the world. And thus, we call on the Government to stop this sham, this window dressing, and get along with the business of not only saying that we are developing our relations with Latin America, with Brazil and Venezuela, and the O.A.S. Deep forces are now bursting forth in Latin America as demonstrated in Peru, in Bolivia, in Chile. They are forging new policies. What are you doing? You want to be a baggage boy in O.A.S.?

We are not saying abandon all relationships with the western countries. But we start out from the major premise that you cannot break from imperialism by staying completely within the

17.6.71

National Assembly

9.50 – 10.20 p.m.

folds of imperialism There is no aspect of your policy which can give the credence in the world that you are non-aligned.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps this would be a convenient time for us to suspend the sitting for 15 minutes.

Sitting suspended at 10 p.m.

10.20 p.m.

On resumption -

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. Jagan: Sir, before the Prime Minister last interrupted I was referring to their inconsistent policy, especially with respect to China. They make quite a show about representation of Formosa in the United Nations. Now, Formosa does not have a seat at the United Nations. Formosa, or Taiwan, holds the seat which was fixed for mainland China, and it is clear, no one can deny this, that the Chang Kai-shek regime of Formosa does not speak for the people of China

There is no point in the Government claiming that Taiwan has many millions of people, and must therefore be represented in the United Nations. This is a different issue. One can in the sameway argue that the German Democratic Republic, North Korea, North Vietnam, West Germany all these should be in the United Nation, too. They represent millions of people also. We do not deny this. But the fundamental issue at the moment is not tying the question of recognition of People's China with Taiwan being In the United Nations.

The Taiwan regime has a seat in the United Nations on the ground that it represents China proper. It has been recognised in international affairs that the People's Republic of China, headed by the Communist Party, is the representative of the people of China. This is the question. The members of the Government, versed in logic as they are, must see this point The

17.6.71

National Assembly

10.20 – 10.25 p.m.

question of the representation of Taiwan at the United Nations is a separate issue which must be taken in the same way as their other unresolved questions, such as the placing of these other countries, which I have referred to, in the United Nations.

Let us hope that the Government in the next session will change its position. I noted that some of their friends voted for the Albanian resolution at the United Nations. These included the sponsors of the Albanian resolution on China — Albania, Algeria, Cuba, Guinea, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania, Pakistan, the People's Republic of the Congo, Rumania, Somalia, Southern Yemen, the Sudan, Syria, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia

10.25 p.m.

We were told a little while ago by the Minister of State how Tanzania has set the course for the non-aligned world. Here is your friend Tanzania sponsoring the Albanian resolution, and even, Pakistan — I will leave Pakistan aside because we know Pakistan is opportunistically between Seato and China. In the People's Republic of the Congo your friend Mobutu, Kinshasa - even that stooge has voted for People's China

Here it is that many of those who are regarded as non-aligned have supported the seating of China and the expulsion of Taiwan, but the Guyana Government has seen fit to abstain on this important resolution. Let us hope instructions will come in time this year to change the petition from abstention to aye. And let us hope, sir, in this very important group which the Minister of State referred to, the Latin American group, that Guyana, even though not a member of the O.A.S. will use its influence to see that the blockade and isolation of Cuba imposed by American imperialism is removed.

Guyana should play a useful role here. Even if you do not want to recognise, which we advocate, the People's Republic of Cuba you could say a word to break this policy. This will be an act of socialist internationalist solidarity. This is what the Minister of State called for, international co-operation, not with the E.E.C.

The E.E.C. is coming into being because the capitalist world has recognised that it has to change its mode of organisation and methods of operation in order to cope with the great leap in the socialist world. This is the reality. This is a fact. And let us not always be thinking of joining associations, whether it is Carifta, or E.E.C., which are imperialist dominated and devised to serve the purpose of imperialism.

