

**DR. CHEDDI JAGAN**

**NATIONAL ASSEMBLY SPEECHES**

**VOLUME 5**

**The National Assembly of the  
Second Parliament of Guyana  
February 1969 -December 1972**

Dr. Cheddi Jagan  
National Assembly Speeches Volume 5  
With a Preface by Dr. Roger Luncheon  
This edition © The Government of Guyana, 2011  
Preface © Roger Luncheon 2010

Cover design by Peepal Tree Press

All rights reserved.  
No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any  
form without permission.

This publication was made possible by the support of the Peepal Tree Press  
(Leeds), the University of Warwick Yesu Persaud Centre for Caribbean Stud-  
ies, and the Government of Guyana.

ISBN 978-1-907493-28-7



The Caribbean Press



## PREFACE

Dr. Jagan was first elected to the Legislature of British Guiana in 1947 and served until 1992, a span of almost fifty years in elected public office. During his period as a Legislator/Member of Parliament 1947 – 1953, Dr. Jagan served as an elected member; as a Head of Government 1957 – 1964 in the pre Independence period; and as a Leader of the Opposition Party in Parliament 1964 – 1992, until the PPP was returned to power in 1992. In 1997, he died in Office as Head of State and Head of the PPP/Civic Government.

Compiled in chronological order, these volumes contain Dr. Jagan's speeches made in Legislative Assembly/Parliament during his long career there. These speeches reflect his consummate attention to events that developed during the important periods in Guyana, the Caribbean region and the world.

Dr. Jagan was elected and entered the Legislative Assembly in the colonial era. The inequities and inhumanity of that period (the post World War II period) was the arena in which he started his life and career as a politician. With universal suffrage and the political party of his creation, the PPP, he entered the legislature and piloted the PPP that was poised to take British Guiana to Independence.

Betrayed by the Western powers, the PPP was removed from office in 1964 and led in Parliament as the Opposition Party for twenty-eight years. In 1992 his party regained power, removing the PNC after a free and fair election.

Dr. Jagan's speeches illustrate his humanism, his dedication to the working people, the poor and the powerless. He spoke as an Internationalist, joining his and Guyana's voice in the struggle for national liberation, independence and development. During the Cold War years, he argued for peaceful co-existence and non-alignment. His major contributions dealt with national issues impacting on socio-economic development in Guyana. He proposed initiatives that were well thought-out and carefully crafted, and which enjoyed the support of Guyanese. He emphasised good governance, economic planning and a tripartite economy. He exposed excesses and wrong-doings during the colonial regime and under the PNC Government and fought tirelessly in Parliament to succour the victims of colonialism and PNC misrule. For him, democratic Government needed to address issues of economic justice, for the sake of global security. The unnecessary and cruel wastage of human talent was his major concern. As he once declared, "Democracy can only prosper in an environment of economic, social and ecological development. Poverty atrophies the vigour and initiative of the individual and deprives the society of incalculable human re-

sources. If left unattended, the expansion of poverty with hunger and the hopelessness it engenders will undermine the fabric of our civilisation and the security of the democratic state, thus threatening world peace." He was equally passionate in the cause of environmental protection, recognising an intimate linkage with human economic development but also the human spiritual hunger for beauty. He put it memorably thus : "... the natural resources of our planet must be utilised for the benefit of mankind in such a way that they remain available for future generations, and that in the process of utilisation, fullest measures are taken to prevent environmental degradation. Sustainable development is an all embracing process which is centred on human development. There are two major needs which have to be satisfied. One is to use natural resources for the material and spiritual upliftment of all people. The other is to maintain the delicate balance in nature reflected in the various eco systems adorning our planet." Cheddi Jagan was, and is, the adornment of our country. His record of service is unsurpassable and the history of the party he led is intimately interwoven into the essence of things Guyanese.

**Dr. Roger Luncheon**  
**Head of the Presidential Secretariat**

## Biographical Summary of Dr. Cheddi Jagan

- Name:** Cheddi Berret Jagan
- Date of Birth:** March 22, 1918. Port Mourant, Corentyne, Berbice, Guyana  
Died March 6, 1997
- Parents:** Son of indentured plantation workers; mother (Bachaoni) and father (Jagan) along with two grand mothers and an uncle came to the then British Guiana from Uttar Pradesh, India.
- Personal :** Married August 5, 1943, to Janet Rosenberg of Chicago, Illinois USA;  
has two children: Cheddi (Joey) and Nadira
- Education:** 1933-1935: Queen's College, Georgetown  
1936-1938: Howard University, Washington, D.C. USA  
1938-1942: Northwestern University. Dental School, Chicago, USA, Doctor Dental Surgery (DDS)  
1938-1942: Central YMCA College, USA. Bachelor of Science (B.Sc)

### Trade Union and Political Career:

- 1946:** Organised and spearheaded the formation of the Political Affairs Committee and the PAC Bulletin.
- 1947-1953:** Elected Member of the Legislative Council
- 1950:** Founded the People's Progressive Party.
- 1952-1953:** President of the Rice Producers' Association.
- 1953:** From April to October, headed PPP elected government and was Minister of Agriculture
- 1954:** Spent 6 months in jail for breaking movement restrictions order.

- 1957-1961:** Headed second elected PPP government and was Minister of Trade and Industry.
- 1961 –1964:** Headed the third elected PPP government as Premier and Minister of Development and Planning.
- 1964-1973;**
- 1976-1992:** Leader of the Parliamentary Opposition.
- 1970-1997:** Honorary President, Guyana Agricultural General Worker's Union;  
General Secretary of the People's Progressive Party.
- Oct 9, 1992-**
- Mar 6, 1997:** President of the Cooperative Republic of Guyana.

## Contents

Miscellaneous Enactments (Amendment) Bill: 21st February 1969 .....	1
Miscellaneous Enactments (Amendment) Bill: 25th February, 1969 .....	7
Debate on the Governor-General's Address: 26th February, 1969 .....	9
Motion: 28th February, 1969 .....	23
Budget Debate - Approval of Estimates of Expenditure: 13th March, 1969 .....	26
Estimates - Head 1- Governor-General: 17th March, 1969 .....	41
Head 4 – Parliament Office .....	42
Head 17 - Attorney-General – Deeds Registry .....	43
Office of the Prime Minister and Cabinet: 18th March, 1969 .....	44
Division VI - Public Service Ministry .....	46
Division VIII - Ministry of Economic Development .....	47
Head 19 - Ministry of Home Affairs .....	48
Approval of Estimates 1969 Budget Debate: 20th March, 1969 .....	54
Approval of Estimates of Expenditure: 24th March, 1969 .....	56
Income Tax (In aid of Industry) (Amendment) Bill: 27th November, 1969 .....	61
Approval of Estimates of Expenditure for 1970 – Budget Debate:	
14th January, 1970 .....	67
Ministry of Trade, Division XIII - Tourism .....	72
Congratulations to Two Ministers on Eve of Their Wedding: 15th January, 1970 .	74
Request for leave to move the Adjournment of the Assembly on definite	
matters of Urgent Public Importance: 9th February, 1970 .....	75
Continuance of Miscellaneous Enactments (Amendment) (No. 2) Act,	
1969 (No. 33) .....	76
Interpretation and General Clauses Bill: 16th February, 1970 .....	79
Guyana's Attainment of Republican Status: 23rd February, 1970 .....	87
Congratulations to the President: 17th March, 1970 .....	91
Debate on President's Address: 2nd April 1970 .....	93
Protocol of Port of Spain: 22nd June, 1970 .....	100
Financial Paper No. 5 - Supplementary Provision on the Current and Capital	
Estimates for the period ending 31st May, 1970 .....	105
Financial Paper No. 6 - Supplementary Provision on the Current and Capital	
Estimates for the period ending 30th June, 1970. ....	107
Motion: Financial Paper No. 6 of 1970: 30th June, 1970 .....	110
Public Business Motion: 25th August, 1970 .....	121
Personal Explanation: 30th November, 1970 .....	124
Public Business Motion: Financial Paper No. 7 of 1970 .....	125
Public Business Motion Supplementary Estimates Financial Paper	
No. 7/1970: 1st December, 1970 .....	133
Bills - Second Reading Corporation Tax Bill: 9th December, 1970 .....	139
Approval of Estimates of Expenditure 1971 – Budget Debate:	
14th December, 1970 .....	142
Approval of Estimates of Expenditure 1971: 15th December, 1970 .....	154
Public Business Motion - Approval of Estimates of Expenditure 1971:	
17th December, 1970 .....	161
Bill - Second Reading: Capital Gains Tax (Amendment) Bill .....	166

