

**THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES**

OFFICIAL REPORT

[VOLUME 7]

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

192nd Sitting

2 p.m.

Thursday, 5th July, 1979

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY (63)

Speaker

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

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

Prime Minister (1)

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

(Absent)

Deputy Prime Minister (1)

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

(Absent)

Senior Ministers (12)

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

(Absent – on leave)

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

- Cde. B. Ramsaroop,
Minister of Parliamentary Affairs
and Leader of the House
- Cde. C.V. Mingo,
Minister of Home Affairs **(Absent)**
- * Cde. H. Green,
Minister of Health, Housing and Labour **(Absent)**
- * Cde. H.O. Jack,
Minister of Energy and Natural Resources
- * Cde. F. E. Hope,
Minister of Finance **(Absent)**
- * Cde. G. B. Kennard, C.C.H.,
Minister of Agriculture **(Absent)**
- * Cde. M. Shahabuddeen, C.C.H., S.C.,
Attorney General and
Minister of Justice
- * Cde. V. R. Teekah,
Minister of Education, Social
Development and Culture **(Absent)**
- * Cde. R. E. Jackson,
Minister of Foreign Affairs
- * Cde. J.A. Tyndall, A.A.,
Minister of Trade and
Consumer Protection
- Ministers (2)**
- Cde. O. E. Clarke,
Minister – Regional
(East Berbice/Corentyne)
- Cde. C. A. Nascimento.
Minister, Office of the Prime Minister **(Absent – on leave)**

*** Non-elected Ministers**

Ministers of State (10)

- Cde. F.U.A. Carmichael
Minister of State – Regional (Rupununi) **(Absent)**
- Cde. P. Duncan, J.P.,
Minister of State, Ministry of
Economic Development and Co-operatives
- Cde. K.B. Bancroft, J.P.,
Minister of State – Regional
(Mazaruni/Potaro)
- Cde. J.P. Chowritmootoo, J.P.,
Minister of State – Regional
(Essequibo Coast/West Demerara) **(Absent)**
- Cde. J. R. Thomas,
Minister of State, Office of the
Prime Minister
- Cde. R.H.O. Corbin,
Minister of State, Ministry of
National Development **(Absent)**
- Cde. S. Prashad,
Minister of State – Regional
(East Demerara/West Coast Berbice)
- Cde. R.C. Van Sluytman,
Minister of State,
Ministry of Agriculture
- Cde. L.A. Durant,
Minister of State- Regional
(North West)
- * Cde. F.U.A. Campbell,
Minister of State for Information,
Ministry of National Development

***Non-elected Ministers**

Parliamentary Secretaries (5)

- Cde. M.M. Ackman, C.C.H.,
Parliamentary Secretary, Office of the
Prime Minister and Government Chief Whip **(Absent)**
- Cde. E. L. Ambrose,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture
- Cde. M. Corrica,
Parliamentary Secretary,
Ministry of Education, Social Development
and Culture
- Cde. E. M. Bynoe,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Trade
and Consumer Protection
- Cde. C. E. Wrights, J.P.,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Economic Development
and Co-operatives **(Absent)**

Other members (15)

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

Members of the Opposition (16)

(i) People's Progressive Party (14)

Leader of the Opposition (1)

Cde. C. Jagan,
Leader of the Opposition

Deputy Speaker (1)

Cde. Ram Karran
Deputy Speaker

Other Members (12)

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

(ii) Liberator Party (2)

Mr. M.F. Singh, J. P	(Absent)
Mr. M.A Abraham	

OFFICERS

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

Acting Deputy Clerk of the National Assembly – A. Knight.

PRAYERS**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SPEAKER****Late Starting of Meeting**

The Speaker: Comrades and hon. Members, you will observe today that the meeting is starting at 10 minutes past 2' o' clock. Perhaps when the **New Nation** writes it will not say that the Speaker was late but that, at the request of Members of Parliament, the Sitting was commenced late.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

The following paper was laid:

Statements of Guarantees given by the Minister of Finance made under section 3 of the Guarantee of Loans (Public Corporations and Companies) Act, Chapter 77:01 for the quarters ended 30th September, 1978, 31st December, 1978, 31st March, 1979 and Aggregate for the year ended 31st December, 1978. [**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House on behalf of the Minister of Finance**]

PUBLIC BUSINESS**MOTIONS****SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 23 (3)**

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House (Cde Ramsaroop):
Cde. Speaker, in keeping with Government's commitment that the Motion on the Order Paper, No. 216, published on the 29th of last month, should be debated today, I accordingly move the Motion standing in my name to facilitate that debate:

“Be it resolved that paragraph (3) of Standing Order No. 23 be suspended to enable the Motion by the leader of the Opposition published on 29th June, 1979, on Notice Paper No. 216 to be moved at the Sitting of the National Assembly on 5th July, 1979.”

Question put, and agreed to.

Standing Order No. 23 (3) suspended.

The Speaker: Cde. Leader of the Opposition.

CONDEMNATION OF SOMOZA REGIME AND RECOGNITION OF GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL RECONSTRUCTION

“Whereas the brutal Somoza regime is carrying out a genocidal war against the people of Nicaragua;

And whereas the heroic people of Nicaragua, led by the Sandinista Front need urgent international solidarity and support;

And whereas several Latin American and Caribbean Governments, including the People’s Revolutionary Government of Grenada, have broken off relations with the Somoza regime and recognised the Government of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua:

Be it resolved that this National Assembly condemns the Somoza dictatorship and calls upon the Government to express solidarity with the Committee for National

Salvation led by the Sandinista Front and to recognise the new Government of National Reconstruction.” [The Leader of the Opposition]

The Leader of the Opposition (Cde. C. Jagan): Cde. Speaker, we are dealing today with a matter of very great importance, the subject of the great brutality committed against the fighting people. In the long history of struggles of the people all over the world, the Somoza dictatorship will go down as one of the most brutal. This fascist regime has declared war, genocidal massacre, against its own people. Anastasio Somoza is bombing and rocketing his own people indiscriminately in the large cities. Their only crime is that they are poor and they want to be free.

We have had such butchers before in the person of Franco in Spain, Hitler and Mussolini and in our hemisphere the Trujillo dictatorship which lasted for 30 years. But the brutal Somoza dictatorship has been on the backs of the Nicaraguan people for 44 years and this dictatorship would have been overthrown a long time ago had it not been for the fact that those who champion the cause of human rights forget about the violation of fundamental rights in this country. Indeed, the whole sordid history of the brutal dictatorship stems from imperialist intrigues, which led to the dismemberment of this country several years ago.

I have here with me a very authoritative book written by a former President of Guatemala, another one of those dictatorships imposed in our hemisphere, one Jose Arvelho, and in this book there is a great deal said about the early history of Nicaragua. I would like, with your permission, to read from pages 82 and 83 to show the sordid hand of imperialism in what happened then and continues to happen today. Senor Arvelho says the following:

“More eloquent than all the legal allegations is the following documents we are going to reproduce. It contains the opinion of an eminent Yankee, Elihu Root, who was Secretary of State of the Empire. In a letter published by **Century**, right after the signing of the Treaty, Root said the following:

‘I am assailed by anxieties and fear when I consider the question whether the Nicaraguan government that celebrated the treaty is really the genuine representative of the Nicaraguan people, and whether that government can be regarded in Nicaragua and in Central America as a legitimate and free agent to authorize the Treaty. I have read the report of the head of our Marines in Nicaragua and I find in it these words:

“The present government is not in power by the will of the people. The elections were in their greater part fraudulent”.

And further on I have read in the same report the statement that those who oppose the government make up three quarters of the country. Can a treaty which is so serious for Nicaragua and in which perpetual rights are conceded in that territory, be celebrated with a President who, we have just cause to believe, does not represent more than one-fourth of those governed in the country, and who is kept in his position by our military forces and to whom, as a consequence of the treaty, we would pay a considerable sum of money so that he could dispose of it as President? It would cause me disgust to see the United States place itself in such a situation.”

Arvelho goes on:

“Let us not forget that there is quite a background for Elihu Root’s moral code in matters of imperial grabs or seizures. He was the true author of the Platt Amendment and was the one who carried out that heroic action against Cuba. It appears that what happened in Nicaragua even the outside limits of the moral code of the shark.

And by chance, was it not Senator Borah who, in his famous speech in January 1917, said to his countrymen,

‘The Bryan-Chamorro Treaty is a downright violation of the most elementary principles of international decency. That treaty was made with ourselves. The so-called Government of Nicaragua has neither power nor authority to contract it’.

Arvelho goes on to say:

“That exactly was what the head of the Yankee Marines of Occupation had stated in his report to his Government.”

2.20 p.m.