Here in Cuba, a country within the region, a country which you cannot divorce when you begin to talk about Caribbean integration, especially for those of you who talk about socialism. Why then has not one word been said by the Guyana Government with respect to the breaking of the blockade against this country which has started the fight against imperialism in this area? Now there are a few other countries doing the same. You are not going to be breaking new ground — Chile, Peru, and others have taken the lead. Surely, you can follow, because in doing so you will be helping to lift the pressure on yourselves.

In Africa the Prime Minister generously donated \$50,000 to the African freedom fighters. We welcome this support, but all we ask of the Government is consistence. If sanctuary is to be given to African freedom fighters, we say similar facilities must be offered to those who can meaningfully make use of it. I refer to those in Brazil who are tortured by the Fascists in that country. Why no helping hand to these people? What about Vietnam? You are poor, you do not have to give money, you say you are poor and my friend, the Prime Minister, says that Vietnam is getting aid from the socialist countries and does not need money. Whatever rationalisation you use not to give them any financial aid, you can give them moral and political support. What have you done?

I have here a petition which was signed by a whole lot of M.P.s in the British Parliament. Parliamentarians all over the world are now engaged in a move of solidarity with the Vietnamese people. The petition is signed by Brockway and Mikardo. Brockway is your friend. He used to defend you. I am talking about political defence. Sir, here is a petition calling for the withdrawal from Indo-China of all American military forces and materials including air and naval forces and a cessation of all bombing attacks from bases either within or outside Indo-China. Would these

17.6.71

National Assembly

10.20 – 10.25 p.m.

people in the P.N.C. sign it? You do not have to pay any money. Call on them to sign it. They would refuse. *[Interruption]* It is not English people. These people always see things in terms of colour or nationality!

The Prime Minister's policy on this is similar to the two Chinas policy of the United States. When all the progressive forces all over the world are calling for the unilateral and unconditional withdrawal of the United States troops from Vietnam, the United States says that North Vietnamese troops must be withdrawn too.

10.35 p.m.

Where is your non-aligned policy? We see today the controversy which is raging in the United States. Last night, the B.B.C. commentator said that it is clear that the Johnson administration had planned the attack on North Vietnam long before they bombed, and long before they took certain steps which forced the North Vietnamese to defend themselves in the Gulf of Tonkin, which the American President then said was an attack on the American fleet and used to justify the bombing of North Vietnam.

And, the commentator said today that the C.I.A. advised the Johnson administration: Firstly, that there was no North Vietnam — [**Mr. Green:** "You rely on a B.B.C. commentator in this stage of your life?") It is coming out of the confidential papers. The B.B.C. is relating what is happening in the *New York Times*. The C.I.A. advised the Johnson administration that the liberation movement in South Vietnam was an indigenous force not as they made the world to believe that it was an invasion from the north, secondly, the so-called "Domino" theory that if South Vietnam fell to communism the whole of South-East Asia would become communist. The C.I.A. should know better because they are all over the place like fleas. They advised Johnson that this was not going to be so. But, sir, Johnson, the ex-President of the United States, and even his predecessor Kennedy, put all of this in the background and went ahead because their main objective was to forestall the growth of socialism in any part of the world. All right, now you have more information. Why do you not change your policy? Why do you not say a word now

that the whole world is calling for an end to this war? The whole world is adding its voice. Why is it that the Guyana Government is silent on this fundamental issue? The Vietnam issue is not just an issue of the people of Vietnam. The Vietnam issue is an issue of whether a small country has a right to transform from a neo-colonial status, to go on. This is the position. *[Interruption]*

One thing we can say, at least in the United Force there is consistency and honesty in that they stand for capitalism, they stand for imperialism, yesterday, today, tomorrow and the day after tomorrow. But, sir, with this breed it is far more dangerous. [**Mr. Green:** "That does not affect you."] Yes, because it is affecting the people of Guyana and not only the people of Guyana, but outside of Guyana