Public Business - Approval of Estimates and Expenditure, 1971:	
18th December, 1970 .....	168
Supplementary Estimates: 21st December, 1970 .....	172
Public Business Motion - Approval of Estimates: 23rd December, 1970 .....	174
Christmas and New Year Greetings .....	180
Housing Development Bill: March 25th, 1971 .....	181
Debate on President's Address: May 21st, 1971 .....	183
Debate on President's Address (Cont.) .....	191
Public Business Motion - Guarantee of Loan to the Guyana Development Corporation: June 1st, 1971 .....	195
Assistance to East Pakistan Refugees .....	197
Supplementary Estimates .....	199
Motion - Write Off of Losses of Cash .....	203
Withdrawal of Defence Levy .....	205
Financial Paper No. 3 of 1971 .....	210
Guarantee of Loan to Guyana Bauxite Company, Limited .....	212
Debate on Foreign Policy .....	214
Provision of Central Electricity Services .....	228
Confirmation of Customs Duties (Exemption from Import Duties) Order, 1971 (No. 31) .....	231
Public Business Motion - Increase in the Prices of Paddy and Rice: 22nd September, 1971 .....	232
Dismissal Notices – Employee of Messrs Sandbach Parker and Co. Ltd.: November 1st, 1971 .....	238
Public Business Motion - Financial Paper No. 5 of 1971: November 22nd, 1971 .	241
Hospitals Bill: December 23, 1971 .....	243
Head 33 - Ministry of Trade: December 23rd, 1971 .....	244
Head 31 - Ministry of Mines and Forests: 23rd December, 1971 .....	249
Division XXIV – Ministry of Housing and Reconstruction: December 23rd, 1971 .....	251
Head 13 – Ministry of External Affairs: December 28th, 1971 .....	252
Miscellaneous (Fiscal Enactments) (Amendment) Bill: December 29th, 1971 .....	257
State Pensions Bill: December 29th, 1971 .....	259
New Year Wishes: December 29th, 1971 .....	263
Suspension of Standing Order No. 82 .....	264
Financial Paper No. 2 of 1972: 27th July, 1972 .....	266
Financial Paper No. 3 of 1972: 31st July, 1972 .....	275
Approval of Government's Policy Adumbrated in the President's Address: 20th November, 1972 .....	289
Supplementary Estimates: 23rd November, 1972 .....	302
Confirmation of Consumption Tax Order (No. 82): 24th November, 1972 .....	308
Sugar Industry Special Funds (Special Provisions) Bill .....	311
Local Authorities (Postponement of Elections) Bill 1972: 1st December, 1972 .....	315
Budget Debate: 15th December, 1972 .....	323
Head 14 - Ministry of Foreign Affairs: 20th December, 1972 .....	336
Ministry of Finance: 28th December, 1972 .....	340



**DR. CHEDDI JAGAN**

**NATIONAL ASSEMBLY SPEECHES**

**VOLUME 5**

**The National Assembly of the  
Second Parliament of Guyana  
February 1969 - December 1972**



## Miscellaneous Enactments (Amendment) Bill: 21<sup>st</sup> February 1969

**Dr. Jagan:** When the National Security Act was being debated in this Assembly we were told that we must trust the Government; the Government will not abuse its powers. But what do we find? The Government picks up a man. It has a right to hold him only for 24 hours. It lets him out; he gets on the road and then he is picked up again. He is held for another 24 hours and then is let loose in Georgetown. As soon as he walks out into the street four men grab him and throw him in to a police van.

We were told to trust the Government; the Government would not abuse its powers. While these dastardly acts are being carried out by the police on behalf of a fraudulent people who call themselves the Government, others go abroad of Geneva – and elsewhere and talk about human rights. They talk about human rights, the preservation of freedoms. Where are the freedoms? Where are the liberties? The Minister talked a moment ago about preserving gains made by this Government. What are the gains? Ask anybody today what is the situation in this country. Ask the man in the street. Crime, delinquency, unemployment, mass exodus! Then the Government gets up and talks about gains. On the one hand it gives the impression of prosperity, and on the other hand it seeks power to take away rights, claiming that the situation is so bad that it has to take on powers to take away freedoms which are guaranteed to the citizens of this country.

Not too long ago we heard the acting Chancellor talking about corruption in the Government services today. What can we expect when corruption starts from the very top? What can we expect when immorality breeds in high places, when the leaders of the Government set the example of fraud and corruption? How can you tell the people, *“Thou shall not steal, Thou shall behave well; Thou shall love thy neighbour?”*

The Minister said a moment ago that he believes in the creed of ballots and not bullets, but the whole world knows that this Government has assumed powers by fraud, naked fraud. Why did the Prime Minister and his High Commissioner in London, who rigged the elections, refuse to appear in Granada television films? Independent sources, independent persons have examined the situation and the record is there. This is why the Government has now sought powers to ban films. It was this very Prime Minister who, years ago when he was leading the revolt in this country against colonialism, moved against the Government of that time led and supported by people like Lionel Luckhoo who wanted to ban books. Now this Government wants to ban films in place of books, and yet our Attorney General goes abroad and talks about freedom, freedoms being honoured and respected in Guyana. Now we have powers being taken by the Government to declare certain areas protected areas, to decide who must travel and who must not travel.

The Minister says that these powers will not be exercised in an arbitrary manner, that persons who are refused permission to travel will be allowed to have their cases heard before a tribunal, but we know how the state operates. We know how people in this country behave when bribery, corruption and terrorism take place. The Minister is taking these powers, we understand, for the purpose of maintaining public order, public safety, and for the purpose of preventing the subversion of democratic institutions in Guyana. We know everyone knows that democratic institutions have been subverted in this very country by this Government. The Public Service Commission takes orders from the Prime Minister's Office. This is a known fact. The Public Service Commission has come under criticism from even the Civil Service Association.

We have seen recently, in the case of the Elections Commission, that the previous Minister of Home Affairs virtually lied when he said that it will be the job of the Commission to prepare the voters' list when, indeed, what eventually happened was that the Minister simply dictated what was to be done through his Ministry – a fraudulent operation from beginning to end: How can this Government have the gall to talk about subverting democratic institutions when it has done so consistently in the past? How can this Government which itself is immoral talk about public morality? The whole thing is so hypocritical. Whom are we trying to fool?

