

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

17th Sitting

2 p.m.

Friday, 7th December, 1973

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Speaker

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

Members of the Government - People's National Congress (49)

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

(Absent)

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

Senior Ministers (7)

The Hon. H.D. Hoyte, S.C.,
Minster of Works and Communications

*The Hon. S.S. Ramphal, S.C.,
Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Justice

*The Hon. H Green,
Minister of Co-operatives and National Mobilisation

(Absent)

***Non-elected Ministers**

*The Hon. H.O. Jack,
Minister of Energy and Natural Resources

*The Hon. F.E. Hope,
Minister of Finance (Absent)

*Dr. the Hon. K.F.S. King,
Minister of Economic Development

*The Hon. S.S. Naraine, A.A.,
Minister of Housing

Ministers (6)

The Hon. W.G. Carrington,
Minister of Labour

The Hon. Miss S.M. Field-Ridley,
Minister of Information and Culture

The Hon. B. Ramsaroop,
Minister of Parliamentary Affairs
and Leader of the House (Absent – on leave)

*The Hon. Miss C.L. Baird,
Minister of Education (Absent)

*Dr. the Hon. O. M. R. Harper,
Minister of Health (Absent)

*The Hon. G. A. King
Minister of Trade

Ministers of State (9)

The Hon. M. Kasim, A.A.,
Minister of State for Agriculture

The Hon. O.E. Clarke,
Minister of State – Regional
(East Berbice/Corentyne) (Absent)

The Hon. P. Duncan, J.P.,
Minister of State – Regional (Rupununi)

***Non-elected Ministers**

The Hon. C. A. Nascimento,
Minister of State, Office of the Prime Minister

Mr. M. Zaheeruddeen, J.P.
Minister of State – Regional (Essequibo
Coast/West Demerara) **(Absent)**

*The Hon. C.V. Mingo,
Minister of State for Home Affairs

*The Hon. W. Haynes,
Minister of State – Regional (Mazaruni/Potaro) **(Absent)**

*The Hon. A. Salim,
Minister of State - Regional
(East Demerara/West Coast Berbice) **(Absent)**

*The Hon. F. U. A. Carmichael,
Minister of State – Regional (North West)

Parliamentary Secretaries (8)

Mr. J.R. Thomas
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Housing

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

Miss M.M. Ackman,
Parliamentary Secretary, Office of the Prime Minister,
and Government Whip

Mr. E.L. Ambrose
Parliamentary Secretary (Agriculture),
Ministry of National Development and Agriculture

Mr. K. B. Bancroft,
Parliamentary Secretary (Hinterland),
Ministry of National Development and Agriculture

Mr. S. Prashad,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Co-operatives
and National Mobilisation

***Non-elected Ministers**

Mr. J. P. Chowritmootoo,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Education

Mr. R. H. O. Corbin,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of
Co-operatives and National Mobilisation

Other Members (18)

Mr. J.N. Aaron
Mrs. L. M. Branco
Mr. M. Corrica
Mr. E.H.A. Fowler
Miss J. Gill

Mr. W. Hussain
Miss S. Jaiserrisingh
Mr. K. M. E. Jonas

Mr. M. Nissar
Dr. L. E. Ramsahoye
Mr. J. G. Ramson

Mrs. P. A. Rayman
Mr. E. M. Stoby, J.P.
Mr. S. H. Sukhu, M.S., J.P.

Mr. C. Sukul, J.P.
Mr. H. A. Taylor
Mr. R.C. Van Sluytman
Mrs. L.E. Willems

(Absent – on leave)

(Absent – on leave)

(Absent)

Members of the Opposition

Liberty Party (2)

Mr. M. F. Singh, Deputy Speaker
Mrs. E. DaSilva

OFFICERS

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

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

7.12.73

National Assembly

2.05 – 2.15 p.m.

2.05 p.m.

PRAYERS

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SPEAKER

Leave to Members

Mr. Speaker: Leave has been granted to the hon. Member, Mr. Ramsaroop, for today's sittings.