The time has come really and truly in this country for a break to be made. Only yesterday we were talking about removing some of the burdens of the people and you are not going to do it. I predict and many of the predictions we made have come to pass, like the failure of the \$300 million Seven-Year Development Plan. We predicted it would fail and it has failed. [**The Prime Minister:** "Who said it has failed? We are varying it"] It is like your non-aligned policy. We call on the Government to follow a genuine policy of non-alignment, like Tanzania. We refer to Tanzania. Tanzania is carrying out a domestic policy based on taking over the commanding heights of the economy controlled by foreigners and the local parasites, consistent with a foreign policy which goes along with that. They were able to mobilise the masses. We saw it in the building of the Tanzanian railway where the western countries wanted about five times as much and which used delaying tactics. Here is an example, a practical example, of what socialist relations can do to take a country from imperialist domination, racist apartheid domination. It was done through the help of socialist countries.

Our friends in the Government want to split hairs between China and Russia. We are not here for that. We are talking about the socialist world, we are saying, "Do not tell us about non-alignment when you are aligned hand and foot with the United States of America; when you use words but performance is something entirely different." We would urge the Government sincerely to practise what it preaches, to follow the example of Tanzania in this regard. And I can

assure the hon. Members that so long as they pursue these forward-looking domestic and foreign policies they can be assured of co-operation not only in this House but all over the country, the co-operation which is necessary to build as they have built in China, as they have built in the Soviet Union; that is how those countries were built, by the people, not by dependence on imperialism. They were able to get hold of capital, which was going out before, by nationalisation and by mobilisation of the human resources. But we are only talking about "aid is raid" as an excuse not to go to the socialist countries. Now that the money bus stopped we are getting it in the form of food handouts but this will not lead to deliverance, as we have seen in India

The time is certainly long past for these new measures. The hon. Minister of State referred to something new developing in the Caribbean, a new unity, but unity will not come and will not be meaningful unless it is based on some solid foundation of anti-imperialism. I read the speech the Minister made the other day. Nowhere is there any talk about that. The unity will come when the peoples of the Caribbean begin to speak the same language with the same voice and they are not yet speaking that language. They are not speaking through the Burnham party, the P.N.C., or the Williams P.N.M. We see the declining numbers whom they represent. This is how unity is going to come when the new Caribbean voices begin to speak throughout the region for a new programme based on a new ideology, not the distorted ideology but one based on Marxism/Leninism.

The hon. Minister of State in his opening remarks said that there was a widening area of accord towards a national foreign policy. Of course, as the Government gropes and stumbles towards a progressive policy at home, inevitably it has to move in the direction which we say must be followed in foreign affairs. Similarly, no doubt, growing forces, as we see in Trinidad are calling for a new road. We want to assure the Minister that, so far as support is concerned, this will never be lacking from this side. We are not reactionaries or opportunists who are out to take political advantage of any given situation for the sake of what is called power politics. We are interested in Guyana and principles and we call on the Government to stop filibustering and

putting on this air of freedom fighter and get Guyana moving forward, in a direction where it will be respected, not only in the short term but in the long term. Let Guyana be a place which will lead the Caribbean and the Third World countries. *[Applause]*

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister (replying): There were times during this debate when I was in some doubt, listening to the contributions of the Opposition, as to whether we were debating the foreign policy of Guyana or the foreign policy of the United States of America or of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or the People's Republic of China. And I shall attempt, if it is at all possible at this late stage and hour, to bring the discussion back on to the road which it was intended to cover.

As I understand the hon. Attorney General and Minister of State when he opened this debate he sought to put over the proposition and successfully, I think, did so that Guyana's relations with a foreign nation are based on three things: mutual respect as between nations, a policy of non-alignment, and pursuing in each circumstance what was considered to be to the benefit of Guyana.

Now, when the First Non-Aligned Conference was held, for the information of many, it was the subject of attack, overt and covert, on the part of both the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. because in each case these large powers who consider it their divine right, so to speak, to divide the world into two camps were not happy at the thought that these potential fiefdoms, these potential satellites, had decided that they were not prepared to be any other nation's fiefdom or satellite. And it seems to me that we have had a return this evening to this attitude in this House on the part of both of the parties in Opposition.