There is a lot of talk about the Venezuelans, that, because of the Venezuelans' acts of aggression and subversion, the Government wants to take on these powers. Now a small minority is being blamed when that minority was the bosom friend of the Government not too long ago. Let us take a moment to look, in perspective, at this so-called subversion in the Rupununi Savannahs, for it is not only the Venezuelans who have caused the trouble. Our position on this question is quite clear. My party has made it abundantly clear that it does not support any move which will aim at destroying the territorial integrity of Guyana. We have made this position clear and whether the subversion or aggression comes from Surinam, or from Venezuela, or from any quarter, we will resist it.

The Venezuelans, naturally, would like to have a fifth column in Guyana. They will want it as Hitler did. Before his army moved into the European countries he had them softened up by local people. Fifth column people do not become fifty columnists, unpatriotic, anti-national, just for the sake of being so. Has the Government asked itself why these people have so acted? In my view, this is a combination of the Government's high-handed attitude and action.

We heard talk about the Rupununi aristocrats, but these are not aristocrats by any standard and they should not be called aristocrats. What has the Government done in connection with their leases? A few days ago a previous Member of this House told me that his lease was cancelled in the Berbice River and a P.N.C. supporter has been given a lease of five square miles of territory expanding almost to his house. This is the kind of action

that is creating unrest and dissatisfaction in this country.

Another case is Kabawer where 300 persons were settled. The Government has now cancelled their leases arbitrarily and its cronies are going to be put there.

Has the Government examined its own conscience to find out whether the people in the Rupununi revolted because they were incensed by the fraud which permitted the P.N.C. assuming power alone without their erstwhile partners? Have the Members of the Government asked themselves? It is no use rigging the ballot box. It is no use talking about elections in such a way when no one has any respect for the ballot box. Has the Government said anything about irregularities at the elections? This callous and fraudulent Government gives no explanation as to how four ballot papers wrapped with a rubber band were found in a ballot box. People like me go to London and Ottawa! That is our right to expose this fraudulent Government anywhere and everywhere.

The Venezuela issue has come about because of the Government's own doing. The Government must ask itself who is to be blamed. The Government is party to the United States – Venezuela conspiracy to keep this country in a neo-colonial state. Who signed the Geneva Agreement? Who refused, when the Venezuelans occupied the island of Ankoko, to take action, when the Venezuelans agreed to patrol our territorial waters between three and twelve miles? Now they are saying that the Venezuelans are subverting the Amerindians. What are they doing? Why are they talking? Why have they not gone to the Security Council? Because they do not want their masters in Washington to be exposed. Because they do not want the Venezuela problem to be settled. Because they want to use that as an excuse to militarize the politics of Guyana. These are the reasons.

Do not tell us there is fear of attack from Venezuela. Let us get the facts clearly. So long as this is a puppet state, so long as this is a client state of the United States, there will be no attack from the Venezuelans. Let us recognize this. All the puppet states in Latin America now have gentlemen's agreements with the United States that in case one state is attacked by another state, the United States will protect it. This is a tacit agreement between the republics that have taken orders from the United States through the O.A.S. and the Rio Charter. I am talking of overt attacks – aside from the question of taking up the matter with the United Nations – but this hysteria which is being built up about Venezuela aggression and danger to our territorial integrity is all a ruse to have a big armed force, to have a bigger Police Force, so that when fraud can no longer sustain them ... Fraud helped them in the elections – force will be used.

Imagine the immorality! A parson's wife is now a Minister of this Government. Now even parsons are blessing frauds in this country in the same way that parsons blessed the acts of Hitler and Mussolini when they were raping Abyssinia and Spain. Even parsons have been taken over by this Government to do its dirty jobs. But, Sir, time will tell.

Okay. At the last elections, they went to the people and told them, *"We could not do very much for you. Please vote for us because the last time our hands were tied by the United Force. They are capitalists. We are socialists."*

We have not seen any manifesto. The New Road exploded in their faces in 1968. This time we have no road. Even the newspapers have said that the Throne Speech was bereft of matter, empty. Even those erstwhile friends are now criticizing them.

Sir, the whole logic of the situation is to militarize the situation, because, as there is more discontent, as there is more demonstration, as there is more unemployment, as there is more choke and rob, then the military apparatus will have to come in. Such is the big issue in this country that even in the streets it is not safe. One cannot walk out of one's house, of one's hotel, so bad is the situation. Is the Government going to solve these issues, crime, unemployment, mass exodus, growing disillusionment? Is the Government going to solve these problems merely by assuming more arbitrary powers?

If I could be made to believe so, we would gladly support the Government but it is clear that these are steps being taken, not to protect the Guyanese people but indeed to suppress them. They must not have any understanding so they must not go abroad to study. They must not understand what socialism is and those who have graduated are not to be given jobs. People with degrees cannot get jobs because they have qualified in the socialist countries. We have doctors here who are serving, not very satisfactorily, coming all the way from South Korea, but the doctor from the Soviet Union, whose qualifications are recognized as being equal to any in the rest of the world, whose qualifications have been accepted so much so that the Medical Board has agreed to give her temporary registration, no. The Government fails to employ such a person.

But they do not want these people any more; they do not want these people with knowledge. All one has to do is conform. The puppets cannot tolerate any dissent. The puppets cannot allow debate and discussion. So they want to stop people going abroad. They want people to be thought controlled with one directed point of view; through the press, through the radio, through the pulpit, through the schools. But where are we heading? That is the point.

The Minister says all modern states have protected areas, have provision – to declare protected areas. But surely we are speaking of two different things. He refers to floods, to national disasters, but what is the national disaster we are talking about? When the Government slaughtered Amerindians in the area? Two Amerindians, a member of this House and a P.P.P. organizer who used to work in the area, were ejected. Are we being told that by their presence they would be prying on what is being done? Who would believe this naivety?

It is clear that the Government is using this hysteria about Venezuela, hysteria I call it, in order to build up bigger forces, police and armed forces,

in this country in order to suppress the people. This is what they are trying to do. Intimidate and establish a military dictatorship! This is what is intended. Do not come like hypocrites and talk of Venezuela when you are part and parcel of that conspiracy!

Let us see where we are heading. A bigger army, a bigger police force and bigger debt charges which are mounting and growing and which will invariably mean more taxation. Their own leader has already remarked about the necessity for greater sacrifices. Sacrifices for what! Paying taxes? For what! For more jobs? For better livelihood! Where is it?

The Minister says that they have the means to put down anyone or any group who attempts to destroy the security of the state. Well, erstwhile dictators in other countries have told you similar lies. Similar! In Vietnam, one dictator after another propped up by dollars and bayonets have fallen. Hawks like Mr. George Bundy who agreed to the escalation of the war are now saying that the USA cannot continue at the annual expense of ten thousand lives. We read in the papers one-quarter million Americans were injured in the war, ten thousand being killed every year. US \$30,000 million is the annual cost. This morning over the BBC. we heard that Nixon has said that it is likely that American forces will be withdrawn from Vietnam.

We see another dictator named Franco who ruled with blood and thunder for many, many years. Today, the students are revolting, the workers are revolting in the United States itself. Why is it that Nixon and company are changing course? Why is it? Is it because they love freedom? All of a sudden they have become democratic? No! It is because of the reality of the situation, because of the blow they are getting at home, in other places like Vietnam, and because of manifestations and confrontations.

