

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

[VOLUME 4]

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

43rd Sitting

2 p.m.

Monday, 1st March, 1971

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Speaker

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

Members of the Government – People's National Congress

Elected Ministers

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Hon. D.A. Singh
Minister of Trade

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

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

Appointed Ministers

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

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

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

Dr. The Hon. Sylvia Talbot, (Absent)
Minister of Health

Parliamentary Secretaries

Mr. J. C. Joaquin, J. P.,
Parliamentary Secretaries, Ministry of Finance

Mr. F. Duncan, J. P.,
Parliamentary Secretaries, Ministry of Agriculture

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

Mr. Salim,
Parliamentary Secretaries, Ministry of Agriculture

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

Mr. C. E. Wrights, J. P.
Parliamentary Secretaries, Ministry of Works, Hydraulic and Supply

Other Members

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

Members of the Opposition

People's Progressive Party

Dr. C. E. Jagan, Leader of the Opposition
Mr. Ram Karren
Mr. R. Chandisingh
Dr. F. H. W. Ramsahoye, S.C. (Absent – on leave)
Mr. D. C. Jagan, J. P., Deputy Speaker
Mr. E. M. G. Wilson
Me. A. M. Hamid, J. P., Opposition Whip
Mr. G. H. Lall, J. P.
Mr. N. Y. Ally
Mr. R. D. Persaud, J. P.
Mr. E. M. Stoby, J. P.
Mr. R. Ally
Mr. E.L. Ambrose
Mrs. L.M. Branco
Mr. Balchand Persaud (Absent – on leave)
Mr. Bhola Persaud

Mr. I. R. Remington, J. P.
Mrs. R. P. Sahoye
Mr. V. Teekah

United Force

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

Independent

Mr. R. E. Cheeks

OFFICERS

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

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

The National Assembly met at 3 p.m.

[Mr. Speaker *in the Chair.*]

Prayers

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SPEAKER**APOLOGY FOR LATE COMMENCEMENT OF SITTING**

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, I wish to apologise for the late commencement of the Sitting of the House for which I am very sorry.

PUBLIC BUSINESS**BILLS – COMMITTEE AND THIRD READING****BAUXITE NATIONALISATIONBILL**

Assembly resumed consideration of the following Bill intituled:

“An Act to amend the Constitution to provide for such public ownership and control of bauxite undertakings in Guyana as may be necessary to secure the interests of the people and to promote the development of the national economy, and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto.” [**The Minister of Mines and Forests**]

Assembly in Committee.

The Leader of the Opposition (Dr. Jagan): Mr. Chairman, I have spoken to the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Mines and Forests and it was agreed that we should deal with the Minerals bill first. But there were two matters which will need a little more time to sort out.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Burnham): Mr. Chairman, it was urged upon me by my hon. Friend that we deal with the Minerals Bill first. I have not agreed, but I am prepared to accede to his wishes. I should really like that we complete both Bills, if not before the normal suspension at 6.30 p.m., at least today. I appreciate that there are certain things which will have to be discussed, not as between us but as between them. So I would be prepared to agree that we proceed with the Minerals Bill now through all of its stages and put the Nationalisation bill after, provided we sit through and finish it. Because for purposes of the problems that are involved, which are sort of domestic, we will at least have 4 to 4.30 p.m. and 6.30 to 8 p.m. for the resolution of those domestic problems. So, if you permit and my hon. Friend agrees, I will move that this matter be deferred to be taken immediately after the completion of the Minerals Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill No. 4 of 1971, by approval, deferred.

Assembly resumed.

3.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed with the second item on the Order Paper and the hon. Minister of Mines and Forests will move the Second Reading of the Minerals Bill.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER

The Minister of Trade (Leader of the House) (Mr. Ramsaroop): Before the hon. Minister takes the Floor, I wish to move the suspension of paragraphs (2) and (3) of Standing Order No. 46, in order to enable this Bill to be taken through its second and subsequent stages at this meeting.

Question put, and agreed to.

Standing Order No. 46 (2) and (3).

BILLS – SECOND AND THIRD READINGS
MINERALS BILL

A Bill intituled:

“An Act to make provision for the orderly extraction and marketing of minerals and the orderly production and marketing of articles prepared or manufactured there from.” [**The Minister of Mines and Forests**]

The Minister of Mines and Forests (Mr. Jack): I move that the Minerals Bill be read for the Second time. This Bill seeks to confer authority on the appropriate Minister to regulate the extraction and marketing of any mineral, including the production and marketing of any article there from. Provision is also made authorizing the Minister responsible for finance, by Regulations, to impose taxes in respect of the extraction and marketing of any mineral, or in respect of the production and marketing of any article or thing from any mineral.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to give authority for the proper regulation of mines in this country and to ensure that the rate of extraction is the best in all the circumstances in the interest of this country, that is to say, that mines are so regulated that they do not carry on an excessive rate of extraction nor do they extract at so low a rate as to be harmful to the economy of the country.

Also, it is envisaged that in the event that any mine should be stopped arbitrarily, and that stoppage was held to be detrimental to the economy of the country, then the Government would be empowered to ensure that the operations of that mine continue for such length of time as is

necessary so that the economy of the country would not be damaged. For these reasons I ask that the Bill be read a Second time.

Question proposed.

Mr. R.D. Persaud: I must state very clearly that those of us on this side of the House are disappointed in the manner in which the bill has been presented. During the Budget Debate, speaking for the Opposition, I welcomed the establishment of a special Ministry to deal with our natural resources because it was my view then, as it is now, that very little or no attention was being given by the Government to our natural resources, resulting in a drop in production affecting the economy of our country.

I was expecting that the hon. Minister of Mines would have seized this opportunity to tell Members of this honourable House what were his plans to organize our mining districts, numbering six, that are disorganized at the moment, our mining districts that are without any control at the moment, our mining districts that need proper supervision, and what has been done by his Ministry since he assumed office as Minister of Mines. I would concede at the very outset that he has been there for a short time, but seeing that he is now in charge of this important sector, one would have expected some explanation by the Minister as to how he proposes to put into operation the Bill that he has presented to the House.

As in the case of the question which has just been deferred, the People's Progressive Party will forever support any move by the Government to take control of its natural resources and so, basically, we see no opposition to the Bill before the House, if it is the intention of the Government to take control of our minerals for the benefit of the Guyanese people, the nation as a whole.

However, when one examines the Bill, one sees that there is no provision to prevent the Government from entering into deals with foreign companies and individuals to exploit and

explore our natural resources, because, what the Minister is empowered to do under the Bill is to regulate and to decide who will explore, how they will explore, and to what extent they will explore.

What bothers us very much is the question whether the Government still has the intention of allocating areas in our mining districts to foreign companies and to foreign individuals. If the Government has this intention, I wish to state that though the People's Progressive Party in principle supports the Bill before the House, we are strongly opposed to any effort to give out mineral rights to foreigners. This is a basic point and if it is possible, the Opposition would like to see that provisions are made in the Bill to say very clearly, though the Minister will derive powers from this Bill to take control of our minerals and supervise and so on, that no allocation should be made to foreign companies or foreign individuals.

3.15 p.m.

I started off by saying that our mining areas are disorganized. This is so because the six mining districts in this country are being served by only two mining inspectors. And up to the beginning of the year, and I think the position is still the same, there is no qualified mining engineer. Would the hon. Minister tell us this afternoon if Government has any intention of bringing back to this country Mr. Steve Cole who is now employed by ALCAN? He is qualified; he is capable and experienced Guyanese who served this particular Ministry, but whose expertise has been purchased by ALCAN. Now that the government has moved somewhat progressively by introducing the Nationalisation Act, and one expects that the Government would also move to bring back to this country all those Guyanese who can effectively serve this aspect of our economy. One such Guyanese is Mr. Steve Cole who is now employed by ALCAN.

Mr. Speaker, this Ministry is a technical Ministry and it needs technically qualified men to run it. It is a Ministry where the Government cannot afford to have persons employed and promoted on the basis of political patronage. If the government does this, it will be destroying

its very objective of making our natural resources contribute effectively to our economy. The Minister, I am sure, will concede that two inspectors cannot serve the six mining districts. The Minister will concede that there is urgent need to have qualified mining engineers. He will also concede that this Bill, when passed, will be useless unless the Ministry moves immediately to provide the personnel to make this law effective.

In all these mining districts or areas people are allowed to go and exploit, and when they are finished they are the ones who take whatever minerals they get to the officer who will fix and collect the royalty. Now, imagine, a little clerk is charged with this responsibility of fixing and collecting royalty. This is a serious thing, and it has been happening for years. The time has come when the Government should examine not merely the upper structure of the Ministry, but those areas that are vital for this aspect of our economy to make a contribution. One of those areas that need immediate examination is mining with respect to those persons in charge of fixing and collecting royalties for our minerals.

We have seen that persons who are fairly wealthy and of fairly good social status becoming susceptible to bribery and corruption; we see them every day in our country and it will be a serious thing for the Government to allow these little clerks, Deputy Commissioners, in a few cases and below that status to be in charge of our mineral royalty. I hope that the Minister will give due consideration to these points I am making.