10.55 p.m.

So far as the miniature Opposition party is concerned there was an inconsistency between the opening remarks of its Leader and the arguments which he sought to develop subsequently.

He said our policy is all right. I was unhappy about that. But my unhappiness vanished when he sought to persuade us that the sort of foreign policy that we should pursue should be to do obeisance to the United States of America which was the greatest, the best, the kindest, the sweetest nation. All those qualities may be qualities which America stands for, for Americans.

On the other hand, we were being told here by the less small Opposition party that what we must do, in fact, is to align ourselves to the bloc led by the Soviet Union. They were that presumptuous or naive to suggest that there is no hope of real economic development by our placing emphasis on association with the other non-aligned countries of this world because say they, with the colonial complex, which is the leaden thread that joins the two Oppositions parties, we are poor, the non-aligned group is poor and If you want to be less poor you must get close to a rich group which they say is socialist, and because it is socialist it will lend aid to you readily.

That contention the Government cannot accept because it was remarked at the Third Non-Aligned Conference at Lusaka that the non-aligned group is not devoid of skills, is not devoid of ingenuity. And though we must accept the fact that we live in the world, experience has shown that there is little or no point in jumping from the embrace of one large power into the embrace of another. There is a great deal of facility born of an ignorance, and I am using “ignorance”, not in its pejorative sense but in its true and nice sense – “ignorance”, not knowing. I am not suggesting “ignorance” which is sort of endemic in the use of the word “ignoramus”. With a naivety and aplomb born of ignorance of the facts they cite countries in Africa and other parts of the world which have been benefited so greatly from the largesse and the generosity of the social countries.

One of the problems of being in Government is that confidences exchanged between you and colleague Heads of Government cannot necessarily be aired in a public place like a Parliament. I am not denying the difference in ideology between the United States and the U.S.S.R. I will not be that puerile as to suggest that their socio-economic systems are not different but, the experience of many has been that there is what one of my colleagues calls “the

big power syndrome” and that at certain points the desire to be in the position of dictating, to be a member of the exclusive club of big powers, transcends ideological mouthings and positions.

What is the point in a debate on the foreign policy of Guyana to enter into a long disputation as to who is right or wrong in so far as America’s conduct of her affairs is concerned or Russia’s conduct of her affairs? I am not here to defend the American intervention in the Dominican Republic as my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition is here to defend the Russian intervention in Czechoslovakia. And let me say this, that leading members of the non-aligned group – whose names are sometimes taken in vain by members of the Opposition in justifying what they suggest should be our position – have been openly critical, including President Kaunda and President Nyerere, both of American intervention in the Dominican Republic and Russia’s intervention in Czechoslovakia.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this debate should rather concentrate on whether or not the policy which is based on non-alignment, that is, closer relations with the other members of the non-aligned group; basically closer relations, political and economic, with other developing countries, is good for Guyana. My contention, sir, is that it is good.

If I may take what one may consider an example that, at first blush, is far away from the subject: our closer association with some of the developing countries which have similar problems to our own, has given us in many instances an insight into the use of the labour intensive technology. Now, this may appear a far cry from foreign affairs, but it is not. The closer association brings about more understanding of how other people in your position are tackling a problem which you have. And the sharing of the experience as a result of that association can be beneficial to you. Similarly the way you have faced up to certain situations and tackled certain problems can be of benefit to them.

We must not, I contend, run the risk of believing that the only two colours – and in fact neither of them is a colour – are black and white, that there is the black imperialists and there is

17.6.71

National Assembly

10.55 – 11.05 p.m.

the white, the socialists, or to put it another way since we contend now that black is beautiful: the white, the imperialists, and the black, the socialists. It is not as easy as that.