Leave to Clerk to attend Court

Mr. Speaker: I also wish to inform you that the Clerk of the National Assembly has received a subpoena from the Court of Judicature in connection with the case between Dr. Gunraj Kumar, Plaintiff, and Mr. Marcellus Feilden Singh and Mrs. Elinor DaSilva, defendants, to give evidence on behalf of the plaintiff and to produce the Minutes of the National Assembly of 26th and 30th July and 2nd, 3rd, 7th, 10th and 14th August, 1973, and other documents related to the case. As leave of the Assembly will have to be given in this matter, I will now put the Question.

Question –

“That leave of the Assembly be given for the Clerk to attend Court and to produce documents required”

Put, and agreed to.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

The following papers were laid:

- (1) Customs (Exemption from Duties) Order 1973 (No. 136), made under section 8 of the Customs ordinance, Chapter 309, on the 11th of November, 1973, and published in the Gazette on the 17th of November, 1973.

7.12.73

National Assembly

2.05 – 2.15 p.m.

- (2) Financial Paper No. 6/1973 – Statement of amounts withdrawn from the Consolidated Fund under article 112 (3) of the Constitution totalling \$23,110,708, for the period ending 17th October, 1973.
- (3) Agreement entered into on the 30th June, 1973, between the Government of Guyana and the Guyana Public Service Association, the Federation of Union of Government Employees, the Clerical and Commercial Workers' Union, the Guyana Labour Union, the Pilots' Association, and the Guyana Teachers Association, on the Classification and Revised Salaries and Wages Plan. [**The Minister of Economic Development on behalf of the Minister of Finance**]

In terms of Standing Order No. 68(1), the Minister of Economic Development on behalf of the Minister of Finance named Monday, 10th December, 1973, as the day for consideration of the Financial Paper in Committee of Supply.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS – FIRST READING

The following Bills were introduced and read the First time:

- (1) Guyana Timber Export Board (Amendment) Bill 1973.
(2) Timber Marketing Bill 1973.

[The Minister of Energy and National Resources]

PUBLIC BUSINESS

BILLS – SECOND READING

CARIBBEAN INVESTMENT CORPORATION BILL 1973

The Minister of Foreign Affairs and Justice (Mr. Ramphal): Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the Second Reading of a Bill intituled:

“Caribbean Investment Corporation Bill 1973”

In so doing, I wish to tender the Certificate required in accordance with Article 80(2) of the Constitution signifying that the Cabinet has recommended that the Assembly proceed upon the Bill intituled:

7.12.73

National Assembly

2.05 – 2.15 p.m.

“An Act to provide for the Implementation by Guyana of the Agreement establishing the Caribbean Investment Corporation and for the purposes connected therewith.”

The measure before the House, seeks to give effect to an Agreement which has already been the subject of discussion in the Parliament. It is not, therefore, an occasion for me to elaborate on the nature and character of the Caribbean Development Investment Corporation for that was very fully done at the time when the Government debated the Georgetown Accord in the presentation then made by the Minister of Finance. I think it should suffice for me simply to recall that when the Georgetown Accord was concluded in April, 1973, in which the Heads of Government of the four Independent countries pledged their undertaking to establish the Caribbean Community and with it the Caribbean Common Market, they did so on the basis of the formal document which became known as the Georgetown Accord in which, among other things, they acknowledged that it was very much in their mind that the territories of the region were at different stages of development and that there was, therefore, need to enable all Member States to share equitably in the benefits of regional economical integration.

2.15 p.m.

It is essentially this pursuit, to distribute fairly between all the peoples of the region benefits which may accrue from effective economic integration, that led the Governments of the region to agree to the establishment of the Caribbean Investment Corporation.

As a corporation, it is pledged to the promotion of enterprises located in the less Developed Countries essentially in the Associated States in the Montserrat, but only in those L.D.C.'s that are members of the Caribbean Community and Caribbean Common Market come 1st May, 1974. Until 1st May, 1974, all territories that were signatories to the Georgetown Accord are entitled to benefit from the provisions of the Agreement.

The Agreement essentially is an Agreement between the Governments of the region, and with the private sector. It is an Agreement which seeks to establish a specific investment corporation, designed to redress the imbalance of industrial development between what have

come mistakenly to be known as the M.D.C.'s and the L.D.C.'s. It is another of the special measures and special incentives to help the Associated States.