Another dictator named Ayube Khan – ten years he has been holding power – basic democracy – yes, like your democracy, basic. But the preservation of democratic institutions – the latest word on him is that he has agreed to withdraw.

Next door Pengel, a good friend of the Prime Minister, has been forced to throw in the towel. The Minister said that there are all kinds of people who set dates and revise dates. We are not astrologers and time servers.

Why is it that the Government had to resort to such massive fraud in this last election? Is not this an indication that they are losing support in their own ranks? They do not want me to go to Canada. Go to students in the US and in the UK and elsewhere and see what they think of your Prime Minister and others. Ministers of the Government will do well to take note of these shadows which are casting their reflections in their path.

This Government will do well to have friends inside and outside of Guyana and try not to resort to high-handed methods. For we have seen, as I have just said, how others who thought they were even more secure, are now facing their masters – the people of the country. The late President Kennedy who once helped to put them where they are, who pressured the British Government to manipulate our electoral system and who warned,

and I will close with this warning, he said those who prevent change by evolution... I am not giving the exact quotation: "*Those who make a peaceful revolution impossible make violent revolution possible*". And it is not the P.P.P. which goes about talking about revolution. Today, the people of this country will be no exception. Block the gates, block all avenues, the human rights which are enshrined in our constitution and which they now seek to subvert and destroy, and they will only create the conditions for their own destruction. We are not happy. Because fascists like you will destroy your country. Further, you will not only destroy your country but will sell it in the process. That is why we are concerned and are opposed to any conspiracy as entered into with Venezuela and now used in order to subject the people of this country to further sacrifice.

Sir, we oppose this measure because the Government will argue about but cannot give a single instance of an emergency situation which demands this. There is no emergency in the country today. What is the reason? The Government claims that the country is peaceful and quiet. Why then is this necessity for taking on further and further arbitrary powers? Hypocrisy will not help the people of this country. I therefore urge the Government to retrace its steps and withdraw this Bill from this House.



## Miscellaneous Enactments (Amendment) Bill: 25<sup>th</sup> February, 1969

**Dr. Jagan:** I only want to reiterate the point about discrimination. The Minister yesterday referred to the security of the State and he told us about some individual who appeared on TV. in the United Kingdom and whose expressed purpose, as declared on a television show, was to recruit mercenaries to come and fight against the Government of this country. I do not think anyone would deny the Government powers to prevent such individuals from harming this country but we have not been told what television programme he appeared on; we have not been told who this individual is. This is the way the Government acts. Which television programme did he appear on? The Leader of the House says he was employed "*by the Rupununi Development Company, that imperialist company.*" Those were his words. Why is it that the Government has not cancelled the title for 24,000 square miles of land held by that imperialist company and given it to poor Amerindians? No; members of the Government will only talk about imperialism.

Government used its powers to eject this individual. Let us assume that what the Minister has said is true. As I said, one can hardly believe what they say nowadays. Correctly, on that assumption, they eject this individual, but we had another case concerning television also. The Grenada Television Company sent a telegraphic request to the Prime Minister's Office for permission to enter Guyana and to move about freely in Guyana. Listen to the ignorance of the fool! These people asked for permission merely to come in to pursue news which had been given to them, which they had heard about legitimately. What was the answer of the Government? Through the Prime Minister's – I do not know what he is called – through Mr. Pilgrim a telegraphic reply was sent, "*All requests negative*".

Were these people coming to subvert the State? Under what clause was this done? Was it public morality? Public Order? Public Safety?

We have just heard the last speaker saying that Mr. D'Aguiar was allowed to go to Venezuela. That is freedom. But the rebels whom the Government is pursuing are there and the Government can say that Mr. D'Aguiar's presence in Venezuela will be contrary to the public interest because he may be consorting with the rebels over there. He is allowed to go. We have no objection, as I said, to his going but, as my colleague has just said, students who are going to the Soviet Union to pursue courses in the theory of socialism are taken off planes. Are we not moving in the direction of control of ideas? This is exactly what it is.

The Grenada Television people were not coming here to subvert the Government or to start a battle with mercenaries. They were coming to pursue an election and we see how the discretionary powers of the Government were used.

Every day we read in the newspaper, the *Guyana Graphic*, where Lucian and others are saying we must trust the Government. But how can we trust the Government when we see in practice – even without a law – the arbitrary manner in which the Government is acting.

It is clear that these powers will be abused and will be used arbitrarily to attack the opponents of this regime, to deny them their freedom to move about inside and outside this country on the spurious excuse that the security of the State will be endangered.

This is a violation of the spirit of the Constitution; it is a violation of democratic practices even in the country from which the Members of the Government take inspiration, the United States of America. We ask these Members who prattle so much about democracy and freedom – some who sit on the back benches and know what is being done are remaining silent today – to speak out now. In particular we ask this of the Youth Movement of the P.N.C. which talks about the things they want and about their aspirations for the people of Guyana. These cannot be achieved, they can never be realized if one set of ideas are propagated in this country, pro-capitalist, pro-imperialist ideas, ideas which are meant to shackle the people of this country. That is all that this clause seeks.

If we take inspiration from the United States of America on as many matters as this Government is doing now in economic fields and in fiscal matters, why is it that the Government is departing from the example of the United States when dealing with issues which concern the fundamental rights of citizens? My colleague Dr. Ramsahoye has pointed out how in the last decade these issues pertaining to the freedom of the individual, the rights of individuals have gone through a certain course, first of suppression and now of liberation, so to speak.

I mentioned last night that the black individual – that is the term now used in the United States – Mr. Carmichael, who was denied his passport was eventually allowed to travel because of a Supreme Court ruling. Why then are we departing from this principle of democracy and freedom, from which we seem to be taking all kinds of inspiration on this particular field? It would seem that we must take all that is bad and reject all that is good. Soon the right to strike will be denied us. Anyway, I shall deal with that at a subsequent stage.

If the courts in this country had in them men who are not under attack and who are not afraid that they would be terrorized, perhaps we could hope that abuse of arbitrary judgments based on this law could be taken to the courts on the basis of denial of fundamental human rights. But we know that one cannot expect very much from these courts, padded as they are. The courts in this country are subverted. This is why it is incumbent on the people of this country to see that those who talk about subversion of democratic institutions should be pressed. The people must see to it that the liberty which has long been enshrined in the constitution of democratic countries and which we have fought for is not jeopardized by this autocratic regime.

## Debate on the Governor-General's Address: 26<sup>th</sup> February, 1969

**Dr. Jagan:** I did say on the last occasion that there is a great deal of hypocrisy coming from the side of the Government. In the Throne Speech, the Governor-General has certainly put this in proper perspective. I am not going to go into the question of its emptiness. One cannot expect the Governor-General's Throne Speech to be full of anything when the Government has no programme and is merely drifting along.