Cde. Speaker, that was the sordid treaty which led to the dismemberment of Nicaragua and a big slice of its territory being stolen from it by the imperialists. Imperialism continued its occupation and its control of this country until the 1930s when there was a liberation movement started and it succeeded in expelling the marines from that country. They expelled the marines but even though they left, they put in their place Somoza, the father of the present one, to carry on the dirty work. That Somoza was assassinated in 1956. Since then, the present Somoza took over and he is nicknamed the last U.S. marine in Nicaragua. So we have a situation where today we find people are being slaughtered, being tortured in a manner of the Savak in Iran. They are bombarded. Defenceless civilians are being killed, slaughtered. We have a few excerpts of the behaviour of these people. Sergio Valeiro, ex-head of Somoza’s death squad, was captured in 1978. He told of two cases which were typical.

He said:

“I have seen young children torn from their parents’ hands and machine gunned in front of them. A young prisoner was castrated, then his ears and eyeballs were punctured. When they were finished

they killed him. His special guard is taught to kill, not capture.
“Kill, kill, kill,’ is drilled into them.”

We have a documented report of the brutalities, the torture and the killings which have taken place during the last two years in this country and I will just read one example for this House where two adolescent girls, afterwards, reported what happened in their neighbourhood. It states:

“They stopped checking the people, then they let the women pass, the old man and the children. But they made all the young men get down on the ground. ‘These sons of bitches are going to work taking down all the barricades,’ shouted one of the guards. We stood nearby because we had three brothers on the ground there. When the place had been cleared away they made the prisoners kneel in two rows. A guard ordered us to turn our faces in the other direction and then there was nothing but the sound of gunfire. Thousands of shots. We turned to see and all we saw was a guard firing his machine gun at the men writhing on the ground. Then two guards grabbed us and covered our eyes with their hands. Later they had us look. Then a tractor ran over the bodies smashing them into pieces. The remains were gathered together, then, gasoline thrown on top and set on fire. While the fire was still burning, the guards came up to us, looked at us awhile and one said, “go to hell and keep your mouths shut.’ Only one of the dead was not a young man.”

Dreleiro Martinez Dramerez was fifty years old.

Every young man and woman today is regarded as an enemy by this butcher and so, indiscriminately, they shoot them down. This is the kind of situation we are dealing with in this

country today and this House needs to speak out in the strongest language against the brutality which is going on under this regime. President Carter recently said that the reporter who was shot by a national guardsman was really murdered. No doubt, this must have influenced public opinion in the United States which in turn influenced the United States Government in its position on Nicaragua. As I said already, had the United States not been propping up this regime, it would have ended long ago like so many others. Now it seems that what is wanted is an end to Somoza but not an end to Somozaism. This seems to be the logical outcome of what is now going on behind the scenes.

There are various things which seem to indicate that intervention is taking place. In Guatemala, an army officer, Reuben Castanada, was captured, an Israeli fighter plane was shot down. That Pro-imperialist Zionist State, racist State, is also helping this fascist regime, supplying arms and fighter planes. There are indications that American and Honduran mercenaries are fighting on behalf of the dictatorship as we saw in the struggle in Angola. It has been reported that a heavy cruiser was bombarding Sandinistas' positions at El Narango. And since it is unlikely that this type of cruiser is owned by any of the countries in the neighbourhood, it is suspected that it probably belongs to the United States.

2.30p.m.

The U.S. Government called for an inter-American peace-keeping force after the slaughter was intensified, when the Guerilla liberation forces occupied parts of the capital. Fortunately, the C.A.S. did not fully endorse the position of the United States. We know what would have happened had there been a peace-keeping force sent to Nicaragua. We had the experience in the early 1950s when the United States christened a force which they had hurriedly sent to South Korea, christened it with the United Nations emblem and flag. Fortunately, it was turned back by the Chinese and the North Koreans from its mission, not only to take over the North of Korea but also, under Mac Arthur, to invade China.

We saw where such a force also intervened in Africa, a so-called “peace-keeping force,” at the time when Lumumba was President or Prime Minister of the Congo and that intervention led to the murder of that great patriot of the African people. So, it was good that even this, what is called the Colonial Ministry of the State Department, the O.A.S., had the guts to come out and oppose a peace-keeping force for Nicaragua.

As I said, it is probable that the murder of the journalist so infuriated American public opinion that the United States had to withdraw, or back track, in the same way as Kissinger and Ford had to back track, when they wanted to send troops to Angola, because of intense public opinion and popular support for the M.P.L.A. and non-intervention in Angola.

The O.A.S. in its Resolution said that what was needed was the immediate replacement of dictator Anastasio Somoza. It also said that the principle of non-intervention should be scrupulously observed. So it is good that this step has now been taken by the O.A.S. This is perhaps the very first time in the history of all America that the United States did not have its way in the O.A.S. We know in the case of Cuba when America agreed to impose blockade, the O.A.S. went along first with the San Jose Declaration in 1960, in Guatemala, later the Resolution of the O.A.S. in 1964.

So it is that times are changing but note what happened there is this Resolution. All the dictatorships in Latin America either voted for or abstained. Uruguay and Nicaragua voted against the Resolution. Chile, Uruguay, Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador all abstained. On this occasion, however, the countries were led first of all by the Andean Pact – I should say first of all by Cuba, because we know that Cuba has been giving support to the Sandinista movement and the liberation struggle for many, many years. There is no question about that. What is very important is that the Governments which make up the Andean Pact - Colombia, Venezuela, Peru, Ecuador, they came out and supported the Resolution very strongly. Panama, Mexico, Costa Rica, they broke off diplomatic relations very early and even Brazil broke off diplomatic relations. There are great developments in our hemisphere and we are happy that these

democratic tendencies are now exerting themselves on the political arena in terms of hemispheric affairs. It is well that the United States has been defeated on this occasion.

Now we have to ask ourselves what must be done in the present situation. The people of Nicaragua are desperately poor. We know from reports we are hearing that there is a terrible shortage of food. Many people are dying of starvation. Even before this period things were very terrible in that country. Seventy per cent of the population is illiterate. Fifty per cent of the people receive no medical treatment of any kind and housing conditions are bad with little or no hygiene to speak of and now we can imagine what is taking place there.

Fighting for liberation is a very broad front made up of all the social forces in the country. There is the National Patriotic Front. It contains the Group of Twelve, that is a group of industrialists, intellectuals and professional people, the People's United Movement which has 23 popular, progressive and revolutionary groupings and parties within it, including the trade unions, the socialist party and the communist party and the three Sandinista factions which include social democrats, socialists, Marxists, Christians and others and this Front has a progressive revolutionary programme calling first of all for the overthrow of the regime and a transitional national popular Government for the reconstruction of the country. It calls for the confiscation of all of Somoza's property and the property of those who support the Somoza dictatorship. It is calling for the setting up of a popular People's Army for land reform, an agrarian revolution and for a proper school system to take care of those illiterates who have been brought on the agenda in view of the repression and oppression of the Nicaraguan people.

I referred a little while ago in reading the "Shark and the Sardines" to the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty. Well, it seems that history has now turned almost a full circle where Chamorro, the publisher of one of the most popular papers, was assassinated in 1977 by the Somoza dictatorship and this sparked off the revolution, sparked off the uprising and, although it was not a military success when it first started last year, nevertheless, it kindled the revolutionary consciousness of the masses of the people and brought about unity of all the popular forces in the

5.7.79

National Assembly

2.30 – 2.40 p.m.

country to oppose the dictatorship. And successes have been achieved, we are happy to note. Two ships were seized by their crews, one of them in Panama. And the crew have sought asylum in Panama. A Nicaraguan airliner was hi-jacked and taken by its crew to Costa Rica where they also sought asylum. The liberation forces have set up on the border with Costa Rica a 25-mile zone which is regarded now as liberated territory from which they can move against the dictator. They have liberated several cities and we now see that they are achieving successes in the international arena where they have been conducting a lot of political work in order to win support for their struggle. There is, however, the need for continuing solidarity, the need for support, medicines, etc.

2.40 p.m.

I have a report here of an interview with one of the comrades of the National Leadership of the Sandinista National Liberation Front where he said:

“We request, concretely, those medicines which will allow us to counteract the illness in our country called mountain leprosy which occurs in the mountain zones of our country and which the Government, until recently, did not even bother to alleviate.”

He goes on to say:

“It is impossible to find them in the pharmacies of our country. Repodol, Camoral, Buldena, the scientific name for Camoral is neo antimosant, are the names we have been able to uncover and which have given positive results in the treatment of the disease. We also need plasma, anti-biotics, vitamins, haemorrhage treatment, anti-haemorrhagants because our struggle is often bloody and this is a situation we are facing now in many places.”