The Corporation will have a share capital of \$16 million Eastern Caribbean, divided into 150,000 shares of \$100 each. Of these, under the Agreement, Guyana will hold 6,750 shares or something in the order of 4.5 per cent of the total shareholding. However, the initial issue of the shares would only be to the extent of 50,000, that is, there will be an initial issue of one-third of the authorised shares, of which Guyana will have to subscribe in proportion to its total 2,250. But the contributions in respect of these initial shares are to be made over five annual instalments, so that Guyana's financial obligation in relation to the establishment of the Corporation would be spread over five years. The first instalment will be payable on allotment, and the others would be payable equally over the next four years.

The headquarters of the Caribbean Investment Corporation is in St. Lucia and it has been agreed, pursuant to the Agreement itself, and in consultations which have taken place since, that the Corporation will function essentially through existing agencies, and every effort will be made to ensure that the Corporation does not add to the regional bureaucracy. It is believed that a sufficiency of such agencies exist in the region to make the operations of the Corporation on this basis meaningful and effective.

It will have a Board of Governors of which the Minister of Finance of Guyana will be a member, and its day to day operations will be conducted by a Board of Directors on which one of the public officers of Guyana will sit. Those are the essential purposes of the Agreement and this Bill seeks to give legal effect to the legal status of the Corporation under the laws of Guyana.

It is, I hope, a measure which all Hon. Members of this House would welcome, not only as part of the processes of Caribbean economic integration but of the special assistance which we seek to render to the smaller and even less developed territories of the region, in the form of the Associated States and Montserrat.

I beg, Mr. Speaker, to move that the Bill be read a Second time.

Question proposed.

Mr. Singh: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is basically a sound idea indeed, to encourage joint foreign and local investment in Caribbean resources. It should have a very good effect in CARICOM countries which are so vitally interested in assisting such enterprises. It is essentially for the development of the less developed territories, so its direct effect in Guyana should be very negligible. However, I think we should take this opportunity perhaps to say a passing word about investment in Guyana.

Here our politicians sporadically blast the private sector. They threaten existing companies with further taxation and, indeed, administrative harassment, and they point to the discredited External trade Bureau, discredited up to this present time. We see that the Government has had the hindsight to appoint as the new Minister of Trade, an eminent member of the business community, and we wait to see what effect that will have on the discredited External Trade Bureau. But in the past, they have pointed to this External Trade Bureau as a model for the future.

I say that this, combined with our dreary overall economic situation, has completely discredited potential and foreign investors. After all, is it not true that we have had no new industries, no new job employment opportunities provided by new industries for several years now? We would say that if this Government, truly in the spirit of this legislation, wants private investment from any source, it should put its house in order and silence its demagogues once and for all, by changing its policy, not merely by threatening to put them in Sibley Hall.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs, do you wish to reply?

Mr. Ramphal: No, sir.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a Second time.

Assembly in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Schedule.

Mr. M. F. Singh: Mr. Chairman, on the Schedule, I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to certain aspects which I think need slight correction. Page 9, under Article 4, DEFINITIONS, there is a reference to “Less Developed Country”. Nowhere in the definition do they have anything about “LDC”, yet, for the first time, in paragraph 4 of article 17 on page 16, there is a reference to “LCD”. I would suggest that either you write out fully the words “Less Developed Country” or put in the definition after Less Developed Country, the words “hereinafter referred to as LDC,” because, as I said before, “LDC” does not have any definition anywhere before that.

On page 10, paragraph 3 of article 6 reads:

“Upon any subsequent issue of shares up the amount...”.

There seems to be a typographical error, and that may probably be, “above the amount”. The phrase “up the amount” does not seem to make sense.

On page 15, paragraph 2 (a) of article 17. Again, there seems to be a typographical error. It states:

“Subject to sub-paragraph (b) and (c) of this paragraph a director shall hold office for a term of three years and shall eligible for re-appointment...”.

Presumably, “be” is left out.

Then we move on to page 18, paragraph 6 of article 21, which states:

“Each member of the Board of Directors shall have one vote. The Chairman shall have a casting vote.”