It is merely drifting along. But one has to be concerned because the future of the people of this country is at stake; and the Government has been making all kind of utterances that it seeks to govern justly and fairly and that it is seeking to create a just society. The Prime Minister said that elections are no elections unless they are fair. After the elections, he proudly said they had breached the racial frontiers; they had breached our strongholds in the Corentyne and elsewhere and the Hon. Member (Mr. Zaheeruddeen) who moved this motion said that there was a great swing because of the confidence of the Guyanese people on the achievements of the Government

It is only a while ago I received a clipping from the *Guardian* of 12<sup>th</sup> December, 1968. It is a letter written by B.C. Narayan claiming that he and many others who were registered did not get their ballot papers because obviously, they had Indian names. I will read a part of the letter. This is what it says: The caption is: "*Guyana's postal votes*" –

*"... Voting in England closed on the 9<sup>th</sup> instant. It has come to my notice and to the notice of a great number of Guyanese that those who bear conspicuously Indian names have never received their voting papers because it is presumed that they would be expected for Dr. Jagan. There is also the case of an Indian who pretended that he was supporting the Government's Party, and was supplied with a second ballot paper. I cannot but feel that this is a highly irregular procedure, wholly inconsistent with a truly democratic election."*

Perhaps this is not the point. The point is this. The photo static copy of the *Guardian* has a little cartoon - not put by the writer, no doubt put by the editor - and it shows Uncle Sam casting a ballot and it says: "*C.I.A. - X*". This is what your friends now think about you. Your friend the *Guardian* is no left-wing newspaper; it is no communist paper; it is no supporter of the P.P.P. We are told that the Granada Television company is prejudiced and they produced films which were meant to create trouble and to be mischievous. On this point, Sir, about people on the voters list in the United Kingdom. The second film was entitled "*The making of a Prime Minister*" No! No! Not starring Cheddi Jagan. They showed the Prime Minister walking and it says: "*The Prime Minister is now in London for the Commonwealth Prime*

*Minister's Conference. We doubt he has the right to be there."* This was the advertisement to the film. Let us go further. On page 19 of the script, the programme says: "*Sir Lionel Luckhoo has declared that postal votes could not get into the wrong hands. If there was no house or correct address, the envelopes would simply go back to his High Commission. But we found in most cases, no forms were actually sent to the fake houses and voters. The officials responsible for sending the forms knew which were fake.*" If these people were paid by D'Aguiar and hired by the P. P. P., how come all these brilliant scholars did not file legal suits against the Granada TV. Company?

I spoke already about the immorality of this Government. This is the kind of immorality practised in this country today. The P.N.C. did not breach any frontiers of our supporters. Let us look at the statistics for the Corentyne where my Honourable Friend, the Prime Minister, said they breached our stronghold. We did a breakdown analysis of all the districts in the Corentyne. Districts Nos. 2, 3 and 4 were combined. They were two districts before they made them into three. This is the percentage made by the P. N. C. in the whole Corentyne. In the No.1 area the P.N.C. increased by about 13 per cent, in the No. 2, 3 and 4 districts by 143 percent.

At No. 5 Corentyne, there was an increase of about 6 percent and at No. 6 there was an increase of about 3 percent. If we go to Suddie we will find an increase of 144 percent. I understand that he alone posted over 1,000 proxies in Essequibo for old age pensioners, people who have land in Government settlements, people who work with the rice development company. One man came to me and told me he lost his job because he refused to sign a proxy at the Rice Development Company.

Nos. 2, 3 and 4 on the Corentyne Coast are predominantly rice areas. Suddie is a predominantly rice area. And the P.N.C. gained an increase of 143 and 144 percent in these areas. What is the reality? Rice prices, as we were told by the Honourable Member today, fell by around \$5 per bag during the term of the last Government. The lowest price of paddy at the Anna Regina Rice Mill was \$3.14 as against \$5.19 under the P.P.P. What is the reason? Why is it that in predominantly rice regions the people have suffered? As my colleague said these were practically the only groups which had a substantial fall in their standard of living- the P.N.C. made such a fantastic gain of 143 percent while at Nos. 1, 5 and 6, Corentyne, the gain was only in the vicinity of 10 percent?

There was fraud, massive fraud, abroad and at home. The Government was thoroughly exposed in the first Granada television film which was called "*The Trail of the Vanishing Voters*". In the second film the company went back and reproduced some of the shots from the first film. Since Hon. Members are not likely to see the film, perhaps they should have a preview of what they have missed. I read from page 4 of the script where a person is being interviewed. Faces are shown on the screen. I quote:

**“Interviewer:** *I’ve got on my list a Barbara Curtis, who gives this as her address.*

**Butcher,** *chopping meat: Never heard of a woman by that name.*

**Interviewer:** *How long have you been here?*

**Butcher:** *About 15 years.”*

Then the next person is interviewed. He is a deaf man and has not heard.

**“Deaf man:** *James battery?*

**Interviewer:** *How long have you been living here?*

**Deaf man:** *15 years now.”*

Then the commentator states:

*“In our first programme, we hardly found any Guyanese voters at all. We sent out teams of researchers to check a sample from the 40,000 names on the official list of Guyanese voters living in Britain, the people who would be voting by post. In Britain we found 900 names and found few more than 120 genuine Guyanese voters.”*

Listen to this:

*“It was commonplace to find nothing at all- a voter called Gladys Foster was meant to live here in London – the house was demolished for the railway in 1874.”*

The vacant spot was shown. Then there was another shot and the commentator said:

*“Half the houses we checked in Manchester didn’t exist. Lily and Olga Barton were said to live here. But the houses had gone long ago, and two horses had moved in.”*

They showed two horses grazing in the pasture.

Here is a clipping from the London *Sunday Times* of December 15, 1968. The United Force had hired a firm called Opinion Research Centre. The man writing this story says that the error used in this systematic probability method is unlikely to exceed 3 percent. It is said here that, according to this survey, not more than 10,000 of 40,000 names are genuine. The Direc-

tor of this company, Humphrey Taylor, appeared in the second film too. This is what he said:

*“Obviously I don’t know what happened in Guyana, but so far as Britain is concerned the compilation of the register was a totally dishonest and corrupt operation. And, as we have clearly established, the great majority of the people listed do not exist. This I would think is unprecedented for a Commonwealth country, as far as I know; and it’s you know, a pretty awful and disgraceful episode.”*

This is what independent people are saying about your fraud. Over the last weekend, we heard the Prime Minister declaring that history will decide whether he is honourable. Over the last weekend, the Prime Minister declared that Guyana will be a Republic next year. Our stand on this has always been a matter of principle. We have always said that sovereignty comes and rests with the people, and not with a king or a queen, but when I said that in London in 1962/1963, the Prime Minister said, *“No we will have the Monarchy for a little while.”* There was no principle then and there is no principle now.

The only reason why he is seeking to make Guyana a Republic is because he wants to bypass the court in the United Kingdom, the Privy Council. You can corrupt and subvert the courts here, but twenty-five million persons have seen the film in England. All the newspaper editors know, there is no question of fooling them. We have seen in the United States where judges are now interpreting the Constitution a different way from the way they interpreted it a few years ago. Conditions have changed. The summary of the film showed that nonexistent persons voted. This is how they win; they could not have won by fair means.

We are told to bear sacrifices. The second film shows a posh car owed by Sir Lionel Luckhoo in front of the studio. A letter is being delivered. How many people voted in Guyana? Listen to this:

*“Sir Lionel Luckhoo, QC. is Mr. Burnham’s High Commissioner in London. In a statement after the programme, Sir Lionel said his office had acted ‘merely as a Post Office’ in the election.*

*Sir Lionel said his Government had in fact ‘provided the safeguards to foil’ any rigging. This morning, Sir Lionel delivered by hand to us, a letter which at long last gave the official figure for Guyanese voting in Britain, 19,000. This is impossible. Our most generous estimate is 13,000.”*

Then they went on to show in bold figures the picture in the States. Again, the same old story. This is in New York, the same house to house investigation:

*“We could find no 8 and 12 W 110<sup>th</sup> Street, because there were no even num-*

bers on this block. Raul Chung and Jane Knight should live here, but this is the top end of Central Park.”