This failure on the part of the Government which has actually pushed the mining industry into disarray has resulted in a serious drop in production of gold and diamonds. In the *Economic Survey Report of Guyana for the year 1969* on pages 21 and 22, we find this, sir:

“In 1969 gold production declined again to 2,100 ounces. Diamonds also experienced a year of declining output.”

As a result of the decline in production obviously there was a serious decline in the export market, because the Report goes on:

“There was consequential decline in the value of export of diamonds which moved down from \$4.7 million in 1968 to \$3.8 million in 1969.”

Mr. Speaker, the point I make with respect to the organization of the mining industry and the suggestion shown by the Government, so far as our mining industry is concerned, is supported by the *Economic Survey Report for the year 1969*. So if the Minerals Act is to be meaningful in the context of our country today, I say that the Ministry has got the serious responsibility and duty of re-organising the entire mining industry starting from the bottom. Because in my view this country loses millions of dollars everyday from the smuggling of our gold and diamonds. It is true that here and there the Government is able to arrest one or two persons, but these are in the minority, the majority of the vagabonds are allowed to go scot-free; and more so, there are those who have pacts with those who are incharge of the operation and, as a result, they pay for a small amount and they are allowed to go without paying full royalty for the amount they are able to obtain from our various mining areas.

3.25 p.m.

There is smuggling within the country and there is smuggling outside of the country. This is a vital Ministry. This is an important Ministry and while, no doubt, the Economic Survey Report of 1969 showed an increase in the export of bauxite, this was because the bauxite industry was managed by a private company and it was able in its own interest, of course, to run the industry efficiently so that it will make maximum profit.

This is the challenge to the Government, where private capitalists are able to make a success with certain industries but those very industries placed in the hands of the Government can fail, as some have failed. The challenge therefore is for the Government to strive to become more efficient than private enterprise, because when these areas of our economy are operated effectively and efficiently, the benefit will not go to foreigners but it will come to the Guyanese nation. We will be able to reduce unemployment. We will be able to provide for the thousands

who leave school every year. We will be able to provide greater social facilities and services to the Guyanese nation.

We have failed in these areas in the past because of our failure to take control and command of the economy because of our failure to recognize that the richness of this country was being used for the benefit of those who do not even live here, who have absolutely no interest in Guyana and who could not care less what happens to Guyana and the Guyanese people. Now that we are taking stock of ourselves, now that we are taking stock of our country, and now that we are examining the various areas of our economy, let all of us be re-assured by the Minister concerned that every step possible will be taken to ensure that our natural resources are used for our own benefit.

I want particularly to ask the Minister to tell us this afternoon, as a question of policy, whether the Government has any intention, or any desire, of allowing foreigners to come in and exploit and export and manage our natural resources. Of course, the Bill tells of Regulations which will be made by the Minister of Finance, and these Regulations will finally come back to Parliament for approval. In the Bill, there is no provision as to how long it will take to bring these Regulations and we speak here unaware of what form these Regulations will take. Probably the hon. Minister will enlighten us so far as these Regulations are concerned.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the PPP supports the Bill and the PPP hopes that the Government will ensure that this vital sector of our economy plays its true role in our country, and, indeed, is used wholly for the benefit of Guyana and the people of Guyana. *[Applause]*

Mr. M.F. Singh: Mr. Speaker, in the context of Guyana as a developing nation, we must indeed support this measure. *[Applause from the Government Benches.]* We have no objection at all to the proposed legislation in principle but we must stress that very wide powers are given in this Bill and, in fact, we must point out the opportunities for abuse. We urge the Government to

be very careful that its administration of this Bill does not take advantage of the opportunities for abuse.

I have the very highest regard for the present Minister but he cannot be there all the time and in the light of what has been happening recently, since this legislation will ensure at least for the life of this Government, one must make certain that a word of warning is sounded. We know that in the past there have been Ministers who have been so power-drunk as to use their wide powers to act emotionally, without any commonsense, and indeed, without respect for the rights of other people, so we must be worried in the light of past performances by members of the present Government.

When this Bill is passed, it will in theory and in fact give the Government the opportunity to play ducks and drakes with any business that is engaging in the mining industry or manufacturing articles from minerals. This includes Guyanese business; certainly it is not said here that it is intended to apply the provision only to expatriate industry.

It will apply to all industries in the mineral business or the manufacture of articles from minerals, and that includes Guyanese also.

3.35 p.m.

Once this Bill is passed if a Guyanese company extracting minerals, or dealing in minerals, if it does not do something which the Government wants it to do, or operate in a way which the government wants it to operate which may well not be the correct way, it is perfectly possible under the proposed legislation, for the Government to move in and take over the business and run it. The hon. Minister has, in fact, given us an indication as to the circumstances under which the Government will take over an industry and run it, and does not envisage that the Government will do what I say it is possible for it to do, but another Ministry may well do it. This is what I want to warn the Government about.

For example, you may have a Guyanese company extracting sand somewhere and a Co-op Society – let us pick a name and call it the Blue Seas Co-op Society may have eyes on this sand pit. The Government may be able, under this legislation, to work it in such a way that The Blue Seas Co-op Society will be able to move in and take over. This is what I want to warn against. In fact, by this proposed legislation, those Guyanese industries which are engaged in extraction of minerals and the manufacture of article made from minerals will be subject to a form of state censorship.

It does not even stop there. Under Clause 4(4) of the Bill, it is stated that if the Government moves in and takes over a business the authorized controller – the person whom the Government will appoint to run the business- will be deemed to be acting as agent of the undertakers, the owners of the business, will not have any right of control over the business at all. They will have the liability, but not the rights. It is theoretically and indeed possible for the Government to use another man's working capital to run his business and the same thing that this Government is accusing ALCAN of doing is the same thing that it is doing. The Government will sell the product to a Government subsidiary at a nominal price, or even at a loss, and then the Government subsidiary or agency will make a real profit. But the man's business, which the Government is running with the man's working capital, he makes a loss or a very small profit. The owner has all the liability because the authorized controller is the agent of the owner of the business. The owner has no say in the management or marketing. This is, in fact, as I said, possible.

The hon. Minister has said they would not operate like this, but it is possible to do this and this is what we want to point out. Because if this were done it certainly cuts across one of the fundamentals in the Constitution which is the right of a person to his private property. I repeat, we are not merely talking about foreigners; we are talking about foreigners and Guyanese businessmen because there are Guyanese businesses engaged in minerals, sand, stone, gold, diamonds. It is not only expatriate companies or individuals that are involved in these fields.

Therefore, absolute care must be taken to use these extreme powers only in extremely necessary cases.

I am very heartened by the fact that the Government has seen it fit to accept the suggestions of the Opposition that all regulations made must come to Parliament. There is an Amendment moved by the Minister after representation was made to him by both sides of the Opposition. It shows that the high regard in which I hold the present Minister is not without good foundation. He certainly, without any hesitation, agreed to these amendments so that all regulations will come to the House, some for negative resolution, and some for affirmative resolution. We have got the meaning of this set out in the Interpretation and General Clauses Act. These more serious powers under the Bill, the power of taxation and moving to take over a person's business, will be subject to affirmative resolution. That is, in terms of the Interpretation and General Clauses Act it will not operate as law until this Parliament approves of it and the rest will be subject to a negative resolution. So that Parliament will have to pass a negative resolution but then we can apply the veto to it in Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that when it is bringing these regulations to Parliament, the Government will not, as has been done in the past, seek suspensions of the Standing orders in order to rush through these regulations. Because here is an opportunity to exercise almost absolute power under this legislation. Therefore we must have an opportunity in this House to debate meaningfully any legislation, particularly affirmative resolutions. I would emphasise that when bringing these regulations before Parliament the Government must not come here to seek suspension of the Standing Orders to rush them through with indecent haste as we have seen so often in the past.

The proposed legislation will apply to future as well as existing undertakings. I will urge the Government to say a little more so that existing undertakings in Guyana will not come to the conclusion that this legislation, coming as it does after the nationalization of DEMBA, is an additional threat to foreign investors in Guyana. That is why I trust that the Government will

make it abundantly clear that in cases of absolute necessity it will go in and take over a man's business and this will not be done merely as a means of channelling business into directions which experienced entrepreneurs in Guyana will consider inadvisable.

Finally, I should like to ask the hon. Minister to pay particular attention to the administration of this legislation to the rights of Amerindians in respect of minerals and mineral extraction. These people have suffered very much in the past. The law is there to a certain extent. I understand that the administrative machinery is not there in order to ensure their protection. So often they have been kicked around, so often they have been neglected. Now that we are talking about minerals and we are introducing and passing legislation in respect of minerals, the Amerindians must not be taken advantage of. I have already had a word with the Minister. Every opportunity should be taken in respect of Amerindians to do what is right and just for them.

3.45 p.m.

Mr. Stoby: I should like to make a few remarks regarding this important Bill. The present moves by the Government are rather surprising to many Guyanese. The nationalization of the bauxite company is very important to the Guyanese people and I should like to speak a few words about minerals. Minerals are found in places which are owned by Amerindians. Government appointed the Amerindians who have been promised legal land ownership. Up to now, the matter is still not settled and it can only be considered as a promise.