Cde. Speaker, the Motion before the House calls for the condemnation of the Somoza dictatorship. It calls for urgent international solidarity and support and it also calls for the recognition of the new Government which has been set up, the Government of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua. As regards aid, as I said already, this must be shown not only by way of a resolution. Tangible help is needed. Thousands and thousands of people are starving, thousands and thousands of people are being injured. They need medicines, they need drugs and Guyana must not fail these heroic fighters who are sacrificing their lives not only for themselves, but for all of us in this continent. I hope when the Minister speaks that he will announce to this House and to the nations that Guyana is giving at least a million dollars to the heroic fighters of Nicaragua. I do not think this is a large sum. This is indeed very small. But considering that they are carrying out the struggle under great pressure, fighting against weapons of mass destruction, being bombarded by jet fighters and rockets; clearly we must not pay lip service to this question of support. Support means much more than passing a Resolution. Support today in Nicaragua means militant solidarity. Militant solidarity means not only giving financial support but taking to the streets and demonstrating. I say the Government has not done enough in Guyana in this regard. We will hear the Minister in due course.

The Motion also calls, as I said, for the recognition of the Government of National Reconstruction. Little Grenada followed very early some of the other Governments, put out a strong statement and declared publicly that it was recognising this new Government. I wonder why the Guyana Government has remained silent. Perhaps the Minister will tell us. Why Guyana, which was said to be the leader in the English-speaking Caribbean, if not elsewhere, has remained silent. We will hear. This is no time for silence. This is a time to show our active and militant solidarity to these heroic fighters.

I know sometimes the Government makes the point that we do not have enough money and we are already helping Africa and we cannot help anybody else. That was the answer which was given in the late 1960s when the question of solidarity with Vietnam came up. They did not even give moral support much less financial at that time. Well, let us erase the past and let us

5.7.79

National Assembly

2.40 – 2.50 p.m.

now write a new chapter. We call on the Government to give generous financial support, to speak out in bold terms and to recommend that further steps must be taken to isolate this regime and defeat it as quickly as possible so that we can have another free territory in the Americas.

Cde. N. Persaud seconded.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs (Cde. Jackson): Cde. Speaker, on February 21, 1934, Augusto Caesar Sandino, a true son of the soil of Nicaragua, died at the hands of his own people as a martyr. It marked the end of an epic chapter which began with the occupation of Nicaragua by the U.S marines in 1926. His death, the death of Sandino, was a vile and treacherous act and was perpetrated by the so-called National Guard which then, as now, is an agent of Imperialism.

More than two centuries ago, indeed 170 years before the assassination of Sandino, almost exactly to the day, our own Cuffy, bearing aloft the torch of freedom, launched a heroic slave revolution which breached the ramparts of Colonialism and Imperialism at Magdalenenburg in Berbice. Sandino was a patriot and a fighter against Imperialism. His life, in reality, was distinguished by the first Somoza. Since then Nicaragua, ruled by one Somoza after another, has been systematically raped. The history of that country under the Somoza has been a history of repression, of torture and of brutality and death.

2.50 p.m.

Like my friend, Dr. Jagan, I, too, have read with great interest “The Shark and the Sardines” and, as he said, it gives a graphic description of the way in which Imperialism has distorted the true course of the revolutionary people of Nicaragua.

Arm-in-arm with Imperialism, the Somozas established a dynasty and turned that country into a fiefdom, amassing huge fortunes at the expense of the blood and sweat of the Nicaraguan working classes. The present feudal baron is alleged to have assets worth half a billion U.S.

dollars. I am told that the first Somoza began with a single coffee plantation but by now the Somoza estate controls every form of business within Nicaragua. It owns an airline, shipping line, shipping service, port facilities Puerto Somoza; a newspaper, T.V station, a slaughter house where it controls all the beef, a sugar refining complex, tobacco, rice and so it goes on. It is nothing but a fiefdom and it is done at the great expense of the blood, sweat and tears of the people of Nicaragua.

The Foreign Minister of Cuba, speaking in the General Assembly last year, had a most important quotation in discussing the situation in Nicaragua. He said – and I quote:

“The scientific analysis of socialist processes shows that when an idea becomes a part of mass consciousness it is transformed into a powerful material force. When the people decide to throw off the yoke that oppresses them, nothing can stop them.”

This today is what we are witnessing in Nicaragua. The valiant people of that country have decided that the time has come to end the stranglehold of the Somoza dynasty on them.

Sandino, like Cuffy, sought to chart a course for his people that will lead them to a better way of life in freedom and dignity. I think that Sandino echoed the words of Cuffy when he said on May 12, 1933:

“I am not willing to hand over my arms even if everyone else does so. I will have to die with the few soldiers who stay with me because” --
and this is important –
“it is better to die as rebels than to live as slaves.”
On the 1st January of the same year he had said:
“We will go toward the light of liberty or towards death and
if we die our cause will live on. Others will follow us.”

Today we are witnessing the execution of that prophetic statement.

Basing themselves on their historical circumstances and their national experience, the people of Nicaragua began to organise for the overthrow of the tyrannical dictatorship of Somoza. Mobilised by the Sandinistas and drawing support from all sectors of the society, the people's on-going struggle took concrete shape and pursued a direct path in February last year when they successfully called a general strike. But I believe, as the Cde. Leader of the Opposition observed, that it was since the murder of Pedro Joaquin Chamorro, a scholar and newspaper man, and by no account a revolutionary, that the people's struggle gained momentum. Since then, Somoza has drenched the land of Nicaragua with the blood of its innocent people. But I believe that it was in September last year that the valiant people of Nicaragua launched a sustained armed struggle to recover their freedom and their dignity.

As a response, Somoza, armed to the teeth, and seeking the security of his bunker, has devastated the cities of his own country and has literally murdered thousands upon thousands of children, men, youths and women. The names of those cities will long reverberate in the pages of history: Magabantan, Rivas, Esterly and Nassia. In those circumstances, in the demonstrations of heroisms which the people of Nicaragua, led by the Sandinistas, are demonstrating, they not only deserve international support but they deserve our full and unstinted applause and congratulations.

In considering this question, one must take account of the newspaper published in this country called the **Mirror**, a mirror of what, I do not know except, perhaps, of distortion and disinformation. In the editorial of June 22 of this year, this newspaper urged that the Government break off diplomatic relations with Nicaragua. I believe that the Cde. Leader of the Opposition, although he made no mention of this, is informed by that paper. Indeed, there are articles appearing in it, from time to time, under his name. But I ask a question: How can a Government break off diplomatic relations with a country with which it does not have such

relations? I think this is another example of what one chap gave of a definition of a statistician: “A statistician is a man who moves from an unwarranted assumption to a foregone conclusion.”

The **Mirror** had a conclusion that the Government must break off diplomatic relations. It did not seek to consider whether in fact such relations existed. Let us, at least, have the facts right. The truth is that this Government has consistently refused overtures from the regime of Anastasio Somoza – Debayle for the establishment of diplomatic relations between our countries. Indeed, it seems that the principled position which we took over the years stirred the wrath and fury of that dictator, for how else can one explain the utterly false and baseless story which he concocted and published on September 27, 1977, in the newspaper **Novedades** which he owns? The story, which is nothing but a vicious lie, was to the effect that Guyana, along with Cuba and the Soviet Union, was involved in a plot to overthrow him.

3.00 p.m.

If I might digress, with your permission, Cde. Speaker, for a moment it is to observe that within recent weeks some sections of the western media have been penning similarly false reports of Guyana’s involvement with the turn of events in Grenada. We as a nation need to remain ever vigilant against these obvious and deliberate attempts at dis-information and subversion and to guard against the possible consequences of them. Earlier, Cde. Speaker, I had made reference to this editorial in the **Mirror** of June 27. That editorial also essayed an argument – and if I may quote you will see how erroneous that argument was. It stated:

“The P.N.C. Government has been strangely illusive on the issue of Nicaragua.”

and I think these sentiments were reflected again today in the statement made here by the Leader of the Opposition. “It has made no declaration.” It goes on:

“But why does the Guyana Government have to seek cover under the Coordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned countries.”

Perhaps this debate gives us an opportunity to remove, if it is at all possible, some of the myths about foreign policy and its conduct which the Opposition is wont to embrace. I would like to thank Dr. Jagan for the initiative which he took to have this debate and which, if he is amenable, can be put to good and constructive purpose. Maybe, who knows, we might in the future see an even more enlightened approach from the Opposition Benches on matters of foreign policy. The objective of foreign policy action is effectiveness where a small country is fiercely independent and determined, come hell or high water, to pursue its own path of political, social and economic development.