For Instance, let us consider the question of China. The Opposition little appreciated that we on this side sympathize with them in their quandary because it was the leader of the Opposition who at the golden jubilee of the C.P.S.U. lambasted China. Now he comes here to tell us how wonderful China is. What is the problem between the Soviet Union and China? They are both socialist, they have both based their political ideology on Marx, they are both anti-imperialist, according to what they say, but why do the Russians refer to the Chinese as “yellow peril?” Why is it that when I discuss a question affecting Guyana, in terms of our border problems, with the Russian Ambassador to the United Nations he spends half an hour telling me what terrible people these Chinese are, and their great cry is that they want to set up non-whites against whites?

11.05 p.m.

This is a socialist a deputy foreign minister, of the leading socialist country telling me this about the largest socialist country. For a simple mind like mine confusion is created. Maybe the Leader of the Opposition can see his way out of this labyrinthine maze; maybe he, like Theseus, has his thread and he is going to come out all right after having slain the Minotaur which he hopes he can slay single-handed. He is like Glendar, confident against the world in arms, having slain the Minotaur of imperialism

It is not as simple as that, because in each case, socialist or non-socialist, a country's foreign policy, a country's attitude to other countries, the actions a country takes, the alliances which a country makes, all these things are adjuncts to nationhood and are intended to advance the interest of the nation.

If I may take my good friend on an excursion into recent history, no one quarrels with Stalin because he signed a non-aggression pact with Hitler. We understood that he did that to

preserve Russia; he did that to save time for Russia because Russia was not ready to meet the panzer divisions of Adolf Hider.

Therefore, what is good for larger nations is good for any other nation. You must consult your interests. And it little 'boots' merely to say the P.N.C. Government is the United States' puppet and the only thing to do is to get under the aegis of the great anti-imperialist, the Soviet Union. Do we forget October 1962 when Castro said "These missiles are not being removed from here," and then President Kennedy wrote to his good friend, Nikita Krushchev and he said: "Dear Nikita, I, John F. Kennedy, will remove your missiles from Cuba? Let us talk business; let us divide the world up to suit our convenience."

How long are the people of Guyana going to be entertained on irrelevancies and misconceptions? It has been suggested, for Instance, that our attitude towards the admission of China to the United Nations is dictated by the American policy. As I said sotto voce and I now say, standing on my legs, if the American Ambassador really believed that the Leader of the Opposition was right he would be a happy man and he would never have to take sedatives.

The two Chinas' policy represented a position which we took way back in 1966. Let me explain what I mean by "twoChinas" because there are these chameleon words, phrases and concepts which have different meanings to different people in different contexts. In 1966, when we were admitted to the United Nations we made our position clear that so far as we were concerned we thought that the People's Republic of China should be seated and have the Security Council seat, but since we thought that the Taiwan Government was the effective Government of a country of over twelve million — and at that level we do not go into a number of irrelevant niceties — it should not be thrown out of the General Assembly.

The Albanian Resolution, which has always been a double Resolution, was to the effect that the People's Republic of China should be seated and Taiwan thrown out. You can imagine my consternation at the intellectual decline of my erstwhile comrade, the Leader of the Opposition, when in this House, out of a desire to show that whatever the Soviet Union says, as

distinct from does, is good he says. "The question of Taiwan membership is irrelevant I agree, but the Resolution was tabled that way and has been tabled that way since Noah was a boy, combining the two questions of the seating of the People's Republic of China and the exclusion of Taiwan.

In 1969, because we felt it was an important question, we voted for the important question. But, when it came to throwing out Taiwan and seating the People's Republic of China we abstained. In 1970, we abstained on both. The position which we take now and which we think is dictated by what has transpired by the voting, in addition, at the 25th General Assembly is that if the price that has to be paid for seating the People's Republic of China in the Security Council and the Assembly is the exclusion of Taiwan, the time has come where we will be forced to pay that price so far as our vote is concerned.