According to my information and my experience throughout the districts, many people feel that the Government is betraying them in some way regarding the ownership of their lands. In these areas there are minerals and I believe that the people are anxious to know what the Government will do for the control of extraction of minerals in these areas, and the taxation that will be involved. My knowledge is that Amerindians from certain areas cannot operate in other

Amerindian areas. They cannot take dredges; they are deprived of that privilege I feel that is unfair because many of the divers in these areas are Amerindians who go as far as 80 feet under the surface of the water, risking their lives, and all this helps to build the economy of our country.

I would like to know clearly what the Minister will say as regards the deposits of minerals that are in these reservations, especially in the Mazaruni and the Rupununi areas. Another thing is this. This Bill states that no person shall extract any mineral or shall prepare or manufacture for market any article or thing therefrom or shall market any such mineral or any such article or thing except in accordance with the law relating thereto, including any regulations made under this Act.

In certain areas certain types of clay are used by the Indians to make pottery. I want to know what the Minister will do when they manufacture this pottery and put it out for sale. Will the Government control them? Will the Government overtax them? Conditions are very bad and I believe the Government should try to exempt these people from paying taxes when they manufacture these ornaments for sale. These are little points I would like to have clarified.

Before I take my seat, I would like the Minister to make a proper explanation as to what is Government's intention in relation to the mineral deposits which are situated in what I term Amerindian reservations, where Government has not given the Amerindians title to their land, only promises.

Mr. Jagan: On looking through this Bill, one sees that the power of the Minister will not be exercised under this Bill but almost everything will be done by regulations, that is to my, the Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister who moved this Bill will be making Regulations. Therefore it is important to consider the question of the regulations and the different types of regulations, and what control this House may have over those Regulations. There are different

types of regulations, but clause 3(3) states that regulations made under subsection (2) shall be subject to affirmative resolution of the National Assembly.

After discussion with my hon. and learned Friend, the Minister who moved this Bill, and the Attorney General, my contention is that since there are very important matters which the Government may wish to deal with under regulations, all regulations under this Act should come under clause 3(3). For instance, under clause 4(2) of the Bill, as printed and circulated, the Government has the power to take over any existing under-taking from any individual for the purpose of running it and those regulations would not be subject to an affirmative resolution. However, the Minister as you have seen, has circulated proposed amendments to include that provision 4(2) be subject to clause 3(3), which would require an affirmative resolution. But, the Government does not wish to have all other types of Regulations come under section 3(3) of the Act.

In respect of the other regulations that may be made, the Government proposes that those regulations should be subject to negative resolution and in order to determine what the Government means by negative resolution, one has to refer to the Interpretation and General Clauses Act, 1970. With your permission, sir, section 17(1) reads as follows:

“The expression ‘subject to negative resolution’ when used in relation to the making of subsidiary legislation shall mean that such subsidiary legislation shall be laid before the National Assembly with all convenient speed after the making thereof and if the National Assembly within such period as shall be prescribed by the standing orders of the Assembly resolves that the subsidiary legislation shall be annulled the subsidiary legislation shall be void as from the date of the resolution but without prejudice to the validity of anything done thereunder or to the making of new subsidiary legislation.”

If an Act refers to “negative resolution”, one is forced to look at the interpretation under section 17(1), and 17(1) states that a Motion must be moved if a member wants to set aside that regulation but within such time as is prescribed by the Standing Orders. When one looks at the

Standing Orders, that Standing Order does not set any time within which such a Motion could be moved.

3.55 p.m.

Your Honour, a copy of the proposed Amendments to the Standing Order was given to Members. When one looks at the proposed Amendments one will see that it is far from satisfactory having regard to the –

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will agree that there is no proposal.

Mr. Jagan: Maybe I should deal with it in this way. The Government proposes to move an Amendment to the Standing Orders. This was discussed with me. It is the intention of the Government to have a Standing Order to allow a period of 30 days within which a Motion can be moved to set aside the regulations.

You would recall that under the National Insurance Act there is a section which spells it out instead of referring to a negative resolution. It states that anyone who wants to set aside those regulations could do so by Motion within forty days. I am very sorry I have to refer to it again, because I have done so on many occasions. But the Minister and my hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister had indicated that these provisions would be regulated and amended.

What I am dealing with here is the question of regulations. The regulations were laid in Parliament as required by the Act. The hon. Member Mr. Harry Lall, within the time permitted by the Act, moved a Motion to set aside those regulations because of what they contained. Unfortunately, that Motion was never put on the Order Paper to be debated. To make things worse, after that Motion was tabled the House prorogued. It means that that Motion could never be debated. Unlike other Motions by Members this would not come up again.

For instance, a Member might move a Motion which might not be debated, but the Member might have an opportunity to re-introduce that Motion in the new Parliament. The hon. Member Mr. Lall would never be able to re-introduce that Motion because of the way it is worded in the National Insurance Act. Therefore, there would be no opportunity to have a debate to set aside those regulations.

The same will happen under the proposed Amendment to the Standing Orders. I understand that Your Honour is not aware of the proposal but this is an arrangement made among us. Maybe if I am permitted to read --

Mr. Speaker: If I am not aware of such provision could I properly permit you to read something which is not before the House?

Mr. Jagan: Your Honour, I recollect that these are the words as far as I remember:

“The period prescribed for the purposes of section 17(1) of the Interpretation and General Clauses Act of 1970 which relate to subsidiary legislation subject to negative resolution shall be 30 days from the date on which the subsidiary legislation is laid before the National Assembly.”

If we agree on this Amendment as it stands, it means that if a Motion is moved, for instance if my hon. and learned Friend Mr. Jack lays a Resolution on the Table and any hon. Member wishes to set it aside, that Member would give notice within the 30 days. But there is no guarantee, as happened in the past, that that Motion will ever come up to be debated. I was discussing with my hon. and learned Friend, the Leader of the House, whether the proposed Amendments could not set up something more definite that when a Motion such as this is moved that there should be some time limit within which the Motion should be debated.

I am aware that there may be many regulations made by the Minister with which the Opposition may not be concerned or which we may not want debated, in which case those things

would automatically have the course of law. But there may be others which the Opposition would want debated; and unless some provision is made whereby the Motion can be debated within a certain time, I think the situation would be just as it was before. Apart from that, as I have said, if it remains as it is, if a Motion is moved, and the House is prorogued, it means that that Motion cannot be re-introduced.

I was wondering if the regulations, as made by the Minister, would have the effect of law. During the tea break I can discuss it with my friend the hon. Leader of the House and my hon. and learned Friend the Attorney-General to see whether what I have said can be incorporated in the proposed Amendment which would allay our fears. [The Prime Minister: "There is nothing to fear but fear itself."] My hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister says that there is nothing to fear but fear itself. Our fear arises from experience in the past. As late as the last Budget Speech, that is in December, certain undertakings were given with respect to the Board of the National Insurance Scheme and up to now nothing has been done. That Board is doing a number of things which is not permitted to do under the regulations, and no one can question it because there is no opportunity to debate it. Maybe at this stage it might be a convenient time for us to suspend. If I may suggest with respect.

Mr. Speaker: I think it is a good time for us to suspend. This Sitting is suspended for half an hour.

Sitting suspended at 4.03 p.m.

5.23 p.m.

On resumption -

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member Mr. Jagan.

Mr. Jagan: Your Honour, in the spirit of co-operation which has been existing for the past few days, I have discussed this matter with my hon. and learned friend the Attorney General and the Leader of the House, and the Government apparently agrees that my proposal is very reasonable. We have worked out an Amendment to the Standing Order which would conform with the Bill because the Bill has referred us to the Standing Order and there is no provision in the Standing Orders. We have therefore agreed on a proposal to amend the Standing order and we have agreed as to the wording of the Standing order.

In view of that, I do not think I would delay the House. The only question that remains is, at what stage we should pass that Standing Order, whether it should be before the Bill or not. I have no objection because I accept my learned friend's word that the Standing Order will be amended as we have agreed upon.

Dr Jagan: Mr. Speaker, we are in the spirit of co-operation, and in the national interest we are prepared to support the Government in this vital measure of the control of our resources in the field of minerals.

The P.P.P. has for a long time been aware that everything is not going well in this field. I recall that in our time we had brought back, as a consultant through the United Nations, one gentleman who used to be working with the Government services here in this field, so that he could advise on the framing of an up-to-date law on the question of minerals. Besides that, we had also brought, through the United Nations, technical teams like the team to go into the question of investigations, such as a magnetometer and geophysical survey, because we realized that the wealth of this country so far unexplored, is perhaps in the bowels of the earth.

We also brought a team to look into the question of oil. In the time of the Interim Government, I remember, the whole of the off-shore area was given to Esso Standard Oil and after their so-called "exploration" for a considerable time, they came to the conclusion there was no oil in the country.

We, in our period, brought another team through the United Nations, Soviet geologists, who said that the geological formation in Guyana was almost a replica of an area of the Soviet Union – they were speaking from their own experience – and there was every likelihood that there was oil in the country.

We are glad to see that the Government is now bringing this Bill which will give it, of course, a lot of powers and these powers can obviously be used in a very wide sense as we see listed here, for control, for investigations, and a lot of things. The Minister is going to be empowered with a great deal of power and we hope that this power will be used wisely. For one thing, I hope the Government will support us in not allocating our resources to foreigners. We feel that no foreign company should be given direct leases to mineral lands in Guyana; that we must not only investigate but do our own explorations.