The word “casting” is spelt incorrectly.

We move on to page 23, paragraph (2) of article 34. There seems to be something wrong here. Maybe it is another spelling mistake or omission. It states:

“Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article, the Corporation shall not be entitled to exemption from taxes which are no more charges for public utility services.”

Should it be, “no more than”?

There is another error which could be very serious on page 25, article 40. It reads:

“Any State referred to in paragraph 1 (a) or 1 (b) of Article 2 of this Agreement may upon signature enter a reservation to paragraph 1 of Article 34...”.

I think that should be “Article 33”, because it goes on to say:

“of this Agreement in relation to a civil action arising out of an accident caused by a motor vehicle used by any persons mentioned therein in the performance of any duties relating to the Corporation.

“Article 34”, which is stated there, deals with exemptions but it is paragraph 1 of Article 33 which deals with immunities and privileges. It states:

“The Governors, Directors, alternates, officials and staff of, and experts performing missions for, the Corporation shall be immune from legal process with respect to acts done by them in their official capacity.”

So it would appear as though where there is “Article 34” mentioned in Article 40 it should in fact be “Article 33” because “Article 34” merely deals with exemptions. So I could not see how “Article 34” could be dealing with motor car accidents when “Article 33” in fact is the one dealing with privileges.

The Chairman: Hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs and Justice.

Mr. Ramphal: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to my honourable and learned Friend for the care with which he has proof-read the Bill and for drawing attention to these minor typographical or spelling or other imperfections.

There is a tradition that when these matters come to notice Hon. Members would draw them to the attention of Parliamentary Counsel before the sitting so that they may be examined with a view to ratification. I am sure that overnight on the part of my honourable and learned Friend was not intended, and, I am equally sure, Mr. Chairman, that the fact that his comments do not rise above imperfections of this kind is an indication of his wholehearted support for this very progressive – **[Interruption]**

The Chairman: I think the Hon. Member said so when speaking on the debate proper.

Mr. Ramphal: Mr. Chairman, to assure the Hon. Member to the extent that any of these imperfections are reflective of the actual provisions of the Agreement which may themselves be subject to minor imperfections of this kind, it is right that they be continued, as it were, at least for the time being in the Agreement. As it is annexed to the Bull itself, we cannot by a modification, even of an imperfection in the annexion, alter anything that is in the Agreement nor can we in the annexion introduce an amendment which is not first made to the Agreement.

What we shall seek to do is to make these comparisons to the extent that imperfections arise from the Agreement itself and as soon as they are taken care of in the principal Agreement the right course will be taken to ensure that they are properly reflected in our legislation.

The Chairman: Hon. Minister, before you take your seat, certainly the spellings can be changed. If I refer you to page 18 dealing with the spelling of “casting” – **[Interruption]**

Mr. Ramphal: I submit with respect, not by way of amendments, by way of – **[Interruption]**

The Chairman: Merely I will make a note that there is an error in the spelling and have it rectified.

2.35 p.m.

Hon. Members, there is a correction to be made on page 18. The correct spelling is “casting”. There is another correction on page 10, paragraph 3 of Article 6: “Upon any subsequent issue of shares of the amount of the capital...”

There are two other points raised by the Hon. Member, Mr. Singh. Page 25, Article 40. Could we correct Article 34 to read Article 33? As I understand the Hon. Minister if there is some imperfection in that they will move it by substantive Amendment later on. The Hon. Member also raised another point about the L.C.D. Is that going to be re-defined? Or shall we—

Mr. Ramphal: That would first have to be dealt with in the Agreement before we can make any changes.

Schedule agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Assembly resumed.

Bill reported without Amendment, read the Third time and passed.

The Speaker: Hon. Minister of Economic Development.

TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL 1973

“A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Tax Ordinance for the purpose of introducing an excise tax on cider and to effect consequential amendments to the Bitters and Cordials Ordinance. [**The Minister of Economic Development**]

The Minister of Economic Development (Dr. King): Your Honour, I beg to move that the Tax (Amendment) Bill be read a Second time. I believe that the Hon. Member, Mr. Marcellus Feilden Singh, will approve of this Bill because it seeks to accommodate not only the private sector but also to ensure that the people of Guyana are protected through the development which occurs in Guyana.