Just a little bit of education for those who may be misled by the semantics and the dialectics of the Leader of the Opposition: it is noteworthy that the Soviet Union's position on this particular Resolution has for the last three years been ritualistic — no particular debate on it, just ritualistic. Further, I cannot say because, as Head of Government speaking to Ambassadors, I cannot divulge the contents of their discussions with me. But, it is about time for the Leader of our Opposition, the alternative Prime Minister of this country, become a little less unsophisticated, a little less naive, and understands the realities of power politics in international relations today.

As part of our policy of non-alignment we are prepared to have trade with any country except South Africa, Rhodesia and Portugal. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, who in recent times has been sharing some of my confidences, to get out of these confidences which he has been sharing, puts this in the mouth of the hon. Member Mr.Chandisingh: "Since the socialist economies are planned, you cannot buy immediately you have to take time." that is because, he says, they have to plan. But that is because I told the Leader of the Opposition certain questions that had arisen in discussions about trade with these same socialist countries. Is the Government to go around saying, "Look we have been talking with X, we have been talking with Y, we have

been talking with Z.” Until our talks and our discussions come to fruition, it is a matter of Government to Government, or Government to agency, agency to Government discussion and negotiation.

11.15 p.m.

Must I repeat to this House, as I have done on several occasions, that when this Government came into office it found that the then hon. Member Mr. Hubbard in May of 1964 was complaining to Cuba that she was not taking the amount of rice she had undertaken to take, and that this Government from the beginning intimated its willingness? Must I say that the Russian Ambassador in 1966 said that Cuba’s purchase of rice from Guyana was a political deal? Mr. McKilloc said that in my residence. The Leader of the Opposition would say, “You are not trading with these people; you are not having any discussions.” Must we be telling him every discussion we have? Must we even tell him the discussions we have as to their opinions about him?

Hon. Members talk about recognising Cuba and working with Cuba. Mr. Speaker, we have been in discussions at one level or another, but when discussions are being carried on, it is not a matter for broadcast. The Leader of the Opposition says we must run to Cuba. In the policy of non-alignment we do not go around begging. There have to be certain mutual positions, certain mutual desires, before you start discussing. So far as the question of discussion with, or relations with China, irrelevant to my mind, is concerned what are we to do? Are we to run cap-in-hand to Peking and say “Look, will you please let us get down and talk? Will you let us fellows have the distinction of recognising?” that is not the way we can or are prepared to operate.

It is a little unfair for us to be asked in a debate like this to give details of negotiations that have gone on for some time with respect to a number of things. And I have discussed these matters with the Leader of the Opposition in confidence. He knows that. But, he comes here now and says, “You are not doing ‘X’, you are doing ‘Y’, and two weeks ago when he sat down in

my office we discussed these matters. Where do we get at this rate, Mr. Speaker? The Leader of the Opposition is supposed to be informed on certain matters in confidence. If he considers, as he rightly does, that he cannot share these confidences in public, do not say the opposite to what you know is the case.

So far as we are concerned, the policy that the Guyana Government is pursuing at the moment is not a pro-imperialist one. Whatever may be the politics of the situation, one of the things we have inherited from the Westminster formula or tradition is that Opposition must always portray a different image. Whatever the politics of the situation, whatever our slavish copying of the Westminster antics, as distinct from the substance, may dictate, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, can a Government that at this time nationalises a North American entity be described as pro-American, as a puppet of the Americans? Again I say, the American Government and its Ambassadors would be happy to believe that at last Cheddie Jagan is accurate.