The Soviet geologists suggested to us that we must go through a phase of investigations at the Government level, perhaps through the help of the United Nations. Unfortunately, after we were out, the Government abandoned that procedure and brought in other oil companies. Where have we got? These oil companies are interested in your oil, yes, but even if you give them, you will not get very much as we have seen with bauxite. There is no assurance when they will work it. They are looking for strategic reserves to last them forever. Imperialism hopes to have its raw material supplies to maintain its economies.

And so we hope that the Government will increasingly use its powers for State intervention in such things as further research, further exploration, and not handing over mineral concessions to foreign companies and individuals, many of whom speculate.

Some people secure a lease, they go abroad, and they speculate. We have had some in the past who secured lands here, either forest lands or mineral lands, and, indeed, robbed people by making it appear that they had got a big find. The whole thing is eventually blown up and the

people who are gullible enough to think that they will reap a harvest in Guyana lose their few dollars which they may have.

5.30 p.m.

Then there is also the question of the granting of these concessions now to the local people. We know that there are some local sharks, too, who monopolise certain areas and exclude other genuine people who may want to work these lands. Something must be done about this also.

There must be no discrimination either on the grounds of the rich versus the poor, one race against another race, or one political party against another political party. In the past, we have had to complain about many areas of discrimination and discrimination which sometimes is tied up with corruption and which eventually lead to inefficiency which affects the whole country. Some of these are well-known. We have had to complain in this Parliament about the way the Assembly functions against the Opposition.

My colleague, the hon. Member Mr. Chandisingh, made the point very clearly that if you are going to fight imperialism you cannot fight the main anti-imperialist force in this country. We hope that in this atmosphere the National Assembly will be meeting regularly, for instance, on Wednesdays, to hear Members' Motions. The Members of the Opposition have very valuable and concrete suggestions to make to the Government. We have ideas which will help this country to move forward. I can give a personal example. At one time meetings were billed for me to speak in the Amerindian areas. I went over to the Essequibo and I was told that permission was not granted. I had to come back home. I hope that all these things will be removed in the future.

We have complained about unfair employment practices. We hope that the Government will give an assurance to the country that there will be no grounds for complaints from the

Opposition in the future on these matters. We feel that one way in which these unfair practices can be removed to be able to give the Opposition fair representation. To use the Prime Minister's words, we must be able to have meaningful participation in such things as the Public Service Commission and the other Commissions, Boards and Corporations, committees and so on. In this way I am sure that once this atmosphere is created and fears are removed you will have people throwing in their lot and things will be moving more in accordance with the interest of the country I should say.

It is not good for this country once these measures are passed, to see these same practices – the giving of lands and concessions – employed in the field of minerals. I pointed out earlier, if there is nepotism whether of a personal nature, or of a political nature, this leads sometimes to corruption and inefficiency. At the corruption level, we have said outside that the Government would do well to appoint an anti-corruption committee, not only at the national level but sub-committees at the local level. We are talking now of who matters in this country. [**Hon. Members:** “Hear, hear!”] The forces that matter, like the PPP and the PNC. [**Hon. Members:** “Hear, hear!”] I think, sir, although we have our friends – [*Interruption*] No, no, I would not say that; they themselves will concede that their leader has deserted the party. [*Laughter*]

We do not want charges to be hurled at the Government. The Government says that we are not doing this but then it must prepare the ground. We have called for certain things in the past which will create the atmosphere for things to be done. For instance, peaceful demonstrations. This does not affect the Government in any way; this is a right which we feel should be respected. I remember chiding the Prime Minister on his dictum that those who go to socialist countries on PPP scholarships will not be able to get jobs. I feel that however they went, as long as they have the qualifications and the aptitudes and also the ability they must be treated like anyone else. I hope that the Government will, in this day and age, now that we are moving towards socialism, use those who have been trained in socialist countries.

There is the age-old problem in the sugar industry. The Minister of Labour last year very rightly came to the point of trying to resolve this problem when he declared publicly that the MPCA did not have the confidence of its members and was not even servicing its members; he made the point that the GAWU had the confidence of the workers. *[Interruption]*

Yes, he said so. He was at the point of saying, "Recognise the GAWU". But then he put it to the T.U.C. and the T.U.C., faced with many contradictions, sits on the question. We hope that the Prime Minister in the interest of national accord will say something on this very important question of solving the industrial relations problem in the sugar industry. It is affecting strikes; it has affected production and the economy of the country. It is affecting even the Government's position because it would not get enough taxes if sugar production falls.

5.40 p.m.

There again I would think that the Government should at this time make a pronouncement on this vital and vexed question. There is what we allege as discrimination in the case of the rice Marketing Board and the Rice Producers' Association. The Government is concentrating today on this question of agriculture. We are glad to see that the new Minister is a man who himself knows about agriculture.

In the Co-operative Republic, co-operatives are supposed to function with democracy. Basic to co-operative movement is democracy; basic to what we said on this Bill yesterday, basic to nationalization is workers' control. How can we argue that we are going to have workers' control and workers' participation in the bauxite industry and refuse to allow it in the vital rice industry?

We would have thought that we would have come to a new era on this sphere and the Government would tell us how it proposes to resolve some of the unnecessary difficulties which plague this area because of alleged discrimination, because of a reversion from previous position.

In the time of the PPP, the Rice Producers' Association, a body which is elected at national elections, has a majority on the rice Marketing Board, in keeping with co-operative principles. That principle has now been violated.

I hope the Government will be in a position to institute a poll in the sugar industry which we have been talking about. The TUC has been in favour of a poll. In 1953, they said they were in favour of it; they backed the PPP Government then. In 1963, they came to me and the Minister and they said they were in favour of the principle of a poll; what they said they did not like was the Government machinery which might manipulate the situation so as to defeat what they call the free trade union movement, or to defeat the Opposition in the trade union field, destroy their trade unions. The Government had no such intention, but the TUC had gone on record in 1953 in supporting a poll, and therefore in that field we need this co-operation.

In this field of the rice industry, another vital industry, we need to settle these conflicts which have been plaguing the country. We have said that we are prepared to go along with the Government in its nationalization policy and to support this Bill before the House which gives the Government many powers, provided we are assured that these powers will be used fairly and squarely, without discrimination and will not lead to corruption and inefficiency.

I thank you, sir, for your indulgence in giving me this opportunity to express this.

Mr. Speaker: In the spirit of co-operation!

Dr. Jagan: I am not doing this to throw bricks but I feel sure that the Government would do well to assure this House that it is willing to work with the Opposition in the national interest.

One last thing I would like to refer to is the very bad name which has been given to this country. We had to appeal to the I.L.O. We do not have time to waste on those things – on the question of house breaking at Black Bush Polder; I hope we have passed through that era.

Since we recognize that mineral development, agricultural development and industrial development must go hand in hand, we hope the Government will work out some formula. I am prepared to talk to the Minister, not only to give majority representation – which we think is necessary – to the farmers on the Rice Marketing Board, majority as they had in the time of the P.P.P., but also to work out a formula for people who get into difficulties in agriculture. We know the many problems which plague them, problems of water control, the problem of pest control, and they fall into arrears of rentals.

I am not going to apologise for the vagabonds who do not want to pay their way but there are many cases. The Government itself will know when it sets up new land settlement schemes, as it is setting up in the interior, how difficult it is going to be in the early days in terms of getting the people to produce efficiently. They get into arrears and some formula should be worked out to get the people to come out of arrears.

One other thing I would like to refer to and that is the question of the National Security Act. I noticed when the Government introduced this Bill, making it into law, the Minister referred to India. I see my good friend from India is here, we met him in India many years ago. India has repealed the Act and since that was cited by the hon. Attorney General, can you say that India is not a democratic society? If India has repealed the Act, why cannot we do it here?

There is no place for the National Security Act in Guyana. Also this provision where the Government has made an Order to withhold passports to prevent people leaving the country; that must go. We must let people all over the world realize that we are living in a democratic atmosphere.

The newest member on the P.N.C. benches in 1961, was defending freedom all over the streets. I am sure she will agree to urge the Prime Minister to defend freedom now. Then there is the question of the Public Accounts Committee meeting regularly. [*Interruption*] It is not only

dependent on the Chairman; it depends on the machinery of the Government to see that this Committee functions.

5.50 p.m.

If all these things are done, I am sure that the Government will reap many dividends. Apart from the Government reaping dividends the country, the nation, will reap dividends because as I see it, things will be moving. We have shown that we are not prepared to obstruct just for the sake of obstructing. [**The Prime Minister:** "What about the Privy Council?"] Our position on that question was taken because of this atmosphere which we have been talking about.

I am saying now that the Government should give some indication, some assurance, that we will not be living in this atmosphere any longer. I can assure the Prime Minister that once the Government is showing goodwill to the P.P.P., this party will always be willing to co-operate as was shown when we were dealing with the last Bill and now. We are prepared to give the Government powers which others will question because some of them feel that the Government is taking too much. We know that a government must have powers to govern, but this does not mean abuse. If we are living in a parliamentary democracy, then all the citizens of the country must feel that they will have fair treatment.