Consistent with our socialist ideology, we have made a rational assessment of our needs and our resources and we have consciously decided to pursue our national policy, of which foreign policy is an aspect, through the use of both conventional and bilateral diplomacy and the employment of consecutive foreign policy. That is why we have rightly put so much emphasis on multilateral diplomacy on our activities in the U.N. and our activities in the Non-Aligned Movement. That small States acting together have been influential in wrenching change in international systems is undeniable. Thus, a consecutive foreign policy has not only a security consideration in a world of complexities involving antagonistic military blocs but provides an international ambience which increases the capacities of these States for action which is meaningful and effective. In this way the separate views of States are consolidated and amplified. If we cast our minds back to the days when you had a turn-table on which you put a record and the sound came out the same way, but when you used an amplifier the quality of the music was better, similarly, by operating within the Non-Alignment Movement, this Government has made Guyana much more influential. The concept of a cover simply does not arise. It is a situation in which I believe the mathematicians say that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Thus, whenever possible, this Government seeks a basis for common action with liked-

mindful States. In the case of Nicaragua we have done this unapologetically within the framework of the United Nations and the Non-Aligned Movement.

In this latter respect it perhaps is not inapposite that I remind this House, in relation to the Non-Aligned Movement, of a section of the Communiqué which was issued on the occasion of the visit of the Cde. Leader, Cde. Burnham, to the Soviet Union. I quote:

“Both States consider that the Non-Aligned Movement, of which Guyana is a prominent member, is an important factor in the struggle for peace and international security in defence of independence, freedom and economic advance of peoples.”

If further evidence were needed, I would like to quote, with your permission, from an issue of the **Soviet Weekly** of June 16, 1979 where it states:

“The Soviet Union highly appreciates the Non-Aligned Movement as a major independent factor in international politics.”

Perhaps two examples, of our success in pursuing a consecutive foreign policy would suffice. In the first place, the announcement made in 1972 that Barbados, Guyana, Jamaica and Trinidad had decided to establish relations with Cuba did not arise out of nothingness. It was a culmination of initiative which this Government took earlier, a fact which was acknowledged publicly in Cienfuegos on Wednesday, April 9, 1975, by the President of the State Council and Council of Ministers of Cuba, Dr Fidel Castro. With your permission, Cde. Speaker, I can quote what he said on that occasion. It states:

“Guyana, for example, became independent less than ten years ago. They lived under the rule of British colonialism for centuries and, although they became

independent very recently, it is obvious that these English-speaking countries of the Caribbean did not acquire the bad habits, as did Latin American Governments of being dreadfully afraid of Yankee Imperialism. The establishment of diplomatic relations with Cuba was a challenge to Imperialism and nevertheless the English-speaking countries of the Caribbean accepted this challenge. It was precisely at the top level meeting among the leaders of those countries held in Trinidad in October 1972 that the Prime Minister of the Co-operative Republic of Guyana proposed the establishment of diplomatic relations with Cuba.”

You will recall that the Prime Minister’s colleagues gave him the honour of making the public announcement.

Secondly, when the Provisional Revolutionary Government assumed power in Grenada, the people of Guyana and the members of that Government knew what would be the reaction of this Government. But desirous of serving larger interests, we initiated consultations at the level of CARICOM. As a result, a measure of joint co-ordination also followed. Let me reiterate: we take action at the foreign policy level for effectiveness. This Government does not pursue foreign policy as if it were a rodeo looking for the spectacular and the extravagant. We rest our action on the ideology of Socialism in the pursuit of our national interest.

Having dealt with those points which emerged out of the editorial of the **Mirror** and, perhaps hopefully, broadening the vision of the Opposition in terms of their articulation and conduct of foreign policy, I wish now to enumerate some of the considerations which have guided this Government in determining its position on the developments in Nicaragua particularly since last year. First, that the Somoza dictatorship has ruthlessly trampled on and massively violated the rights of the people of that country and must be removed; secondly, that the situation is one entirely within the jurisdiction of the people of Nicaragua and as such there should be no outside intervention or interference; thirdly, the situation, however, represents a threat to peace and security in the area and is therefore of concern to all of us in the hemisphere

in general, Central America and the Caribbean in particular; fourthly, that the people of Nicaragua who are engaged in a heroic arms struggle led by the Sandinista Liberation Front, deserve international support, and fifthly, that the use of mercenaries should be condemned.

3.10 p.m.

During the fighting last year it was reported and shown on television in the United States where there was open recruitment of mercenaries in Albuquerque in Mexico, so-called “soldiers of fortune,” to go and fight the valiant Nicaraguan people.

The question therefore arises: What efforts did the Government make and what action did it take? Last year, several countries within Latin America made diplomatic contact with us about the developments in Nicaragua. These contacts were pursued at the level of the General Assembly with Foreign Ministers and other representatives of many States, hemispheric and non-aligned. Our opinion was sought and our advice requested. On all occasions – and I say this without modesty – on all occasions we found full respect for our point of view. We were instrumental in getting the Foreign Ministers in an extraordinary meeting in New York on 2nd October to agree to a Declaration on Nicaragua, and the declaration said:

“In the face of the grave events that have taken place in Nicaragua where the massive use of force has resulted in loss of human lives and property and during which the Government of Nicaragua has violated the territorial integrity and sovereignty of neighbouring States, disturbing the peace and stability of the area, the Ministers expressed their deep concern and decided to follow the development of the situation closely.”

Let me admit: this statement did not go as far as Guyana wanted but, if you are pursuing a consecutive foreign policy you have to take into account the view of other States. The Leader of the Opposition himself mentioned the Resolution of the O.A.S. which showed that, if you pursue

consecutive foreign policy, you can bring about changes even within the very nature of the organisation.

Last year we put forward an opinion that there should be a meeting of the Security Council to discuss the situation. Though this idea was generally welcome, some of the parties more directly involved, like, for example, Costa Rica, were a little reluctant to pursue it and, in terms of the General Assembly in December last year and these are all public documents.

Contacts have continued this year. Only last month at a meeting of the Coordinating Bureau in Colombia we did express ourselves on Nicaragua in a joint communiqué with Suriname and more recently at a special meeting of the Coordinating Bureau in New York in June 25. As the Leader of the Opposition said, this matter was also raised at the O.A.S. and we share many of his perceptions about the results of that meeting.

We ourselves are not members of the O.A.S. but we are not indifferent to its deliberations. Thus we cannot fail to note with pleasure that a recent meeting from June 21 to 23, it did not approve of a proposal for the dispatch of a so-called peace-keeping force. We should note as well that this meeting reflected an upsurge of burgeoning Latin America nationalism.

All this information is public but I nevertheless would like to regret that it appears that the Opposition has not made use of it because if it did, it would, I am sure, have seen the wisdom of the amendment which I have sought to propose and which, with your permission, Cde. Speaker, I would like to read. We have sought to amend this Motion not because there is anything that we disagree with but for purpose of style and efficacy and now with the evidence that I have given it is clear that it needs to be amplified. We want to enrich it. We have, therefore, left the first two paragraphs in the Motion intact and, although we are deleting the rest, you will see that all the ideas are reflected again there, but it is done in a more ordered and structured manner. Our amendment would read as follows:

“And whereas the Non-aligned Movement, in which Guyana participates actively, and which is a major independent factor in international politics, has in September 1978, and more recently in June 1979, expressed support for the just struggle of the people of Nicaragua and called for the adoption of concrete measures for the immediate and definitive elimination of the Somoza regime;

And whereas the Government of Guyana over the years consistently resisted all overtures from the Somoza regime for the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries;

And whereas several countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, which for some time maintained and/or latterly established relations with the fascist clique of General Anastasio Somoza-Debatyle, have recently severed such relations:

Be it resolved that this National Assembly condemns the Somoza dictatorship and endorses the action taken by the Government of Guyana within the Non-aligned Movement to effectuate the end of that dictatorship and to intensify international support for the forces of freedom in Nicaragua under the leadership of the Sandinista National Liberation Front;

And that this National Assembly expresses solidarity with the Committee for National Salvation of Nicaragua and calls upon the Government to recognise the Provisional Government of National Reconstruction.”

As I say, the three preambular paragraphs are straightforward. They are factual and the additions we have made to the first Resolve part reflect what we say in the beginning. I will therefore commend these amendments to this National Assembly.

The days of Somoza are numbered. Everywhere in Nicaragua from the mountain top, in the valleys, in the streets, in the hills, in the barrios, students, youths, workers, peasants are rising against the fascism of Somoza. We must lend whole-hearted support to them in condemning the dictatorship. We must let them know in no uncertain terms that our support is with them and it is with these feelings that we note a report that Somoza is planning to flee the country on Saturday.

The day of the people's victory is at hand, but when that victory comes, it should be clear to all that there should be no encouragement, if I may borrow the saying of the Leader of the Opposition, who himself has borrowed it from someone else – there should be no Somozaism without Somoza. **[Applause]**

3.20 p.m.