“Oscar Hinds should live at 792 Prospect Place, Brooklyn. He didn’t. Instead, we found a butcher’s shop which had been boarding up for five years.”

A man who was being interviewed said this:

“I don’t know Josephine Grumbs. I’ve been the caretaker of this building for five years, and I’ve never seen or heard of Josphine Grumbs.”

Next, a woman who was being interviewed said this:

“No. I haven’t heard of a Margaret Young. I’ve been living here for 15 years.”

When you add up the genuine voters in the United Kingdom and all the rest of the world, they come up to the grand total of 30,300. The figures are, 13,050, 4,700 and 12,550, making a total of 30,300. Then the programme goes on: “On December 16, 36,745 overseas votes were cast in the elections. Inescapably, at least 6,445 were fake and that is being excessively cautious.” This is how they got a majority of seven seats. Through the overseas frauds. Through the local fraud, they got a majority of one seat.

So, the commentator said, the P. N.C. can legitimately claim, the Prime Minister and his presence in London provided, the local elections were free and fair. In the end, the commentator said that the elections in Guyana were neither free nor fair. This is what is said. This is why the Chief Elections Officer dared not give, according to the law, the list of proxies four days before the elections. Why did you not issue the list? Because dead people, nonexistent people, under age persons, were registered. This is why they showed a shot - the Government would not allow them to come back with their cameras - they showed a shot of Hugh Erskine of the United Force. He said in his Abary district where he lives, that at least 100 names on his local list of 600 were fakes. The name of the village is not mentioned. A journalist from Georgetown checked and confirmed Erkskine’s findings before the elections.

It is Peter Taylor whom you are hounding. Michael Duchin treble-checked this list and said 190 names were suspect. It showed another shot. He did not check the proxy list for Campbellville in Georgetown. Out of 57 names, a full 40 did not exist. “I checked three times in Delph Street but no one had heard of them.”

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** That is the man who came here by the name of MacDonald. That is the man who the Government claims was asking for mercenaries to

be brought here.

It goes on; *"Jagan's candidate, Narbada Persaud thinks 500 votes were faked in his area alone."* They showed a house in Berbice and they said a man voted from that house, but the records showed that the man had been hanged 15 years ago. At 53 Russell Street Georgetown - *"I have the sworn affidavit of what he found there from Mr. Rudy Luck, a Barrister-at-Law. Only 15 people live here yet the voters' roll lists 85 inhabitants. No. 53 houses a Burnham party office. Fifty-eight of these 85 were allowed to vote by the proxy."*

They went on:

*"It is my firm conclusion that the election inside Guyana was neither free nor fair."*

So they invite the Prime Minister who says before the elections he felt elections are not really elections unless they are free. We would like him to elaborate. They invited both Burnham and Luckhoo to speak but they said legal complications prevent them. The invitations remain open for a future *World in Action* programme. It is clear this Government has not won the elections.

According to what the Honourable Member, Mr. Zaheeruddeen said, the confidence of the people was demonstrated at the ballot box. You have rigged the ballot box. And now they are trying to put more burdens on the poor people of this country by inventing the excuse of Venezuelan aggression.

The Venezuelans, as I have said, have raised the whole question of the border claim because of American pressure - the same American pressure which helped to put the P.N.C. in office in 1964 and helps to keep it in office in 1968. If the Prime Minister is really interested in the welfare of the Guyanese people, as we are told, why not get this Venezuelan question settled? What steps have they taken in the face of Ankoko, in the face of the Venezuelan edict to patrol our waters with their Navy, in the face of aggression? They say they prove it all over the world. Why not prove it to the security council of the United Nations.

When they signed the Geneva Agreement, we were told that this football will go on for four years. Well, four years are up. We have had enough of that nonsense. One of the advisers is now a Minister.

Every pronouncement made in recent times by the Government indicates clearly that the Venezuelan Government breached the Geneva Agreement. Why is the Government afraid to take this matter to the United Nations Security Council? You will have our backing: We said that from the beginning. The Government does not want to have the matter settled neither does their master in the United States. It helps them, as it did at the last elections when they said *"Peace Not Conflict"* that if the P.P.P. should win, the Venezuelans will march.



They did this for electioneering purposes but they are under pressure from the Guyanese people. When the cost of living goes up your time will come. There are bigger ones than you –Hitler, Mussolini and others. Stalin died in bed!

As long as the American's have puppets in both places there will be no aggression. Assurance has been given to all the puppets in Latin America. If you had any understanding of politics, you would never have said that. If I did not sign it you would not have been there. Here is an article called "*The United States imperialism in Latin America*" dated May, 1968, published in London, page 28. The magazine is called *Peace, Freedom and Socialism*.

*"The Americans now have a new theme: there are no more geographical frontiers, there are only ideological frontiers. This is their new theme because, under the old theme when there were geographical frontiers, sovereignty was to be respected under the various charters. These were the cardinal factors of hemispheric corporation. But, now the Yankees cannot hold back the liberation movement one sees where they have got in Vietnam. Imagine the position of the puppet in Vietnam! He would not have lasted for two days had it not been for their 600, 000 troops and \$26,000,000,000 a year expenditure."*

Now they want to have a Latin American Peace Force. A Latin American Peace Force! The word peace should be put in inverted commas; especially since the landing of 45,000 troops in the Dominican Republic which was criticized by their own people, the liberals! They say: "*we will now get natives to fight natives; it not only looks better, it is cheaper.*" So they have embarked on this Peace Force. They are having a little trouble, for all the puppets have refused to fall in line.

My Honourable Friend who moved the Motion, Mr. Zaheeruddeen, now talks of Cuban subversion. Ask him about the letter he wrote in the contest for a free trip to Cuba, the land of Castro! Ask him of the letter he wrote to the Secretary of the Party complaining that the Editor of the *Mirror* refused to publish the letter! Political harlotry and trickery! Talk about Castro-ite subversion is to cover up bribery and corruption! That is not dialectics. Nine of them refused to toe the line in 1960, but, after pressure, only Mexico decided to have any relationship with the Cuban regime.

All of them are falling in line, and, on this question of the Peace Force, Brazil, Argentina and Paraguay have agreed to join with the United States military strategic line.

Why is it that the Brazilians are their friends? This is what Costa E. Silva said, and I will quote from *Peace Freedom and Socialism*, page 27, which states:

*"Any candidate in the 1969 national or presidential elections will be officially recognized only with the approval of the armed forces."*

Let us go on to the next point. We saw only a few months ago that the

former President of Brazil, Senor Kubitzchek was restricted to a certain area. We also see another President, Quadros, was restricted. We see in the Throne Speech, which we have been debating over the past few days, that the Government is making similar measures and taking similar steps to lock up and restrict people. As far as these puppets are concerned things are getting worse. As I said before, we now have overall sabotage.

In a recent article which appeared in *Newsweek*... Yes, I read all the papers; not only communist papers. The caption of that article is this "Brazilian Clergy" at the top, and "Nuns and Students Protest" in the last line. Traditionally, the Roman Catholic Church was the pillar of that country. The two others were the Military and the Landlords. The Church, according to this article, is now seriously divided.

In Columbia, seven hundred priests put forward a petition that the church would lose its followers unless she took a firm stand with the people. This is what was told to the Pope when he visited that country.