In the field of minerals, we know that the Interior has tremendous possibilities: forests resources, mineral resources, water resources. That is why we were always behind the Government in fighting against the Venezuelans who want to take up two-thirds of our country in that area. This wealth will only come to fruition if there is national accord and there can be no national accord unless we have an opportunity to remove the areas of suspicion.

There is one area in which there has been a lot of suspicion in Guyana. I hope that the Government will in time see that these things are removed too, because this again does not do the

Government any good. I refer to the whole question of corruption at the lower levels. As I said elsewhere, if the small man sees that the imperialists can take out the P.P.P. by instituting a fraud, by changing the electoral system and if the Government can “thief” elections and get away with it, the small man will say, “If the imperialists can ‘thief’ elections, if the Government can ‘thief’ elections, what is wrong with me ‘thiefing’ a little.” We have boycotted the Elections Commission.

We have said in this House that it is a waste of time to continue to pay \$1,000 a month to the Chairman of the Elections Commission. In view of all this, we suggest that the Government should consider this and give some assurance to this House that this commission will be re-constituted and will have some more powers and not be just a rubber stamp, so that people will have confidence in democratic procedures, in institutions in this country.

The Government cannot talk to the citizens about law and order and the necessity to respect law and order when institutions are being subverted by the Government itself. Therefore, this is why I say that the Elections Commission should be re-constituted with a new chairman and with wider powers to supervise the whole conduct of elections so that they are done fairly and squarely in this country.

When all these things are done nobody will query how the Minister is exercising his powers under this Bill. This is what we are worried about. We are not afraid of giving the Minister all these powers. But how will they be used? Will they be used in a manner fairly and squarely without discrimination so that all Guyanese can feel that they will be treated equally?

I hope that the Prime Minister in his speech will be able to tell the House and the nation because I feel that the nation needs to be reassured at this stage. And as the Prime Minister has said we will not be the same again, politically, economically and socially. I hope that the Government really means what it has said in this respect. *[Applause]*

The Prime Minister (Mr. Burnham): Mr. Speaker, it had not been my intention to contribute to the debate on this Bill except as a voter if and when a division became necessary but, in view of the fact that the hon. Leader of the Opposition, as in his wont, has introduced a number of things not directly relevant to the Bill but, I think, relevant to good government and national unity, I would ask your permission to make certain comments on some of the observations which he has made.

Mr. Speaker, on the 1st January, 1971, I called for national unity. On the 20th February, 1971, I observed what I meant by national unity, national unity, not as everyone thought, merely in terms of ethnic understanding and co-operation. National unity means more than that; it means more than the races living together and in some cases sporting together. It means the determination of all of the peoples of Guyana, regardless of their ethnic origin or their alleged class position, combining all their efforts and co-operating in the building of Guyana.

To my mind, it meant, and means, that where fundamental matters are concerned there must be no room for the pettinesses which one associates with political differences and parties.

6 p.m.

It means, for instance, that on the question of a matter like the nationalisation of bauxite it must not be important to which party you belong; what must be important should be whether or not in your judgment the step that is taken or is about to be taken will be something that will ensure to the benefit of the country.

It little matters that after having opposed, for petty reasons, an important step like this you say that you will co-operate after. That smacks almost of hypocrisy. To break it down in a language which we understand, you are playing "One for Parry, two for Knight."

My Government is willing to accept what the Leader of the Opposition says about his section of the Opposition, namely, that it supports these measures even though they undoubtedly give substantial powers to the Government formally, because the goals, the objectives adumbrated, are calculated to change Guyana radically but favourably in economic, political and social terms. We accept the statement, in some cases implicit, in other cases explicit.

We understand from the Leader of the Opposition that there are certain fears. Since fear is an emotion, by definition it is subjective, I as Prime minister would say that there is no need to fear, but what we are discussing is not whether there is the need for fear, whether the fear is logically justified or justifiable. We are discussing the fact of fear and in the atmosphere in which we have been operating over the past week it is not for me to go behind the allegations, the statements, the asseverations of the Leader of the Opposition. I believe that if we are to get on we must, until the man on the other side has proved to be a congenital prevaricator, accept his word. And I am prepared to accept the word of the Leader of the Opposition so far as allegations of fear go.

The Leader of the Opposition has set out certain areas where he feels that these alleged fears can be dissipated. For instance, he proposes that we should meet more frequently on Wednesdays and there should be more scope given to Members of the Opposition to debate their Motions. Government has had a very busy time-table and schedule in and out of this House in the past. It has not always been possible to bring up these Motions because in many cases we have been busy as a result of the machinations of the Opposition. I give an undertaking that in future we will see to it that we meet more frequently on Wednesdays and that there is an opportunity given to the Opposition to have its views aired and also to give advice and points of view on important national matters.

On Saturday I said it is not my preference or desire to re-write past history. I shall therefore make no reference to the problems which the Opposition, then led by me, used to have pre-1964 on this question. Let bygones be bygones! We open a new chapter on a new page.

Says the Leader of the Opposition, he has difficulty in getting into Amerindian areas. This matter has been under very close scrutiny by the Government recently and it has been decided that all Members of Parliament should automatically enjoy the right of going into these areas for which passes are normally necessary. [*Applause*] We will probably give standing passes or something like that. It can be dealt with administratively. I am prepared to accept the *bona fides*. I am a very believing man. Unlike some, I do not believe that Heaven is above. Heaven is within one's heart, within one's mind.

It has been said that Government has been discriminating in its employment practices. I remember when I was Leader of the Opposition I made the same allegations against the Government. Of course, I was not officially the Leader of the Opposition for, unlike me, the then Head of Government did not think such an official post was necessary, but even before I changed my position in the House, from the West to the East, I realized that in the majority of cases allegations of discrimination spring from the shortages in employment opportunities.

Let me give an example, if this House is unaware of it. If there was an opportunity for a job and there were two applicants – at many levels this is the case or even more so, that is, more than two applicants – if a P.N.C. man gets it and the other applicant was P.P.P. he would never accept that the P.N.C. man was better qualified. If the P.P.P. man gets the job the P.N.C. man would never accept that the P.P.P. man was better qualified but would think that there was an attempt on the part of the P.N.C. to bribe or steal a member of the Opposition, or to bend over backwards to give the impression of neutrality, objectivity, impartiality.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows the problems he had on both sides. I think that it is a good proposal because then those on the outside will get an opportunity of seeing the problems inside. We can set up by legislation or administrative act a board or commission, or what have you. That can be worked out. We both speak the same language, though it is not our native tongue in either case. We can work out something so as to have an institution which we may at this stage cryptically call “Fair Employment Practices Commission.”

The Government is not anxious to sit alone; we want all to see what is happening. We have no skeletons in the cupboard on this question but if, perchance, as is said, there is a fear that there is this discrimination, very well, we will all be there to see exactly what happens and we must set up machinery for persons who feel themselves aggrieved to have an opportunity of having their grievances rectified or remedied.

6.10 p.m.

This is not beyond our ingenuity for if we had the ingenuity, the foresight and the capacity to establish the institution of the Ombudsman I cannot see why, with co-operation, we cannot establish an agency to ensure, not merely that employment practices are fair, but also that they are known to be fair by all sides.

But let me say this Mr. Speaker: this is not going to be only for the public sector. I have gone into certain business places in this country and I am surprised to think that I am in Guyana. There are certain business places in this country – I will not suggest that in some cases the owners of these businesses have a political preference for one or other of the Opposition parties – and I have been shocked by the uniformity of ethnicity. If we are to set up an institution like this it must be able to survey all fields, public and private. Unless, perchance, it was said that this surveillance is an encroachment on property rights I am assured that we will have the two-thirds majority to pass it here. I have no reaction from the Leader of the Opposition. [Dr. Jagan: “Of course. I said, Yes.”] As long as a person is aggrieved he can make a complaint and then the question is for the Commission to decide whether he is in fact aggrieved because the square peg may feel aggrieved when he does not get into a round hole. [Mrs. DaSilva: “Don’t forget the N.I.S. and Income Tax Department.”] You should be the last to say that! You are the people who discriminate. Look at the Banks, look at D.I.H., look at the Singer Company, look at Dictator Bakery! We the underprivileged are talking, we the disinherited. Let us talk. For too long you have had everything your way! Mr. Speaker, I had hoped not to be contentious or cantankerous. My apologies.

The Leader of the Opposition has spoken about the Commissions like the Public Service Commission, the Police Service Commission, and also about the Corporation Boards, etc. The Constitution on the question of Commissions was drafted in such a way as to anticipate, or premise, an involvement of the Opposition at the consultative level. Let us call a spade a spade. There was a time when the Opposition said that it was its intention, its purpose and its goal to remove, by all means or by any means, the Government. Self-preservation is nature's first law. Now, however, that there is this atmosphere of understanding and co-operation the Government is prepared, not merely to consult, but to guarantee that the Opposition can practically name representatives as long as it is understood that the Government must have the majority. The Government cannot yield this majority where these agencies of the State are concerned. I think everyone, even the dialectician, accepts that.