Amendment proposed.

Cde. Ram Karran (The Deputy Speaker): I think, Sir, that a great opportunity is being lost at this moment on such an important issue, an issue relating to the struggle of the people in Nicaragua for their freedom. The opportunity I refer to, Your Honour, is that this House, on an issue like this, ought to have been unanimous in every respect rather than to have been forced into a position where unanimity is not obvious. The history of this issue arose some time ago when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition sought to raise the matter at the rising of the House and the Government had agreed to a full debate today, with Your Honour's approval, if a Motion was submitted. Such a Motion was submitted, in fact, the very day, but instead of approaching the matter in a spirit of unity – national unity is the by-word today of the P.N.C. – it has brought in an amendment to our Motion, which sought to enhance the reputation of the P.N.C., a reputation that is dwindling day by day, which is almost in the position of the Somoza regime. The P.N.C. has taken the opportunity to insert in its amendment, its so-called good deeds.

Why have we not heard from the hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs or from the P.N.C. of these good deeds that they have done on the Nicaragua situation. The hon. Minister condemns the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition for calling upon them to withdraw recognition from the Somoza regime. How could anyone know? They do not come here to debate questions. I have here a copy of a Motion which was moved by the Opposition for a discussion on Puerto Rico. This is dated 9th March, 1978. To date there has been no discussion. When last did we have a discussion --

The Speaker: Cde. Ram Karran, for my own edification, you have an amendment put in here? Have you submitted an amendment? I have just asked because I seem to observe in this amendment that everything that the Minister has in his amendment you have copied, except for the deletion in the resolve clause. You have in your resolve clause “That this National Assembly condemns the Somoza dictatorship” and you stop there. You have deleted, “... and calls for the expulsion of Nicaragua from the United Nations.” That is what I have. Then in the final resolve clause you have a little addition, “.... and to support the seating in the United Nation of the Provisional Government...” I just want to know if that is your amendment.

Cde. Ram Karran: Quite correct, sir. I will deal with that aspect of my proposed amendment as I continue. What I want to deal with at this stage is to point out that the P.N.C. Government is trying to use the situation in Nicaragua, the tragic conditions there, to enhance its own position in the eyes of the world. Just as I remember in the case of the Angolans fighting for their liberation, bleeding from Portuguese bullets supplied by the C.I.A. in the United States of America, my friends on the other side were strong supporters, allegedly, of the O.A.U. That is another international organisation. They were supporting U.N.I.T.A. and they were supporting F.N.L.A. We spoke from the opposition, that these two are imperialist organisations set up by the Americans and the Portuguese, and they had them coming from the United States of America running all over Guyana as heroes of Angola, feting them up until the very last hour when they were discovered. Roberto, U.N.I.T.A., associated with the Chinese, associated with the United States and all the reactions. It was only at the last hour that the P.N.C. tried to refurbish its

image, as it is trying to do now, to say that these are gone by even though O.A.U. have been supporting them and they turned their support late in the day, when the Angolans were already free, and said that they were supporting the M.P.L.A. [**Interruption**] Rashleigh, you were not in the Government but you are, now. That is the type of thing we have. Weren't you supporting U.N.I.T.A.? Weren't you supporting the F.N.L.A.? History is very clear.

What we need in this House, what we need in this country, what we need in Guyana is a situation where the Government will come to terms with the situation, not to use every cheap opportunity as it does here in its an amendment, to say that this National Assembly supports what the Government did in so and so. This National Assembly is not aware that the Government has done so and so and that is why, in discussing the matter at this late hour, prior to the Sitting of the House, when Your Honour drew attention to the fact that the House was meeting later than 2 o'clock, an attempt was being made to see whether there could have been an understanding so that the amendment put before the House could have unanimous support. After all, I am not aware of that. However, that is a matter that is still to be considered.

In my view and in the view of many people in this country, the Somoza regime in Nicaragua and the P.N.C. regime in Guyana were both spawned by the C.I.A., they are blood brothers and that is why there is the reluctance on the part of these people who take advantage of the situation in Nicaragua. It is only when the whole world has turned to condemn for Nicaragua and Somoza that my friends have jumped up to say, "all right." But the support for Nicaragua is in such a manner as not to offend their bigger brother in the United States of America. Everybody can read through their attitude, notwithstanding what they say, their alleged camouflaging of their activities under the so-called international organisations. We must know the facts. Sir, my friend says that he is glad for the opportunity for the Motion moved by the leader of the Opposition so that he can use that vehicle to enhance his own position. The Motion ought to have come from the Government but, as I said just now, this House never meets to debate Foreign Affairs. I do not think that this Minister of Foreign Affairs is a steady traveller like his predecessor who was hardly in this country. He is more readily available in Guyana and

he should be here to discuss and to give the opportunity to Members of the House to debate these issues.

3.30 p.m.

I remember another issue in which the cheapness of my friends on the other side was clear. The Leader of the Opposition sought to move a Motion with respect to the United Nations, the deficiencies in the United Nations, and I am sure it did not go down with Your Honour's support when, after the Minister of Foreign Affairs – I think it was Cde. Fred Wills – had spoken under the Head, Statements by Ministers, that Motion was withdrawn. It could not have been with Your Honour's support. It was withdrawn by the Leader of Parliamentary Affairs. Never before in the history of this House has a Motion moved by one Member been withdrawn by another, just to give a little credit so poor is their image that the Minister made a statement and the Motion by the Leader of the Opposition was withdrawn. As you know, sir, even in little debating societies one man cannot withdraw a Motion moved by another man. In some instances, you have to get the approval of the seconder; in some instances you have to get the approval of the whole house. But that sort of jiggery-pokery goes on in this House merely to enhance the dwindling reputation of my friends on the other side.

My friends across there condemn Somoza. They are withdrawing increments, five cents an hour, from people. They are breaching agreements – \$14 a day. Every single thing that Somoza has forgotten they are starting to do now and they are talking about condemning Somoza. You must condemn Somoza when you act with more dignity. **[Applause]**

The working people of this country will have the satisfaction of knowing that there is a demand for the removal of Somoza. It is clear when that demand was made in this country of ours. I formally move the amendment that stands in my name.

Cde. N. Persaud: I wish to second the Amendment proposed by Cde. Ram Karran.

Amendment proposed.

The Speaker: Does any other person wish to speak?

Cde. Jack rose –

The Speaker: Cde. Jagan, I would like to draw your attention to this Rule which means, according to my understanding and my Ruling, that you will have to reply now and I will permit a Minister of the Government to wind up the debate. Unfortunately, Cde. Ram Karran, if you were not critical of the Government I would have allowed Dr. Jagan to reply. You went on to criticise the Government. The rule is here: “A Minister may conclude a debate on any Motion ...”

Cde C. Jagan: May.

The Speaker: I am to decide.

Cde Jack rose --

The Speaker: Cde. Jack, will you please allow me to finish.

“... which is critical of the Government, or reflects adversely on or is calculated to bring discredit upon the Government or a Government Officer.”

Cde. C. Jagan: I will speak on the ruling of yours.

The Speaker: I have already ruled. You should have spoken before.

Cde. C. Jagan: I am speaking on –

The Speaker: Let me hear you.

Cde. Ram Karran rose –

The Speaker: You have been critical of the Government.

Cde. Ram Karran: If the Minister has anything to debunk, if the Minister has any point, he should clearly say so with respect to the Government's policy.

The Speaker: Cde. Jagan, will you reply to the speeches made? Comrades, please allow Dr. Jagan to speak.

Cde. C. Jagan: Mr. Speaker, I am asking a question. Is it that after I wind up the debate a Minister will be allowed to speak? On what grounds?

The Speaker: On my Ruling.

Cde. C. Jagan: Forget the Ruling. I am asking: On what grounds?

The Speaker: You were critical of the Government and therefore the Minister is entitled to wind up the debate.

Cde. C. Jagan: If the Member said something and it is critical, let the Government reply because the Government always brings in new points after and we do not have a chance to reply to this House.

The Speaker: Cde. Jagan, will you proceed, please? That is normal procedure.

Cde. C. Jagan: It is normal procedures.

The Speaker: Had Cde. Ram Karran not intervened and been critical of the Government. I have already ruled. Are you proceeding?

Cde. C. Jagan: Why don't you run this House in a proper manner?

The Speaker: I will not tolerate that. Are you proceeding? That is my Ruling? If you do not wish to reply, I will put the Motion.

Cde. C. Jagan: You can do what the hell you like. [**Cde. Ram Karran:** "That is how Somoza ran his place."]

The Speaker: Will you speak now?

Cde. C. Jagan: I want to exercise my right to speak.