Some time ago Banks DIH negotiated with the firm of Bulmers Cider Limited of the United Kingdom for exclusive rights to produce cider in Guyana, both for sale locally and for sale in the CARIFTA/CARICOM Market.

In order to encourage the production of this cider in Guyana the Government of Guyana agreed that apple juice should be imported free of charge if the apple juice were to produce this

cider. The order exempting apple juice concentration from duty has already been affirmed by the National Assembly.

This Bill seeks to amend the Tax Ordinance, Chapter 298 for the purpose of imposing an excise tax on locally produced cider and to effect consequential amendments to the Bitters and Cordials Ordinance.

Section 2 (b) of the Bill seeks to impose an excise tax of 78¢ in respect of cider not exceeding 26 per cent proof spirit, the ingredients of which do not include manufactured spirit. Section 3 of the Bill amends the Bitters and Cordials ordinance, Chapter 318 by including cider under the definition sweets. The term “sweets”, I understand, means any liquor made from fruit and sugar from fruit mixed with any other material which has undergone a process of change, or a process of fermentation during production.

This is a very simple Bill. As I said at the beginning, I have no doubt that the Opposition will accept the Bill as it stands.

Question proposed.

The Speaker: Hon. Member Mr. Singh.

Mr. Singh: Mr. Speaker, --

The Speaker: before you proceed, I wish to make a minor correction to Section 2, (b) (iii). From the words “...for every liquid gallon and in proportion for any less quantity than a gallon;” should not be in the same line. It should come under the word “50¢” in a separate sentence. Please proceed.

Mr. M. F. Singh: I am glad you made the correction for me. Before I proceed perhaps I should echo the sentiments voiced by my colleague while the Hon. Minister was on his feet; and that perhaps we should give consideration to the establishment of a new industry in Guyana, that of importing the apples, squeezing them here, and making the apple juice locally from the imported apples.

7.12.73

National Assembly

2.35 – 2.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the House, welcome this Bill because it suggests that in the not too distant future, if we are to go by the past performance of the Company whose name the Minister mentioned, Banks DIH Ltd., we would say that in the very near future these pacesetters will have in Guyana on the local market locally produced cider. And this is a very good thing for Guyana. We welcome this and we say thank you to the pacesetters Banks D.I.H. in Guyana.

This has always been our policy. As long as we can produce something in Guyana then there is no earthly reason why we should not ban the imported stuff due regard being taken of our commitments under Caricom. There is no reason at all if we can produce, and we are producing, local stuff why we should not ban the foreign stuff and therefore help our balance of payment situation which we all know is so very worrying in the context of the overall Guyana economic situation.

2.45 p.m.

Our policy has always been that we have no objection to banning as long as we can produce the materials and the article here, as long as Guyanese do not suffer as a result of banning and, indeed, as long as there are substitutes. Maybe there is not the particular article but there are substitutes and, therefore, Guyanese will not suffer. We have no objection to that but what we do object to is the indiscriminate banning of things like sardines and tinned stuff which causes the Guyanese, particularly the poor people and the small man in the interior areas, to suffer.

What tinned stuff have we got when we are going on a trip, as I have gone on a trip, in the interior area in a speed boat or an ordinary boat? What can we do and what kind of tin can we open? We do not even get salt fish now. We do not get any tinned stuff and we cannot even get cheese these days unless we really have lines as so many of the 'high-ups' have, or unless we are organised as the P.N.C. seems to be now, distributing cooking oil in their various Party Centres. It may be a laughable matter to Members in Parliament here but it is a serious matter to those people in the interior areas and that is why I say that we commend this Bill. We agree with the policy, but we take this opportunity to ask Government to re-think its decision in respect of those

articles which have been banned and which are causing the people in the interior areas, particularly, to suffer up to the present time.

It is no point shutting your eyes to this. Many people, including P.N.C. supporters, have come to us and have complained bitterly about this indiscriminate policy of the Government. I do urge the Minister. We here are always indulging in constructive criticisms, not destructive criticisms, and because of the suffering of the people we are urging the Government to re-think its position in this sphere.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Minister of Economic Development.