Peaceful demonstrations: I am surprised at that. I am surprised to hear the suggestion that peaceful demonstrations are not permitted. But this I say: administrative instructions will be given that peaceful demonstrations should be in no way impeded and as long as there are proper guarantees when there are applications for holding processions they would be granted. I who have led so many processions in my life do not want to rob any member of the public, especially the Opposition, of the exercise which I have enjoyed in the past. And I give an undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, when one has to deal with an administration there are occasions when the person, the group, the body, at the head of the administration does not know what is happening. I am sometimes flattered by the implied omniscience with which I am credited by the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition being a man of greater leisure than myself can, if there comes to his attention any matters, or incidents, or events, which seem to be in breach of my undertaking, bring them to my attention. In fact he ought to have told this House that in our most recent discussions I told him that we ought to have frequent consultations, at least one statutory consultation per month and any further consultations as the occasion arises or the need is impressed upon either or both of us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question of the employment of graduates from the so called “socialist” countries. I really do not like to use, in the context of international divisions, the term ‘socialist’ to describe one country or another, for Mr. Wilson will say, when he is in office, that Britain is socialist. Mr. Wilson will say his country is socialist and Mr. Palme in Sweden will say his country is socialist. You see I have the experts from all over the world.

Let us use a geographical and non-contentious term. “Graduates from the eastern bloc”. Mr. Speaker, you know sometimes we do not see what is happening beneath our very noses. In recent months a number of persons who have graduated from eastern bloc countries, including a first cousin of the hon. Member Mr. Ram Karran, a number of these graduates including those like Mr. Ram Karran’s cousin, who went on P.P.P. scholarships have been employed. I understand that the Public Service Commission is aware of the fact. No discrimination whether you went on a P.P.P. scholarship or not. But let me say this: Not every paper is a qualification. The qualifications have to be tested. There are some American qualifications that we do not accept; there are some British qualifications that we do not accept; there are Russian qualifications that we do not accept.

So let there be no fears and let it be said here that, wherever you got your qualifications, you are expected to render loyal service. Disloyalty will be met with the proper sanctions provided under the law.

6.20 p.m.

I want to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for the charm, the apparent and real skill, with which he introduced the question of sugar and the sugar unions. Let me say this: The Leader of the Opposition knows how difficult this question is and has been, before he was in office, while he was in office, after he was in office, before I was in office, after I was in office. Let us hope that it will not continue to be a vexed and difficult question after I will have left office.

Naturally the Government has a vested interest in the highest possible production in the sugar industry because of the revenue implications, but Government also has a vested interest in fair treatment being meted out to those who are employed in the sugar industry and everyone knows that Government has intervened formally and informally recently to have certain of these conditions remedied and certain facilities granted.

Naturally Government recognizes that one of the important and controversial questions in the sugar industry is who should represent the workers, whether it be G.A.W.U. or M.P.C.A. Charity is always a subjective judgment and a Government cannot afford to be subjective. A Government, if it is to govern in the interest of the country, must be objective and I give this undertaking that Government proposes very shortly to work out ways and means of discovering and ascertaining with absolute accuracy where the wishes of the majority of the workers in the sugar estates lie. *[Applause]*

Significant in this context, perhaps, is the plea made for representation of the Rice Producers Association on the Rice Marketing Board. We must not, if we are dialecticians as I know the hon. Leader of the Opposition is, ignore facts. There was a time when there was no doubt about the fact that the Rice Producers Association, through its leadership, for reasons known best to itself, could discover only unwisdom, ignorance, obtuseness, on the part of the Government. The Rice Producers Association would be shouting "This is bound to be wrong." It cannot tell you what is likely to be right. It seemed at one time that the Rice Producers Association – to the Government at least – was more interested in political posturing than in serving its members.

However, I have recently had conversations with representatives of the R.P.A. – myself and my deputy who, at that time, was the Minister responsible for rice and who now again, as Minister of Agriculture, is responsible for rice. I am proposing that we meet again – I think it is on Friday at 10 o'clock in the morning. We will proceed with these discussions. So far I have an undertaking from those who saw us on the last occasion that they are not interested in

politicizing rice. They are not prepared to be guided by political considerations but by what they consider to be the interest of the rice industry. They have accepted the *bona fides* of the Government though they say there are instances in which the Government has been making mistakes. That is possible, Mr. Speaker. We are not divine.

In that context, I can say, that what with the pledge by the R.P.A. to co-operate with the Government in doing something for the rice industry, the Government loses any interest in the political sympathies of any member of the R.P.A. and is prepared to let the R.P.A. have representation on the Rice Marketing Board. Again, it is a matter to be worked out exactly how many there is going to be on one side or the other. It is a matter in which I am prepared further to consult with the Leader of the Opposition because he seems to be in a mood to be consulted in recent times. *[Applause]*

Now, we talked about Black Bush Polder. The Leader of the Opposition has already stated that he is going to have discussions with the Minister of Agriculture to work out a formula for the phased payment of arrears and he is going to be very helpful to us. This is the sort of help we appreciate. From his intimate knowledge of and connection with so many of the Government's tenants at Black Bush Polder he will help us to sort out the sheep from the goats. This Government has never wanted to be hard and oppressive on the people of Black Bush Polder but we can give any number of examples of the things that they do.

A farmer came to us asking to be allowed some respite, and when he was told by the Minister of Agriculture, "I understand you have a car", he said, "Yes, I have a car but it is in my wife's name." That is the type of thing. There are occasions when respite is granted on the representation of a Minister of the Government, a firm undertaking is given that the rice will be sent to the Government mill, and then, lo and behold! This plot was reaped. We understand that it was reaped, but we know that the rice was taken to another mill in another person's name.

If there is going to be co-operation because, as I said before, of the intimate knowledge that the Leader of the Opposition and his party have, all right we can arrange that. We have less interest in breaking down houses than in receiving the rents and as long as we can work out a system, no one needs worry.

Says the Leader of the Opposition, he wants an anti-corruption committee. Right! I should like to suggest an investigation of the use of P.P.P. funds by a certain Treasurer. If I took a poll amongst the members of the P.P.P. and made it a free poll they would all vote in favour of the fact of dishonesty of a certain gentleman. Enough of that.

I have told the Leader of the Opposition that if he will submit his proposals clearly worked out on this, we are prepared to consider them favourably. I make that offer again and I await the submission.

Then there is a big hue and cry. I am afraid that the Leader of the Opposition is going to regret my statement. There is a big hue and cry about repealing the National Security Act. It is his *cheval de bataille*; it is his *cri*! I want to announce that in the context of the improved situation, in the context of the undertakings of co-operation, Government does not propose to renew Part II of the National Security Act when it falls for renewal in June of this year.

6.30 p.m.

Now, let me hear what they are going to quarrel about after this. They have not been locked up; they have not been detained and we are not going to renew it, but the Leader of the Opposition and his group have an obligation, not to the Government, but to the country and the people, to see to it that there is patriotism in place of vociferousness, I do not want to use the harsher term, "subversion". It would be unkind to say that at this stage. It is their duty, I would submit, to see to it that there is no misguided vociferousness. Have your peaceful demonstrations! Use your own way of describing what you consider to be the faults and

weaknesses of the Government and the governing party, abuse us as it is the right of politicians to abuse their opposite numbers, but let us have no nonsense.

Passports: the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that I have discussed the matter with him. He said that none of his boys go out to learn revolution, they do not go out to learn guerrilla tactics because we can train them in guerrilla tactics right here. The G.D.F. is there. If he says that they are not going out for that, they will have their passports. There is no problem. Of course, sometimes you may have a little difficulty with passports if you have a little criminal record which has to be noted. But those formal things have nothing at all to do with the National Security Act. There is going to be no problem. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition never has problems. Whenever he feels like going to enjoy his caviar on the Black Sea, he is free to go. I have been discussing with him the possibility of his being posted to Moscow. *[Applause]*

There is nothing I can do about the Public Accounts Committee except to give an undertaking that on pain of party discipline the members of the P.N.C. Parliamentary Group who are members of the Public Accounts Committee must and will attend all meetings of the Public Accounts Committee summoned by the Chairman or the Clerk. In any case, the P.N.C. does not summon the Committee; it is either the Chairman or the Clerk. **[Mr. Ram Karran:** “The Clerk is a PNC man.”] **[Hon. Members:** “Shame!”] No, it is not a shame. The best advertising agency the P.N.C. ever had is the P.P.P. What are you worried about? So far as they are concerned they will soon be crediting the Almighty with membership of the P.N.C.! That is all right with me. When the elections show one hundred per cent for the P.N.C. don't quarrel!

I think that on the question of the Public Accounts Committee there is required co-operation between the Opposition and the P.N.C.; it is easy to say that you want a Public Accounts Committee. We do not control it; we have members all right; you have members too and the chairmanship. At least the Chairman and the Opposition members can attend. Let us not be like Adam and Eve casting the blame on someone else, because the Opposition has enough to form a quorum. *[Interruption]* We will try to help you. We know of the paucity of members

from which you suffer. We will supplement these with our huge numbers and the Public Accounts Committee will meet.