The Speaker: You can do so in a proper manner.

Cde. C. Jagan: I am always proper. If you were proper I would be more than proper.

The Speaker: That is foreign to you.

Cde. C. Jagan: Mr. Speaker, we do not support the amended Motion by the Government. Now, the Minister regaled this House about all that they have done and the speaker on our side, Cde. Ram Karran, made the observation that the Government is trying to get some cheap credit or notoriety. What are the facts? The fact of the matter is – and I speak from inside knowledge – had I not raised the matter last week, the Government would have done not a thing on this issue. It would have remained silent because silence is the way it operates in its double dealing in this country today. Silence.

Now, let us take the point about how they operate through the Non-Aligned Movement. Mr. Speaker, Julius Nyerere, a man whom we all respect, made the point once: he said many Governments; many delegations go to many conferences – Non-Aligned, O.A.S., etc. They go along with Resolutions, they agree with consensus. They do not vote; they do not put up their hands to show where they stand but they indicate, they imply, that they go along with the consensus, but when they go home they do nothing about it. Because so many Governments are double dealing and behaving in an equivocal manner, many of these forums have come in effect ineffective – United Nations, Non-Aligned Movement, O.A.U., and so on. Because the people go there and they do not go back to their countries to mobilise the people, to mobilise public opinion. That is action.

We have a lot of experience with the Government. When I spoke to the Prime Minister in the old days of Vietnam, I asked him what about support for Vietnam. After they came back from the Non-Aligned Movement 1970 they said they were going to give \$50,000 in aid. We said, Okay. What about Vietnam? What about Brazilian Freedom Fighters? They said they do not have money. We said that Vietnam does not need money; all it needed was the normal support. But they did not have the guts to say that even as late as 1970.

3.40 p.m.

When I dealt with the point of sanctuary for African freedom fighters, I said, Okay, good. But this is a far way from Africa. The comrades do not want to be all the way in Guyana, they want to be nearby. What about the freedom fighters nearby in Brazil? The Foreign Minister said “Oh, yes, we will consider each application on its merit,” so that when they get the application they will send it to the C.I.A. I say it is a circus because you all make it like a circus. I said this because there were some people who, for instance, in 1972 at the Foreign Ministers’ Conference here when the decision came to seat certain countries, some of them walked out of the conference and left. We do not change our line. The Non-Aligned Movement, because of its basic principles at Bandung in 1955, to fight against colonialism, imperialism, racism and for

socialism, was called an immoral movement. That is what we are talking about because we cannot expect Suharto who overthrew one of the first leaders of Non-Alignment to go along with those principles. We could not expect those who are shot now, who overthrew Nkrumah, to carry out the principles of Non-Alignment. So the imperialists came into the movement and watered it up and they have a lot of people vacillating like you all. They go and say, yes, and when they come home they do not do anything about it.

They boast about all the things they have done. On another occasion, on the Angola question, I spoke to the Prime Minister. I said, “What about supporting the M.P.L.A.” The Prime Minister said, “We take our cue from the O.A.U. on African questions.” The Prime Minister told me he takes his cue. But what has happened to them? Up to that time they were sitting in the middle waiting on the O.A.U. The M.P.L.A. came here; they were getting pressure from U.S imperialism and China on the other hand, from M.P.L.A. and from Cuba on the other. So what happened? The delegation came here, they put up a big sign, the P.N.C. supports M.P.L.A., having a meeting. The same day I got a newspaper clipping from the **New York Times** saying F.N.L.A.’s Roberto Holden was a C.I.A. agent since 1961. When he said to them, “Look what you have been backing, you are backing two super powers, two imperialisms. The O.A.U. Ambassador walked out of the meeting at Sophia. After that, they said, P.N.C. supports Angola. The Foreign Minister went to Africa and said, “We are waiting on the decision of O.A.U.” This is the way they behave. Let them doubt these facts.

As regards all the things that the Minister said they did, he made a statement that in the United Nations there was initiative taken but it did not go as far as they liked. If the initiative did not go as far as they liked, what is preventing them from coming in Guyana and saying what they stand for, make it stronger, mobilise the Guyanese people, educate them, unite the countries on these issues? There is no need for fear from this side of the House. The reason why they did not do it is because they fear their masters will not back them – imperialism. That is what is worrying them at the moment. Recently in the Chinese aggression in Vietnam, they came back with the same old line as they had in 1968 with the American aggression in Vietnam. They said

that both sides must withdraw their troops, then. When the world was demanding that Americans and their puppets must withdraw their troops, the Americans said, “the Vietnamese must withdraw and then we will withdraw,” and they regurgitated the decision. Now they are saying the same thing, the Chinese must withdraw from Vietnam and Vietnam must withdraw from Kampuchea. This is Non-Alignment for them. They are hiding under the apron strings, the coat tails of Non-Alignment when the fact of the matter is that they know that China has betrayed socialism, has joined the U.S., the E.E.C., and Japan axis and played the role in the whole international arena of imperialism. They know that.

Since the I.M.F., since the New Investment Code, since they want money, they have to play this vacillating role and hide, and then come to this house and say, “all the wonderful initiatives we have taken under the Non-Aligned Movement.” That is not going to fool anybody. And as regards taking the credit for the diplomatic relations with Cuba, let us get the facts straight. It was the P.N.C. Government which broke off cultural and trade relations with Cuba started by the P.P.P. Government. **[Interruption]**

The Speaker: Cde. Jackson, please allow Dr. Jagan to continue.

Cde. C. Jagan: After they broke off trade and cultural relations, they carried out an anti-Cuban policy for many years. Let the record be straight, it was Eric Williams’ Government in their Caribbean region which first sent a technical mission to Havana. Dr. Livestock Officer, came back and said that the progress Cuba had made in ten years will take the Caribbean region fifty years. That was in 1969, not 1972. **[Interruption]** Don’t worry with what Fidel says. We are talking about facts. Fidel does not know the history of Guyana and the Caribbean.

3.50 p.m.

I want to show this House the basic insincerity of the position of the Government as regards its so-called “stand” of militant fighter against imperialism. Take the Motions which are

before this House. I spoke to the Minister two days ago – or was it yesterday? I said: “Minister, what about --” I did not say “Minister;” I said “Rasleigh, what about taking this Motion that we have at the same time?” That is the one about political prisoners. This one was tabled since the 10th of January last year. It says:

“That this National Assembly expresses its strong condemnation of the Governments of Chile, Uruguay, Paraguay, El Salvador, Argentina, Nicaragua, Bolivia and Haiti, where political prisoners held in jails and detention camps number many thousands, some of whom are subjected to torture and other inhuman treatment and some considerable number simply disappear are not account for.”

When I raised it with the Minister, he said, “I am not aware of any such Motion.” So you see the basic dishonesty – if that is Parliamentary language – of the regime? The Ministers say one thing they are doing something else. Why has this Motion not come up? Since then, an organisation called Habeas Foundation was set up in Mexico with famous people at the head of it. It has some of the most eminent people in Latin America to fight for this. Why is it that the Guyana Government does not want to pronounce on it? Is it the I.M.F. and the \$500,000 and more dollars coming in? Is it that?

Let us take another one – Puerto Rico.

The Speaker: No, no, Cde. Jagan. Will you please listen to me?

Cde. C. Jagan: No.

The Speaker: You do not know what I am going to say and you say and you will not listen to me. Do you know what I am going to say?

Cde. C. Jagan: I am waiting on you.

The Speaker: What I am saying is that you have a right of reply on matters raised by the Minister or any other speaker. These are not matters that are relevant to this debate. You have a right of reply on matters raised by the Minister, Cde. Jackson, and by Cde. Ram Karran. These were the only speakers. Now you are bring other matters into the debate.

Cde. C. Jagan: I hope you will remember that when a debate takes place in this House, especially at Estimates times, when the Ministers in replying always bring in new items. Anyway, I am speaking on the Amendment proposed where the Government is saying that it is taking all this wonderful initiative in respect of Nicaragua, in respect of foreign policy. Let me give the language he used. He said “action which is meaningful and effective in the whole area of international affairs.” Logic is a thing I did not study like you in law school but I know it.

There is this other one about Puerto Rico.

The Speaker: I am not going to allow it, you know.

Cde. C. Jagan: I am only showing the inconsistency of this Government. The members double talk. I am leading up to the point why we cannot support that Amendment. If I do not adduce the facts, I cannot convince our colleagues over there **[Laughter]**

Let us take the Puerto Rican one. There was a Conference in Havana recently. Normally, they go to all Conferences like the World Peace Conferences, but on this one they sent the Ambassador and he remained silent. Silence was the golden stand of the P.N.C. Government. Silence. He did not speak one word on Puerto Rico. And so we can go on. The Puerto Rican one is a very important one.