The Leader of the Opposition analyses for us the holdings in Alcan as is his wont. He knows what is the attitude in Washington. Honest to goodness, this is not the time or place to discuss the number of problems that arise with these same people whose stooges and puppets we are supposed to be. But, one sometimes gets a little feeling of disgust that here you have a suggestion that you are the tool of these people, and, on the other hand, you are running into exactly the difficulties that you anticipated when you embarked on a course like this. So far as we are concerned we have embarked on this course come what may. *[Interruption]* I could not be forced by the P.P.P. who published over and over again that they would not nationalise bauxite or sugar. There comes a time in the life of a man, when he must stand up for his dignity and a nation for its dignity, come what may. And if they want to crush us, Mr. Speaker, they can attempt it. But it is little consolation to find this tape recorder being played over and over again and in the context of discussions in depth with the Leader of the Opposition.

He comes today with some nonsense. He wants us to say now whether we are discriminating between the bands and all that. What nonsense is that? If he knows, as he claims to know, how international banks operate, it is a question of which one you consider most

17.6.71

National Assembly

11.15 – 11.25 p.m.

convenient in the particular circumstances to do a particular set of business with. Let us set up certain propositions about the unity of the imperialists, the determination of the imperialists to crush countries like this, and then suggest that one set of imperialists is less bad than the others.

Guyana today has embarked on a policy which is bound, as I said in my contribution to the debate on the President's Address, to earn hostility, it is bound to incur the wrath of those who have controlled us and our resources in the past. And it is about time that the Opposition brings to an end this empty mouthing.

This Government has nothing on record similar to the asseverations to be found in "Towards Understanding" of 1961, none whatever, Mr. Speaker. This Government has no picture of its leader in a rocking chair with Kennedy. This Government has no illusions about its ability to fool or not to fool, because we understand that the statements made in "Towards Understanding" were because of the dialectics of the situation and intended to fool the ubiquitous, the omnipresent C. I. A.

11.25 p.m.

This Government does not indulge in that sort of nonsense. Our position is clear, sir. We are not anti-American; we are not anti-Soviet; we are not anti-anyone. We are pro-Guyana, and we are pursuing a policy which we feel is for the benefit of Guyana because it is based on self-reliance at home.

Herein is a contradiction. As is his wont, the Leader of the Opposition likes to quote. He quotes from the Manager of the Royal Bank of Canada — in the same way that he used to quote from Jock Campbell, now Jock is dead, long live Muir! — about the wonderful self-help work being done that was witnessed by Muir. Right Is not national self-help part of a policy of self-reliance? Is not that consistent, Mr. Speaker, with non-alignment, and the developing countries seeking to rely more and more upon themselves in national terms and in group terms? Ask the Leader of the Opposition — I will not betray a confidence - what he told me. Let him tell you

what he said when I asked him why he has not yet gone to work on the road. This sort of political hypocrisy must stop.

The Leader of the Opposition comes here and says what a wonderful job was being done in China on the basis of national self-help. He takes no part in a national self-help exercise in his own country. *[Interruption]* I am not talking about “just now,” **[Dr. Jagan: “Tell them.]** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said to me, and these are his exact words “Odo, boy, give me a chance, they going to throw me out. You know, leh we go on lil bit.” He said “Give me a lil chance; give me some more things, so I can show the boys, because the boys say that I am under you. *[Interruption]* The Leader of the Opposition told me that; he told me that they were going to throw him out. Imagine a man being a coward to believe that people like Wilson could throw him out. I did not want to say it; I did not want to betray the confidence of the hon. Leader of the Opposition but he invited me to do so.

This is part of his hypocrisy, sir, that he comes and tells us what wonderful national self-help is taking place in China, but in Guyana he does not participate, because he is afraid that his party is going to throw him out. Man or mouse? This is a case of the tail wagging the dog.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, what I call on the Opposition, in these circumstances, to recognise are these things

(a) that the policy of national self-reliance is consistent with the international policy of non-alignment and

(b) the reason, therefore, for the playing of the old cracked and scratching phonograph record, to the effect that we are aligned, is because basically the Opposition cannot see non-alignment as an effective policy. They are committed to one group, as if the alternative to the so-called “western imperialists” is to run and say “Here, have me; I am a demi-monde I am for sale, highest bidder or sweetest lover.”