We have heard here about the need to extend the powers of the Elections Commission. I agree that the powers should be widened. We can discuss it; we can get on with the job. Instead of making this a matter for political stunting, let us get down to meaningful discussion on how these powers should be widened and how they should be put in legislative form. As long as we agree, there is no bother because I still believe, even with the supervening of death, that the Opposition and the Government would have two-thirds, because under the P.R. system which you did not want, when any one dies, another one moves in. The M.P. is a dead! Long live the M.P.! There is no problem about that if it requires a constitutional amendment.

The Leader of the Opposition passed me a note about the question of recall, and though he did not speak on it, it is my duty in this spirit of amity and co-operation which is now prevailing to deal with it, though I could have ignored it. But I want the Opposition to understand that I do not want to ignore the Opposition. The Opposition has a contribution to make, if it is only that of being a touchstone for the Government.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned the question of the right, which he thinks should inhere in the leader on the list, to remove any member from the National Assembly, who came into the National Assembly on that list. It is the sort of right which one would expect any leader to want. Let us be very frank. It is conducive to proper party discipline though, of course, a party can so discipline itself that one does not need these additional prop.

I myself, and my Government also, am inclined to the view, especially with the large parties – to be more precise, the two large parties – that normally the persons would have come in almost exclusively and entirely on the party's strength.

I have spoken to the hon. and learned Attorney-General and we are working out, in consultation with the hon. the Deputy Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition, some formula so as to give legislative essence or expression to what seems to be a reasonable proposal as from a certain date. We have to work out those details. We are even prepared to consult with the Leader of the United Force, but he must remember that if the P.P.P. and the P.N.C. agree it is the essence of democracy that he accepts.

The Leader of the Opposition, just to be sure, mentioned about not granting mineral resources to foreigners exclusively. We are not going to this trouble, we are not facing the wrath of the great, the mammoth, the Goliath, the leviathan, to take our resources and give to someone else with whom we are going to have discussions. There, as I said, can be arrangements whereby there can be certain investment input, even in our natural resources; there can be a consortium or consortia between Government and foreign investors, but as I said clearly on Sunday the 5th April – and I have repeated it *ad nauseam* – in such consortia government insists, so far as the natural resources of this country are concerned – and those will naturally include our mineral resources – that Government alone, or Government and co-operatives, should hold the majority shares.

There is no question whatever of Government being interested in giving out mineral resources exclusively to any foreign investors or investor. There can be certain input shares, but on a minority basis. That undertaking can be given.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about what Government is prepared to concede, what Government is prepared to admit. It is about time that Government asks certain things of the Opposition. If the Leader of the Opposition is going to be granted the status of automatic consultation, if he is going to be granted the right to certain nominations, he must understand it is his duty to the nation on public occasions to be there. You cannot behave like a spoiled brat and then expect to be treated like a man of responsibility, status and stature.

We are not going to renew the National Security Act in June; you are going to have no problems with passports. Government asks, nay, is entitled to demand, now that all the areas of fear have been removed, that you join with Government to see that the Privy Council, as a Court of Appeal for Guyana, is abolished.

Mr. Speaker: this Assembly stands suspended until 8 o'clock.

Sitting suspended at 6.45 p.m.

8.05 p.m.

On resumption --

Mr. Jack (replying): Mr. Speaker. Some of the points made during this debate have already been answered by the hon. Prime Minister. I refer particularly to the question raised by the hon. Member Mr. R.D. Persaud, a concern which he expressed that we should not be taking our minerals and handing them over to foreign companies. I think this has been amply covered by the Prime Minister. I do not think we would take over our resources from one foreign company merely to turn them over to other foreigners.

The purpose of this Bill is to ensure in these modern times that persons are not allowed to carry out mining operations as if it was the 16th century. For instance, persons engaged in the mining industry would be expected under the regulations to provide proper housing, to provide proper water facilities. We have had the instance whereby, after many years of operation at Mackenzie, the people's water supply is still not adequate, and when the water supply was about to be provided, it was the suggestion that this was being done out of the generosity of the heart of the company. Today, in many states in the world, these things are taken for granted. If workers are working in mines, there must be proper housing, proper schooling facilities, proper water, proper medical facilities.

It is also expected that we would be able to regulate the proper utilisation of the materials and to ensure that we do not leave those gaping holes in the ground which we find in certain areas in our country. The modern legislation provides that where a mine has been worked, that it is necessary to put the land back in some proper order, and I think it is in Jamaica where the companies have to ensure that the land is put back in a manner where it can be used for agricultural purposes. Things like these are contemplated under this Act.

I notice a certain concern was expressed about the operation of this Act with regard to Amerindians and I think it was Mr. Stoby who once again raised the question of the Amerindian Lands Commission. I think it is well known that Government has embarked upon the demarcation of the lands in question but, because of the shortage of surveyors, we have not been able to go as fast as we would have liked. This Act is not intended as a means of getting at the small man and I can give the assurance that it is not intended to prevent anybody from making a pot out of clay. I think the hon. Member Mr. Stoby was worried as to whether Government would send persons into the far reaches of the interior to search out for persons who might take up a bit of clay to make a pot to charge them or to regulate them. This is not the purpose of this Act.

We have also attempted to make sure that no operation of any size can be arbitrarily stopped. This is one of the reasons for the provision of a controller. It is not intended, as the hon. Member Mr. Feilden Singh thought, that we want to get on to the small man's business, put a Government agent, and run it without compensation. This is not Government's intention and I give an assurance to this House to this effect. I think that roughly covers the few points raised. Our Ministry is in the process of re-organisation and some of the questions raised by the hon. Member Mr. R.D. Persaud could not be answered at this moment.

Before I take my seat, may I say it is a pleasure for me to have been moving on my very first occasion, these two Bills which seem to be assured of a passage through the House with

such a degree of amity and cordiality. I trust this augurs well for the future harmonious relations in this country. Thank you.

Question put.

Mr. Ramsaroop: Division!

Assembly divided: Ayes 45, Noes Nil, as follows:

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Cheeks	NIL
Mr. Sutton	
Mr. Teekah	
Mrs. Sahoye	
Mr. Remington	
Mrs. Branco	
Mr. Ambrose	
Mr. Stoby	
Mr. M.Y. Ally	
Mr. Lall	
Mr. Hamid	
Mr. Wilson	
Mr. Chandisingh	
Mr. Ram Karran	
Dr. Jagan	
Mrs. Willems	
Mr. Zaheeruddeen	
Mr. Van Sluytman	

Mr. Saffee
Mr. Jordan
Mr. Fowler
Mr. Corrica
Mr. Correia
Mr. Chan-A-Sue
Mr. Budhoo
Mr. Bissember
Mr. Bancroft
Miss Ackman
Mr. Aaron
Mr. Wrights
Mr. Thomas
Mr. Salim
Mr. Haynes
Mr. Duncan
Mr. Joaquin
Mr. Mingo
Mr. Clarke
Mr. D.A. Singh
Mr. Ramsaroop
Miss Field-Ridley
Mr. Carrington
Mr. Hoyte
Mr. Kasim
Dr. Reid
Mr. Burnham

- 45

Motion carried.

Bill read a Second time.

Assembly in Committee.

Clause 1 and 2 agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 3

Mr. Jack: We wish to substitute the following subsection for subsection 3:

- “3 (a) Save as otherwise provided in paragraph (b), regulations made under this Act shall be subject to negative resolution;
- (b) regulations made under subsection (2) and regulations referred to in subsection (2) of section 4 shall be subject to affirmative resolution.”

The Chairman: The Amendment is proposed.

Mr. Jagan: Can I enquire from the hon. Minister how soon the regulation that requires an affirmative vote will be brought to the House? Is there any provision as to when it will be brought? I do not think --

The Chairman: I am informed that that proposal will be taken immediately after this Bill is passed. The Standing Orders will be suspended.

Mr. Jagan: That is in respect of the negative resolution but I want to set out the time within which a resolution may be moved. What I would like to enquire from the hon. Minister is whether there is a time limit for the Government to bring an affirmative resolution.

Mr. Jack: There are two questions embodied there, the first one, when the Regulations will be made, and the other, how soon it will be brought before the House. I cannot at this stage say how soon the regulations will be made but obviously it is a matter of some urgency that we should have these regulations as soon as possible. I give an assurance that as soon as practicable after the regulations are made they will be brought to the House.

Amendment put and agreed to.

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

Clause 4 agreed to and orders to stand part of the Bill.

Assembly resumed.

Bill reported with an Amendment to Clause 3: as amended, considered.

Question -

That the Bill be read the Third time.

Put.

Mr. Hamid: Division!

Assembly divided: Ayes 50, Noes Nil, as follows:

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Cheeks	NIL

Mr. Sutton
Mr. Teekah
Mrs. Sahoye
Mr. Remington
Mrs. Branco
Mr. Ambrose
Mr. Stoby
Mr. M.Y. Ally
Mr. Lall
Mr. Hamid
Mr. Wilson
Mr. Chandisingh
Mr. Ram Karran
Dr. Jagan
Mrs. Willems
Mr. Zaheeruddeen
Mr. Van Sluytman
Mr. Saffee
Mr. Jordan
Mr. Fowler
Mr. Corrica
Mr. Correia
Mr. Chan-A-Sue
Mr. Budhoo
Mr. Bissember
Mr. Bancroft
Miss Ackman
Mr. Aaron
Mr. Wrights

Mr. Thomas
Mr. Salim
Mr. Haynes
Mr. Duncan
Mr. Joaquin
Mr. Mingo
Mr. Clarke
Mr. D.A. Singh
Mr. Ramsaroop
Miss Field-Ridley
Mr. Carrington
Mr. Hoyte
Mr. Kasim
Dr. Reid
Mr. Burnham - 50

Motion carried

Bill read the third time and passed, as amended.