The situation is boiling over now. More so, we see evidence of this in Pakistan; in Northern Ireland; and next door in Surinam. This is why the United States, the puppet master, says that geographical frontiers in relation to sovereignty is now an anachronism, that it is necessary to construct a continental army so that when any of the puppets is in trouble and it is embarrassing for the Americans to land their troops, other troops will come in. This is the explanation of our new-found friends. The point I wish to make as regards our international (Latin American) front is that one puppet will not attack another puppet. The Hon. Minister of Home Affairs says that I do not know what I am talking about. He thinks he knows a lot because he was dabbling with law books. I will read from page 28:

*"The Latin- American armies are equipped with arms sold to our countries under plans drawn up in Washington. A large part of this equipment consists of World War II weapons. Modern arms go the so- called "tactical units" organized in all the armies of the continent to suppress popular movements. The argument advanced by the American imperialists is that it is the responsibility of the Latin- American armies to cover the internal front, since a war between the countries of the Continent is excluded. The United States will prevent this from happening, and if it does will regard it as its own war."*

I said that Government was using the Rupununi uprising as an excuse to militarize our politics. The Government is fortunate to have had this incident. It came into the laps of the Members of the Government like a blessing from the blue. But, whether it had come or not, this would have been the logic of the development of Guyana.

They talk about external aggression and internal subversion. This is an old theme which has been used since 1947 when the O.A.S. was created and in 1948 when the C.I.A. was created. It was because of the concentration on this theme that Latin American countries today spend over \$2 bil-

lion annually for what is called defence.

Everyone today talks about the explosion and coming revolution in Latin America, and we are seeing manifestations of it. Only today, I read in the newspapers where a Senator of the United States has said that the Alliance for Progress expectation of a 2.5% rate of growth has not been achieved and the rate has only been 1.5%. Is this the direction we want to take in Guyana? Inevitably, if you spend more and more on the country's limited resources for military purposes then you are not going to be able to carry on economic development.

The principle of dependence on foreign loans alone for development cannot suffice. Take a lesson from India. When the Prime Minister of India was here, she said that India's development depend on external borrowing only to the extent of 1/5<sup>th</sup> of her programme. Yet in November, 1967, when I was there the Indian Government has a delegation in Geneva pleading with those who had loaned her money to grant her more time to pay \$400 million (U.S) which has fallen due.

Latin America has reached this situation since 1956 when their countries were borrowing money to pay debts. As long ago as 1956, they borrowed \$450 million (U.S) to pay back debts amounting to \$450 million (U.S). We are seeing the handwriting on the wall. We borrowed; I think it was \$30 million, for sea defences. Now we are borrowing \$11 million for education. Look at the rate of interest!

Only yesterday there were some reports in the newspapers on these loans. I am glad to hear that I am wrong, but that is what I thought I read. There were two loans. Perhaps it was the other loan that carried interest at 6½ percent.

We see today that our country is faced with problems. I do not want to repeat them because we all know what they are. There is crime, delinquency, an exodus from the country, a brain- drain, and unemployment. The newspapers reported that according to a survey carried out by the churches; one- third of the youths cannot find work. These are serious things. How can a small country like this spend more money for the Police and for the Army? Has the Government done everything to solve this problem?

As for the problem of the so-called "*Venezuelan aggression*", are we going to depend on further expansion of the military and police forces? The border question was one of the problems which put India in the great debacle where she finds herself today. Not only is she unable to pay debts but hundreds of thousands of people die from starvation. India was saddled with a border question too. Pakistan was created. There was Kashmir. Yes, China, too. That is why we must look at these factors and see that this is not the road to prosperity and to economic development.

Simple things are not being done. One would have thought that in the first year after Elections – let us forget the fraud at the moment – you would at least have rewarded the people for voting for you. What hope is there in this first Throne Speech? No Schemes are outlined for economic develop-

ment of the country. The Minister is telling us some airy- fairy thing about Interior development. Let him tell us about the economics of the Agricultural Scheme at Naituma. Let us get some up-to-date figures. We have spent some money there.

As I recall, the Members of the Government accused us for hiding the Dumont Report but one of the things said in the Dumont Report is that the Interior, because of its distance, can pose grave problems. I am not saying we must not develop the Interior, but a reasonable economic approach to this question would be to carry on the most intensive development in the coastal areas where it is said you have the most fertile places, where population is already settled and where you do not have to form new settlements.

When we started the Black Bush Polder Scheme, there were no schools, no loans to build houses, and so on. Monies were spent on the Boerasirie Scheme, but up to now internal works have not been done. After the Tapakuma Scheme, the P.P.P Government wanted to start what was called the follow-up Scheme in the Pomeroun. Ask the Minister sitting next to you; he has coconut cultivation in that area. What can the Drainage and Irrigation Scheme do for that area? We were out of the Government in 1964

I am not saying that we must not go into Interior. In our time, research was carried out at Ebini and other places. It is the P.P.P. which commissioned a soil survey of the whole country. There are many areas on the coastland which are already populated. You would not have to have transport, housing, medical and all the other ancillaries for development. Ask the Minister about the Wauna Scheme in the North West. The Wauna Scheme in the North West is very near to Mabaruma. There are steamer services and still the farmers are having a difficult time.

What I am saying is has the Government worked out the economics of this Scheme, including transport costs? The Government cannot make a success of a Scheme which is near to a developed area, and yet it is going to another area further away. I am not telling the Government what it intends to do. Now it says that agriculture is the backbone of the country. When we got to the Bank of Guyana Annual Report we made the point that the Credit Corporation was not lending a lot of money, only what was coming in. The Government now says that agriculture is the most decisive sector. Just before the elections we were told that \$6 million will be given to the Credit Corporation. The Corporation has not got it yet; you have emergency powers.

I hope the Government will tell us something about industrialization. When we were in the Government we were criticized. We have not seen any real plans for the industrialization of the country emanating from this Government. Unemployment is serious. The supporters of the P.N.C. particularly want wage employment.

There is a lot of talk about people in the hinterland and that we must be great pioneers. Let us understand that those days are gone. These days are

not the days of the horse and buggy in America. We are living in a different age. It is clear that if the Government continues in this vein there are going to be further pressures on the working people. Further pressures mean greater dissatisfaction, greater disillusionment, a bigger Army, a bigger Police Force. This is the logic of the development of this country.

Let the Government take its own figures, the Budget figures. In 1967, 44 percent of the Budget went towards the bureaucracy. Last year the Prime Minister said that the civil servants cannot get more because it has already reached 50 per cent. In 1967, 16 per cent of the Budget went towards debt charges. Forty-four percent of the Budget went towards debt charges. Forty – four percent and 16 percent make 60 percent, and there is a remainder of 40 percent.

It does not matter whose debt it is, the question is: where is the country going? If you had not wrecked the economy, the country would have continued. You heard the Hon. Member speak about agriculture, about rice, and he told us how much the national income was for rice alone and what it is now. The position is this. Let us forget who created the debt because, obviously, I can debate that any time with you but I do not want to waste time. What I want to do is just give the projections.

I am told that the Government is borrowing money now while some debt has just matured. An equivalent amount is being borrowed to pay off an amount which has matured. Fifty percent of the Budget, as the Prime Minister said, is going towards the bureaucracy. The military police apparatus is going to be increased to 60 percent. What about debt charges? Berrill's projections of debt charges, when we were asking for a \$200 million programme in 1958, was that in the 1970s it would be 31 per cent.