Dr. King (replying): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that such a simple Bill would have not occasioned the sort of intervention that I have just listened to, but it does seem to me that although we on this side of the House commend the owners of Banks DIH Limited for the initiative they take in producing things like cider it would be better for Guyana if these entrepreneurs engaged in the production of manufactured goods using the basic raw materials produced in this country.

It seems to me, sir, that it is relatively easy to import apple juice into a tropical country, reconstitute the apple juice into cider and sell it because the demand is so great, especially when this Government creates the conditions in which there is really no competition. But this, although it does assist the development of this country, is not tremendously relevant to the development of this country in so far as linkages are concerned and in so far as employment opportunities are concerned, and if we are to commend people for doing this sort of thing, we must ask them most humbly to use their initiatives, to use their business acumen to engage in the manufacture of stuff based on our natural resources so that the linkage effects, both backward and forward, might be greater and so that the number of people employed with regard to the investment would be greater than it is now.

The Speaker, in his oration, wandered far from apple juice and cider and talked about sardines and salt fish and he urged that we re-consider the ban on certain articles. I wish to say most emphatically that we have no intention of re-considering the ban on certain articles. We say

this, sir, because it is evident that there would not have been any manufacture of salt fish in this country if we had not banned salt fish. There would not have been any pickling of fish in this country if we had not banned pickled fish and there would not have been the spate economic activity attendant upon the banning of goods if this Government had not the courage to do this.

I wish to make one last point in this regard. It is easy for a government to be popular, it is easy for any government to say “I will lose votes if I ban”, and it is difficult for a government to have the courage of its convictions and to ban despite the popularity it knows it will court. This Government has no intention whatsoever of not assuming the responsibility the people have placed on it. accordingly, sir, I thank the speaker for his kind remarks with regard to the Bill but I deplore the irrelevant remarks which he made when discussing the Bill.

Mrs. DaSilva: May I be allowed, sir, to ask the Minister just a little question?

Mr. Speaker: You will probably do that under the Committee stage.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a Second time.

Assembly in Committee.

The Chairman: Hon. Member Mrs DaSilva, you will rise when I call the necessary clause which you wish to speak on.

Clause 1 agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 2

The Chairman: Hon. Member Mrs. DaSilva, are you standing?

Mrs. DaSilva: Yes, sir, it is only a very small question. When the Hon. Minister gave us the explanation about the banning of goods and told us that the rest of Guyanese who are disposed and who are so able should use locally produced items for canning, rather than imported things like apple juice for cider to provide extra jobs for people, I wanted to ask the

7.12.73

National Assembly

2.45 – 2.55 p.m.

Hon. Minister the principle employed. Some time ago the Hon. Prime Minister, I think it was, made the point that butter would not be banned until Guyana could produce enough butter of its own and then it would be banned, which we totally agree with is an excellent idea. So it goes on now that we are producing butter but we do not have enough and butter is still coming into Guyana to supplement what we cannot make and when we make enough butter it will be banned and we will support it. I want to ask the Hon. Minister why this principle is not extended to other things so that when we produce enough then the item would be banned. Do not let us put the cart before the horse. I wonder if he could explain.

The Chairman: Hon. Minister of Economic Development.

Dr. King: Mr. Chairman, the explanation is really quite simple. Even the simplest amongst us will realise that some commodities are essential. There are some which are inessential. I do not think that anything will happen in this country if we ban apple juice but, if we ban butter there will be problems. The principle, if you wish me to repeat it, is that we will not ban essential goods if we have no alternative. We will ban essential goods whether we have alternatives or not because in banning these essential goods we might propel, hopefully, some of the private entrepreneurs to produce things for which there will then be a vacuum in the market. That is the principle, sir.

Clause 2 agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Bill.

2.55 p.m.

Clause 3 agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Assembly resumed.

Bill without Amendment, read the Third time and passed.

7.12.73

National Assembly

2.45 – 2.55 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Resolved, “That this Assembly do now adjourn until Monday, 10th December, 1973, at 2.p.m.” [The Minister of Information and Culture]

Adjourned accordingly at 2.57 p.m.