MOTIONS

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER

Mr. Ramsaroop: With your leave, sir, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Order 82 in order to deal with the Amendment to the Standing orders to insert an additional Standing Order, 69A.

Question put, and agreed to.

Standing Order No. 82 suspended.

AMENDMENT OF STANDING ORDERS

“Be it resolved that the Standing Orders of the National Assembly be amended by the insertion after Standing Order NO. 69 of the following new Standing Order:

69A. NEGATIVE RESOLUTIONS

- (1) The period prescribed for the purposes of section 17(1) of the Interpretation and General Clauses Act, 1970 (which relates to subsidiary legislation subject to negative resolution) shall be 40 days from the date on which the subsidiary legislation is laid before the National Assembly.
- (2) Where notice of a motion that any subsidiary legislation subject to negative resolution shall be annulled is given within 21 days of the date on which the subsidiary legislation is laid before the Assembly, that motion shall be debated as soon as practicable and in any event before the expiration of the period prescribed in paragraph (1) hereof.” [The Minister of Trade]

Mr. Ramsaroop: The Motion standing in my name seeks in its terms to add another, to wit, 69A, to the current Standing Orders, to effect negative resolutions. This addition to these Standing Orders will achieve two objectives:

- (a) It defines what is the prescribed period for the purpose of section 17(1) of the Interpretation and General Clauses Act as being 40 days from the date on which the Subsidiary Legislation is laid before the National Assembly. In fine, it grafts this aspect of the Interpretation and General Clauses Act onto the Standing Order to give meaning and effect to such Subsidiary Legislation that may be promulgated.

- (b) It makes provision for a Motion to be tabled for the annulment of Subsidiary Legislation made under the Minerals Act and for the debate of that Motion.

It is hoped that this procedure will not be abused and, indeed, the members opposite have given a categorical assurance that this process will not be misused. Mr. Speaker, I commend this Motion to this honourable House and wish to say that all members opposite have indicated their concurrence in its passage.

Question proposed, put and agreed to.

Motion carried.

BILL – COMMITTEE AND THIRD READING

BAUXITE NATIONALISATION BILL

“An Act to amend the Constitution to provide for such public ownership and control of bauxite undertakings in Guyana as may be necessary to secure the interests of the people and to promote the development of the national economy, and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto.” [The Minister of Mines and Forest]

Assembly in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Bill.

8.30 p.m.

Clause 8

Mr. Jack: I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name. The purpose of this Amendment is to cover any bauxite undertaking which is taken over. This has been agreed upon by the hon. Members on the other side.

Amendment that –

- (a) the words “for income tax purposes at 31st December immediately proceeding the vesting day” be substituted for the words “as shown in the books of the Company at the 31st December, 1969,” in the third and fourth lines of paragraph (2);
- (b) the words “that date” be substituted for the words “the 31st December, 1969” in the fifth and sixth line of paragraph (2);

put, and agreed to.

Clause 8, as amended, agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 9, agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 10.

Mr. Jack: I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name. The purpose of this is to ensure that, as far as is practicable, persons who are now employed at DEMBA will continue to be so employed on conditions no less favourable than they now are. The wording of this Amendment is intended to meet the case but we did not think that there was the possibility of any formulation of words which will cover every conceivable contingency. It is for that reason we have inserted the words “taken as a whole”.

Mr. Jagan: Mr. Chairman, you will remember during the Second Reading I had referred to this Clause 10. The Amendment as proposed, in my view, is not quite clear. What is the meaning of the words “taken as a whole are no less favourable than those applicable to him immediately before the vesting day?”

What we are concerned about is, as I said earlier, that peoples’ salaries or wages should not be reduced. The hon. Minister has told me that the reason it was drafted this way is that persons might have to be removed from one house and given living quarters elsewhere. I do not know whether one’s residence would be taken into account to determine his salary or a reduction of his salary. For instance, who will determine whether it is less favourable than what the person is earning at present or what he is enjoying today?

I do not know whether the hon. Minister has in mind that persons could go to the courts to determine whether their conditions are less favourable than they were before, or whether these persons would be forced to enter into agreement with the Corporation regardless of whether the Corporation thinks it would be favourable or not. I should like the hon. Minister to explain this.

Mr. Jack: Mr. Chairman, one of the problems that would face us is that we do not wish to petrify the situation and make it impossible for any person to be transferred or removed from one place to the next, or for us to have to maintain that in every conceivable way a man remains exactly as he was. When he speaks of “taken as a whole” we are concerned with the general conditions of employment. Even a person working at DEMBA now is not sure that he never will be transferred, that he will not be sent to Ituni, that he will not be put in one house or another. If we do not have a formulation such as this, we may find ourselves in a position where once we have taken over this enterprise you can never do anything with a man. And I do not think it is conceivable that you can get a formulation of words which would allow upon a transfer for every particular, individual item of a person’s employment to be maintained at all times.

When one speaks of his salary obviously it is intended that his salary will be the same, that the benefits will be the same, his pension rights will be the same, his leave facilities will be the same, but there must be some leeway left for the administration to make the normal adjustments that would be made in a transitional period such as this; otherwise the administration of the enterprise would find itself bound hand and foot unable to move any person who would then say "But I must be the same way as I was in January, 1971." I am sure hon. Members on the other side of the House would not want to see the enterprise starting off with that kind of disability.

8.40 p.m.

We do intend that persons' salaries and conditions of employment will remain as they are now. I do not know if I can make an explanation further than that.

Mr. Ram Karran: We do not wish to put the Minister in a position where the work of the organization will be affected in any way but there is one case where there is precedent, and I wish to invite the hon. Minister's attention to the provision made in the case of the Guyana Electricity Corporation and the Guyana Airways Corporation, where these foreign words, "taken as a whole", are not at all present.

While I concede that the position should not be petrified, surely the Minister should recognize that the trade union which bargains for the people, once the general clause is there, will see that the conditions do not operate against the interest of the people, but having regard to the fears, referred to earlier, among the workers at Mackenzie, of Government reducing salaries, reducing conditions, I think it will be advisable for the Government to accept the advice we tender from over here and to remove those words which I describe as foreign. The words "taken as a whole" have no meaning here, if you should take the case of the Guyana Electricity

Corporation and the Guyana Airways Corporation, where the situation was not petrified, where the workers were able to be promoted, and where things went on normally as far as I can remember.

The Attorney-General and Minister of State (Mr. Ramphal): I think the hon. Member is a little misinformed in relation to, for example, the Guyana Electricity Corporation. I have the Electricity (Amendment) Ordinance 1960, and it is clearly provided there in Part III in language identical with the language we are now using, that the conditions shall be those “which taken as a whole are no less favourable.” I believe he was commending the precedent of the Guyana Electricity Corporation and that of the Guyana Airways Corporation.

Amendment –

That the following words be inserted after the word “Corporation” in the sixth line of clause 10(1):

“being terms and conditions which taken as a whole are no less favourable than those applicable to him immediately before the resting day.”

Put, and agreed to.

Clause 10, as amended, agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Assembly resumed.

Bill reported with Amendments; as amended, considered.

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture (Dr. Reid): *Division*

Assembly divided: Ayes 48, Noes 3, as follows:

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Cheeks	Mr. Sutton
Mr. Teekah	Mr. M.F. Singh
Mrs. Sahoye	Mr. DaSilva
Mr. Remington	- 3
Mr. Bholā Persaud	
Mrs. Branco	
Mr. Ambrose	
Mr. R. Ally	
Mr. Stoby	
Mr. R.D. Persaud	
Mr. M.Y. Ally	
Mr. Lall	
Mr. Hamid	
Mr. Wilson	
Mr. Chandisingh	
Mr. Ram Karran	
Dr. Jagan	
Mrs. Willems	
Mr. Zaheeruddeen	
Mr. Van Sluytman	
Mr. Saffee	
Mr. Jordan	
Mr. Fowler	

Mr. Corrica
Mr. Correia
Mr. Chan-A-Sue
Mr. Budhoo
Mr. Bissember
Mr. Bancroft
Miss Ackman
Mr. Aaron
Mr. Wrights
Mr. Thomas
Mr. Salim
Mr. Haynes
Mr. Duncan
Mr. Joaquin
Mr. Mingo
Mr. Clarke
Mr. D.A. Singh
Mr. Ramsaroop
Miss Field-Ridley
Mr. Carrington
Mr. Hoyte
Mr. Kasim
Dr. Reid
Mr. Burnham

- 48

Motion carried.

Bill read the Third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Ramsaroop: I beg to move the Adjournment of National Assembly to a date to be fixed before the House rises. I wish to place on record, the gratitude of this Government for the full co-operation of those who supported us in this House during the last trying days/

Mr. Speaker: This House is adjourned to a date to be fixed.

Adjourned accordingly at 8.50 p.m.