The last one in reference to that: On 9th March, 1978, it was published. Can we be blamed about the charge which was made that we are distorting things if the Government Ministers are in the closed circuits where they operate? Whatever they do, they do not come to

the nation and talk about it. They do not come to Parliament and debate them. How are we to know? The Minister mentioned the **Mirror** not knowing whether we had diplomatic relations with Nicaragua. I remember that for many months we tried to get information about Chile, whether the Government had broken off relations with Chile and when. We could not get it for months. Do not come and blow hot and cold here and tell us that we should have known better. How do you expect the people to know if Parliament does not debate this Motion? The prime Minister quoted from the joint statement made in Moscow. Tell us about the joint statement and also that you do not agree with the manufacture of the nuclear bomb.

The other Motion was on that question since the Americans began making components on 19th March last year. Silence. Not a word. It has not been debated. Why? In other words, all matters in which the United States might be interested, they have to think twice. Let the Minister tell us if it is not true. He was then in the United Nations. When Moynihan was the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, he said there was an automatic majority in the United Nations. The former Secretary of State went on to say – I am sorry I do not have the quotation or I would read it now – I have instructed every Embassy to inform the Government where they operate how we feel about that narrow range of issues on which we feel very strongly.”

The Speaker: Dr. Jagan, just a minute. It is getting on to 4 o'clock. Will the House agree that we sit until this debate is finished? [*Members indicated in the affirmative*]

Cde. C. Jagan: The matter is very clear. Kissinger laid down the a law about what Moynihan said when he was Ambassador at the United Nations. He had talked about automatic majority, that is, between the Socialist countries and the progressive revolutionary Third World countries voting together. At that time, this Government was making some progressive decisions but, Cde. Speaker, from 1970 -- [**Interruption**] Let us divide the period because he is heckling me.

The Speaker: That is why I am not stopping you now. They must learn not to heckle you. When they heckle you, I will allow you to talk.

Cde. C. Jagan: From 1964 to 1970 there was a complete pro-imperialist position; from 1970 to 1973 a vacillating position in favour of imperialism; from 1974, beginning with the Sophia Declaration and the Angolan crisis, etc., the break in relations with Israel, that was what Kissinger was complaining about – those narrow issues on which the United States Government felt seriously. That led to the recall of the Charge d’Affaires of the U.S. when the Prime Minister accused the C.I.A. of sabotaging the Cubana Airline and the P.N.C. had to withdraw its Ambassador from the United States. **[Interruption]** He is not a P.P.P. puppet, he is a P.N.C. puppet. Therefore he cannot be our Ambassador. If he was serving Guyana, we would have called him our Ambassador.

4 p.m.

So the issue is since 1977, the beginning. When they were preparing the Budget, they ran into financial difficulties and they had to make a deal with imperialism and so they hide under the cover of non-alignment, of Organisation of African Unity, and other things. We are taking progressive positions in all these places, but the reality is that they did not come to Guyana and fight for those positions. Why do they come to this position now? They would not have brought this Motion, they would not have agreed. Do you know they have agreed? They have agreed because the United States found itself in the position of isolation.

The United States imperialism was first talking about intervention with an O.A.S. peace-keeping force after it was defeated in Vietnam. Nixon tried to set up a Latin-American peace force which they used after America invaded the Dominican Republic with 45,000 troops which incidentally, Burnham justified after he came back from a horse ride with Johnson in America. He agreed with it. He said, “Now I understand why America intervened in the Dominican Republic in 1968.” But after America was forced to withdraw its troops, Brazilian so-called

Inter-American Peace Force filled the background. That is how it happened. The United States wanted to do the same thing again. On this occasion it was a little different. That time in the Dominican Republic the commando troops and the rebels were going to succeed. In fact, they had taken over the ... and that is when the Americans landed the 45,000 marine. That is what they wanted to do again but on this occasion the United States found itself isolated because even its own puppets in the O.A.S. has decided not to go along with it. Two weeks ago, they would not have touched this Motion but because the United States is now calling to the O.A.S., they have to go along. It is as clear as day. So we have to see the gyrations of this Government; how it manoeuvres and because of that this is a blatant attempt at dishonesty to fool the Guyanese nation about its stand. The boys in Washington say now, “Boy, you can now say Somoza must go.” That is the reality.

We cannot support that amendment. I support the amendment moved by my colleague, Cde. Ram Karran, which takes the matter a step further and, that is, that the Somoza Government must be removed from the United Nations in the same way that South Africa has been isolated and virtually has been taken out of the United Nations forum, wherever it is, the F.A.O. and other agencies of the United Nations. Similarly, we had precedence in the past. We had the conference of the Non-Aligned Movement here in 1972 where the Government decided it was going to recognise not the existing Governments of those countries but the liberation movements. Today, we are calling for this Government to make a solid fight to get this new Government formed by them to be recognised and seated at the United Nations as the true representatives of the people of Nicaragua.

The Minister of Energy and Natural Resources (Cde. Jack): Cde. Speaker, we have met here today to discuss a very serious matter, the struggle of the people of Nicaragua, to shake off the yoke of the Somoza regime. [Cde. C. Jagan: “Mr. Speaker, we are walking out against your ruling.”] *[At this stage, the Leader of the Opposition and members of his Party withdrew from the Sitting.]* It could have been the occasion of an enlightening debate and of a heartening demonstration of the understanding of all parties in this House about the serious matters which

were taking place in Nicaragua. I would say that for those of us who look forward to some degree of responsibility by all Members of this House, what we have seen operating on the Opposition Benches must, in fact, be a disappointing performance.

First of all, it is usual in this House to have objection to the suspension of the Standing Orders. On this occasion, in a spirit of co-operation on the Government side, the suspension of the Standing Order was moved to allow for this debate. The amendment which was put forward by the Foreign Minister seemed to have contained one line which has caused a great degree of trepidation and fear in the minds and in the hearts of the Opposition, a most innocuous line which merely recorded the action taken by the Guyana Government within the Non-Aligned Movement.

From time to time it has been my experience that Members of the Opposition have clothed themselves with armour-plates of ignorance and have felt fortified behind the high walls of that ignorance in saying all manner of things. For this reason it was not surprising when they pleaded that they could not readily support that particular part of the amendment since they were ignorant of what the Government had done through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on behalf of the people of Nicaragua. As the Foreign Minister said, the documents which record the action of the Government and of our representatives in the United Nations and in the Non-Aligned Movement and in other forums are public documents and one would imagine that people seriously engaged in the pursuit of politics would, at least, acquaint themselves with such documents. Nevertheless, they pleaded that they did not know and it fell to Cde. Jackson to give an illuminating resumé of the action which the Foreign Affairs Ministry and the Government in general had taken.

Surprising as it may seem, when that explanation was being given, one of the foremost members of the Opposition, who claimed that he was ignorant and who claimed that he wanted to be enlightened, sought to excuse himself from the House so that he could not be enlightened despite the most valiant efforts of my colleague, Cde. Jackson. But a more disturbing aspect of

the presentation made this afternoon – and I say it very seriously, very disturbing – is that when it was pointed out that the **Mirror** had carried an erroneous report suggesting that we should break off diplomatic relations with Nicaragua, - which, of course, suggests that we did have such relations – when it was clearly pointed out that we had never had such relations – when it was clearly pointed out that we had never had such relations, there was not that generosity of spirit not that addiction to the truth and accuracy as would have allowed the members on the Opposition Benches to admit their error and at least excuse themselves. Rather, they took the offensive in this matter and relying, as I said, upon their armour of ignorance have sought to justify before this House – and I would say, before this nation – that their ignorance gives them a license for invention of all manner of untruths.

4.10 p.m.

Why I say that this must be particularly saddening is that this seems to be engrained in the members of the Opposition and seems to be a policy which they believe they have absolute justification for pursuing. Imagine that any serious politician or Leader of the Opposition or Deputy Leader of the Opposition would be bold enough to tell this House that he does not know what are the diplomatic representations or connections of this Government, especially when those representations or connections are not confined to our State but are between States so that even if we did not say it, the other State could say it. And what is even more distressing is that even if they did not know, they would not have had a single care in this world, a single care with regard to vilifying their own Government and this country and the people who live here that they would put in the newspaper as fact, something which they themselves now claim they had absolutely no basis for printing.

Now, during the last 25 or 30 minutes we heard a lot about Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, Nicaragua, Vietnam, Angola. What we heard of only once from the lips of Dr. Jagan was the mention of Nicaragua and that, Cde. Speaker, was only when you in your good judgment

reminded him that that was what the debate was about. He immediately escaped from the subject into an excursion of his own once again.