It seems to me, therefore, that the basic difference between the Government and both sections of the Opposition is on the question of non-alignment. I dare them to destroy our contention that that is the only policy that can be pursued by a country like ours, because, Mr. Speaker, it connotes the desire of a small nation to exercise its own judgment on matters which affect it; it connotes the desire of a nation like ours not to be dictated to; it connotes our desire, our intention, our determination to depend upon ourselves. It connotes a determined effort by countries like ours to adjust imbalances of trade in the world today.

For instance, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the same problems that we have been having with respect to the vertical development of the bauxite industry in Guyana with respect to North America and the North American multinationals is the same problem that Yugoslavia has had with the Soviet Union with respect to her developing vertically her bauxite industry. Therefore, it means that we of like mind, we who do not want to be dictated to, who do not want to be trammelled, who still have some vestige of dignity, can work more closely together.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is not a question, in these circumstances of seeking to approach the level of American development, or the level of Russian development, or the level of British development. One of the problems of countries like ours is that we tend to accept other peoples concepts of what represents development — our ability to reach the moon, our ability to have a hotel in space, while we have ghettos, while we send our intellectuals to the mad house to make sure that they get mad. Countries like Guyana must not aim at copying other people's values of what makes a good life.

In those circumstances, it is possible for us to progress, to develop far enough to suit our needs and our concepts of a good life. We do not have to go around the world cap-in-hand begging. They speak a great deal about Gandhi and the spinning wheel. That is only epitomizing something, as to whether or not we developing nations must take our cue as to what makes a good life from the big industrialised nations. I think not and, in the circumstances, I am convinced that with closer co-operation between the non-aligned nations we can reach where we want to reach.

17.6.71

National Assembly

11.25 – 11.35 p.m.

Naturally, even at the Lusaka conference there was a whole concept of the world being one, and there was this group, seeking to use what influence it had to lessen the stranglehold that still was had by some of the larger nations on other nations, seeking to persuade them that it was in their enlightened self-interest to be less selfish. We hope we succeed. But, whether we succeed in that or not, Mr. Speaker, I feel we can go a long way working together as a whole. On that rests our policy, the policy of national self-reliance at home, group self-reliance within the non-aligned group and an international policy of non-alignment, being no man's slave [Applause]

11.35 p.m.

Question put.

Assembly divided: Ayes 29. Woes 15, as follows:

Ayes

Mr. M.F. Singh

Mrs Da Silva

Mrs. Willems

Mr.Zaheeruddeen

Mr. Van Sluytman

Mr.Saffee

Mr. Jordan

Mr. Fowler

Mr. Corrica

Mr. Chan-A-Sue

17.6.71

National Assembly

11.35 – 11.40 p.m.

Mr. Budhoo

Mr. Bissember

Mr. Bancroft

Miss Ackman

Mr. Aaron

Mr. Wrights

Mr. Thomas

Mr. Salim

Mr. Haynes

Mr. Duncan

Mr. Joaquin

Mr. Mingo

Mr. Clarke

Mr. Ramsaroop

Miss Field-Ridley

Mr. Carrington

Mr. Hoyte

Mr. Kasim

Mr. Burnham — 29

17.6.71

National Assembly

11.35 – 11.40 p.m.

Noes

Mr. Remington

Mr. Bholā Persaud

Mr. Balchand Persaud

Mrs. Branco

Mr. R. Ally

Mr. R.D. Persaud

Mr. M. Y. Ally

Mr. Lall

Mr. Hamid

Mr. Wilson

Mr. D. C Jagan

Dr. Ramsahoye

Mr. Chandisingh

Mr. Ram Karran

Dr. Jagan. — 15

Motion carried.

17.6.71

National Assembly

11.35 – 11.40 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Resolved, "That this Assembly do now adjourn until Monday, 21st June, 1971, at 2 p.m." [Mr. Ramsaroop]

Adjourned accordingly at 11.40p.m.