It would not be for us to attempt to rebut or to answer all of the untruths, misquotations, etc., that this House has been regaled with but what I want to point out is that I was struck by the sense of real fear that seemed to be agitating the minds of the members of the Opposition – a fear that perhaps they were wrong to bring before this House a Motion which would have allowed the Foreign Minister to give to the Guyanese public a more detailed account, all at one time, of the action which we have taken up to now. Imagine that in the confusion of mind which was evident when the Leader of the Opposition spoke, he could wave away with the wave of a hand as ineffective in this day and age, the United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement and other such organisations! I find that more than passing strange. What is it that seems to be worrying the Opposition in that this Government has pursued a consistent policy for independence and national sovereignty amongst all peoples and that our action in this regard is well known in the United Nations and in other forums of the world?

It is, of course, significant that though the Leader of the Opposition spoke for something like half an hour he did not attempt on a single occasion to refute or to rebut any of the statements made by the Minister of Foreign Affairs with regard to the consistent policy of this Government and the action which the Ministry has taken over the years in the interest of the Nicaraguan people. Not a single rebuttal and so we must take it that he has accepted that the things which we have claimed are true.

But if the things which we say we have done we have done, could anyone in his right mind understand what is wrong in endorsing those things which the Government has done and which have all been in the interest of the people of Nicaragua? Perhaps the Opposition may have said that it would like to see us do some more things but certainly it could not be heard to say, since the members are not saying we did not do these things - they could not be heard to say that the things that we did were not in the interest of the Nicaraguan people.

There is mention of a number of things including what is called the insincerity of this Government and when I was listening to the offering of the members of the Opposition what struck me was that it has turned out they were not really interested in the Nicaraguan people. They were not interested in the struggle of Nicaragua, they were not really interested in Somoza except in so far as it presented them with a platform to enter into a tirade of abuse and not only a tirade of abuse but an abuse, as I would see it, of the Parliamentary procedure and the purpose of this particular debate, for the rest of the debate centred, not around Nicaragua, but around the Government of Guyana.

I had recourse to think of another forum which you, Cde. Speaker, have been graciously presiding over and which, only this week, we have been engaged in conversations and discussions about and the thought struck me that perhaps it would have been a chastening experience if some of the leaders of the T.U.C., whom you are speaking to in another forum, could have been here present this afternoon because when we speak of national unity, when we speak of the necessity of coming together as a people, I think it would have been a chastening experience for them if they had seen the performance on a matter like this on which we should all be united. Imagine that they have scuttled and abandoned their own Motion! They do not even care whether the Motion is passed in favour of the Nicaraguan people at all. Imagine, the poor people in Nicaragua, if they heard the P.P.P. did not stay to even see that the Motion was passed.

4.20 p.m.

Of course, there is a possible other explanation. Perhaps an explanation that does them less discredit and that would be that they have such a confidence in this Government, such a confidence in the P.N.C., that they are certain that the Motion condemnatory of the Somoza regime would be passed and therefore they do not think it is necessary for them to be here. This attitude of irresponsibility has pervaded the ranks of the P.P.P. for, I would say, the last ten

years. It manifests itself on every possible occasion and it really creates insurmountable difficulties for those people who feel that there is the possibility of arriving at some *modus vivendi*. I almost suspect that what the Opposition was hoping for was a refusal to have a debate so that it could have had something to complain about, but that the agreement on the part of the Government to have this debate has taken it unawares. Imagine that a private conversation taking place between the Foreign Minister and the Leader of the Opposition should be hauled in as a matter of complaint when he would have sought to have another Motion debated. Had it not been for the strength of the Chairmanship of this House, I am certain he would have attempted to have had two Motions passed this afternoon although the other Motion was not properly before the House at this time.

I would like to say, Cde. Speaker, that we have taken a stand which we are proud of with regard to the liberation of all peoples struggling, either under colonialism or under any other form of oppression. I would like to say that we are satisfied with the efforts of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs informed, as it is, by the combined wisdom of our Government in pursuing relentlessly the quest for national independence and freedom from oppression of all people.

I will not reiterate all that my good friend has mentioned because he has quoted at length from what others, apart from ourselves, have said about us. I think it is well known – we do not wish to boast – that small as we are we have played a not insignificant role in the Non-Aligned Movement. I would venture to say that for a country of our size, population wise etc., we probably play the most significant role. There are countries that play a more significant role than Guyana, but they are larger countries, more powerful and with larger economies. But if one were to go through the gamut of countries in the forefront of the Non-Aligned Movement I think one would have been searching very hard to find a country as small as Guyana standing up steadfastly for what it believes was right. I endorse all the sentiments of my friend and colleague, Cde. Jackson, and all I would add is that it is to be hoped that on subsequent occasions the Members of the Opposition would be seized more with a sense of national interest rather than

with a sense of gaining cheap points by petty politicking in our National Assembly which should be a forum for serious debate in the interest of the Guyanese people.

For the records, I think it is apposite to refer to the absolutely correct ruling of this House following the provisions of Standing Order No. 33(2) to show that the walk-out was unwarranted and that the right to reply where an attempt or where an attack has been made upon the Government was justified and is in keeping with the Standing Orders of this House.

The Speaker: Cde. Jack, thank you for supporting my ruling on the matter. I will now put the amendment moved by Cde. Ram Karran.

Amendment –

That all the words after the second preambular paragraph be deleted and the following be substituted:

“And whereas the non-aligned movement, in which Guyana participates, actively, and which is a major independent factor in international politics, and in September 1978, and more recently in June, 1979, expressed support for the just struggle of the people of Nicaragua and called for the adoption of concrete measures for the immediate and definitive elimination of the Somoza regime;

And whereas the Government of Guyana has over the years consistently resisted all overtures from the Somoza regime for the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries;

And whereas several countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, which for some time maintained and/or latterly established relations with the fascist

clique of general Anastasio Somoza-Debayle, have recently severed such relations:

Be it resolved that this national Assembly condemns the Somoza dictatorship;

And that this National Assembly expresses solidarity with the Committee for National Salvation of Nicaragua and calls upon the Government to recognize the Provisional Government of National Reconstruction and to support the seating in the United Nations of the Provisional Government of National Reconstruction as the sovereign representatives of the people of Nicaragua.”,

put, and negative.

The Speaker: I will now put the Amendment moved by Cde. Jackson.

Amendment:

That all the words appearing after the second preambular paragraph be deleted and the following words to be substituted:

“And whereas the non-aligned movement, in which Guyana participates actively, and which is a major independent factor in international politics, had in September 1978, and more recently in June 1979, expressed support for the just struggle of the people of Nicaragua and called for the adoption of concrete measures for the immediate and definitive elimination of the Somoza regime;

And whereas the Government of Guyana has over the years consistently resisted all overtures from the Somoza regime for the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries;

And whereas several countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, which for some time maintained and/or latterly established relations with the fascist clique of General Anastasio Somoza-Debayle, have recently severed such relations:

Be it resolved that this National Assembly condemns the Somoza dictatorship and endorses the action taken by the Government of Guyana within the non-aligned movement to effectuate the end of that dictatorship and to intensify international support for the forces of freedom in Nicaragua under the leadership of the Sandinista National Liberation Front;

And that this national Assembly expresses solidarity with the Committee for National Salvation of Nicaragua and calls upon the Government to recognise the Provisional Government of National Reconstruction.”,

put, and agreed to

The Speaker: I will now put the amended Motion as follows:

“Whereas the brutal Somoza regime is carrying out a genocidal war against the people of Nicaragua;

And whereas the heroic people of Nicaragua, led by the Sandinista Front need urgent international solidarity and support;

And whereas the non-aligned movement, in which Guyana participates actively, and which is a major independent factor in international politics, had in September 1978, and more recently in June 1979, expressed support for the just struggle of the people of Nicaragua and called for the adoption of concrete measures for the immediate and definitive elimination of the Somoza regime;

And whereas the Government of Guyana has over the years consistently resisted all overtures from the Somoza regime for the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries;

And whereas several countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, which for some time maintained and/or latterly established relations with the fascists clique of General Anastasio Somoza-Debayle, have recently severed such relations:

Be it resolved that this National Assembly condemns the Somoza dictatorship and endorses the action taken by the Government of Guyana within the non-aligned movement to effectuate the end of that dictatorship and to intensify international support for the forces of freedom in Nicaragua under the leadership of the Sandinista National Liberation Front:

And that this National Assembly expresses solidarity with the Committee for National Salvation of Nicaragua and calls upon the Government to recognise the Provisional Government of National Reconstruction.”

Agreed to.

Motion, as amended, carried.

5.7.79

National Assembly

4.20 – 4.26 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Resolved, “That this Assembly do now adjourn to a date to be fixed.” [Cde. Ramsaroop.]

Adjourned accordingly at 4:26 p.m.