This is the point. If the country was taken up entirely it would be generating wealth and the rate of taxation that is going to the G.D.P., and which is almost higher than anywhere else, would go towards development. There is no more room for you to extract anything from the people. What you are extracting in the bone. The handwriting is on the wall: 55–60 percent of the Budget will be going to the bureaucracy, 30 percent will be going to pay debt charges. We had "double your money" loans contracted - \$33 million; \$66 million will have to be found before nine years. What are we doing? Postponing the evil day? May I ask the Government why it is banning films and preventing students from going to the Soviet Union to study?

This is *Newsweek* of the 9<sup>th</sup> February, 1969. It has headlines – "Brazil's Angry Clergy", "Who in charge here?" The next stage of the revolution in universities is not against discrimination but about the question of who must teach. The students want to have a right to decide who the Professors are and what the books are. Here is a girl, a University graduate from Berkeley University, who has got a job teaching at Chicago University, but because she was relating life to economic theory, the theory of Marxism, they refused to renew her contract. May I just read from page 71:

*"Mrs. Dixon, an honors graduate from U.C.L.A. (where she worked from C.O.R.E.) is certainly an activist. Last year she organized the women's caucus from the New University Conference, a sort of post-grad S.D.S. for graduate students and younger teachers. Last November she stepped out of the inaugural procession for university president Edward H. Levi to join an anti-draft rally. But Mrs. Dixon also is a popular teacher among some students. 'A lot of people have criticized her for bringing politics into the classroom, 'said Barbara Greenberg, a sociology graduate student. 'But she admits her biases. You can separate what's her from what's in the book'."*

Then it goes on to the state the kind of teacher they need, because if it is a question of reading the books, they can read them at home, and because her employment was terminated, they have gone on strike. The first example of students going on strike for the right to say who must teach them and what the curriculum should be? This is the United States of America from which this Government takes its orders.

Our Government, in the year 1969, is seeking to control the thoughts of this country, to prevent people from going abroad. They smoked out most of the left-wing Professors from the University. There were Stewart Bowes, against whose dismissal the student body protested; Professor Horace Davis, Ph.D. from Harvard. There was a time when this Prime Minister – at the time of the White Paper and the suspension of the Constitution – said he was supporting the Mau Mau in Kenya and the terrorists in Malaya. He said, *"I shall proudly wear the title of terrorist"*. Today, he has mastered the name-calling of his masters. They always say we have a colonial mentality. Why talk about freedom and democracy?

I close now by reading this theme to the Prime Minister: He can reverse the course of history in this country. He has it in his power to do so. He can serve the people who have been deluded into following him. But Sir, this will mean a change of course. Even his masters in Washington, whose orders he is bound to take, are sniping at him. I have no doubt that the Venezuelan incident, their aid to the rebellious people, was either agreed to by the United States or connived at by the United States Government. The United States Government is still capitalist and it does not like it when its capitalist friends are booted out of the Government and the United States Government knows...

There is a lot of conspiracy between Venezuela, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. There are a lot of little conspiracies going on. These are the contradictions of the little conspiracy: some people are voted out because those who cannot fill their pockets through capitalist taxation measures or trade measures or tax concessions and have to find money in other ways.

The capitalist class is very sanctimonious on these questions; *"thou shall not steal"* is how the preacher in church puts it; he knows that it is you who raid the treasury to line your pockets, and that there will not be enough

left. Everyone knows that there is a lot of corruption in the country. Bribery and corruption! The Americans, while they are in control, are not happy that things are being managed as well as they would like.

They are not happy about this talk of decolonization and socialism and the P.N.C. youths still keep the name Young Socialist Movement. They do not like these things. So, to maintain control, they connive so as to force people to go, cap in hand, for some old, rusty, military hardware that they cannot use any more, second-class hardware left over from the War. They are going to the same puppet-master who sent help to Venezuela to send help for them. The time will come when they cannot tax the people any longer; even that has a limit, they will see why.

People are revolting in Pakistan, Brazil, students and nuns are marching in Surinam because they had their bellyful of taxation and guns; you cannot hold them. High school students are battling with police in Surinam, and then come the teachers, public servants. Yes those fellows tasted blood and they know what their power is. Fool them with a lot of half-truths and try to work up their emotions; try to give red herrings; but the Guyanese people are no fools. Today, West Indian students are not the same as they were in 1953.

When I addressed them a few mornings ago in Trinidad, after Rodney was banned, what did I find? I told them that if the student body had behaved like that in 1953 the whole course of the West Indies would have been different. But of course, the situation was then not developed to the point where you could have had that kind of action. Students sat down on the train line and refused to allow train to pass, they boarded it, went into the city, jumped over the paling to the Prime Minister's Office and to the American Embassy; and just because they saw the same kind of control which is being put on here.

Ban Rodney! Take away the passports of the two professors from Jamaica! Take away the passports because they went to Cuba! Paralyse Dr. Girran, the Trinidadian with the Jamaican wife, because he is no flaming radical, all that he had said is that the Caribbean is being exploited in bauxite for the North American Bauxite Company but we only get 4% of that income. Because he wrote this they refused to give him a work permit, and he and his wife had to leave Trinidad and go to teach in Jamaica.

My friend just read from Augier; he is a U.W.I. professor. I'm not concerned with his radicalism but of what he said. West Indians, Lloyd Best, Augier, Beckford, Jefferson and others whom they do not want, are all wanted by the students.

Remember when they marched in front of the Prime Minister's residence saying: "*Invite Rodney!*" Inviting every Tom, Dick and Harry from all over the world! When they said Invite Rodney — they said give him a job! When it suits him the Prime Minister demonstrates his power but otherwise he hides like a coward, like then he said that it was the job of the Board of Governors although we knew that all he had to do was to make a little

note, or even a telephone call, and that would be law.

So what are we preaching and encouraging is only a blow-up. I am concerned with the future of this country, my party is concerned with the welfare of the people, and we cannot see that a blow-up like this is in the interest of the people of this country. It cannot be. Look at the tragedy of Vietnam. It will take years to rehabilitate that country. Look at the tragedy of Nigeria. That Government started out by fraud under President Abubakar Balewa and the British manoeuvred to allow the reactionaries to rule Nigeria. Col. Ojubwu is leading the National Liberation revolt in Nigeria, but General Gowon is containing the Ibos in a Federation.

Today, we see what is happening in that country. We see the tragedy of millions of lives. The Hon. Prime Minister said that I am appealing to other people. I am not appealing to other people. Today, the world revolutionary movement is one. Their masters in America said: '*no more geographical frontiers, no more ideological frontiers*'. We have two camps being defined and Mr. Strokely Carmichael makes the cause of the black people in America his cause. In the same way we feel, too, that freedom is invincible. We had a right to appeal against the hypocrisy and corruption in high places and the people will not be silent. As they are not heard in other parts of the world, they will be heard in Guyana. This is inevitable and it is logical.



## Motion: 28<sup>th</sup> February, 1969

**Dr. Jagan (The Leader of the Opposition):** I oppose this Motion not because of what it seeks to do but because of the way it is being presented in this House. I think the Members of this House and the public should not be treated like little children and the Members of the Government should stop behaving like drifters. Surely we deserve to know what is happening in the Interior - this is a practice that has been going on for a long time and I have not heard of any change since this Government assumed office- there is exploitation of the Amerindians. The Amerindians have to provide fish, shrimps, and perhaps other things, for Government Officers who serve in the Interior whose salaries are banked in Georgetown and who live off the fat of the land when it comes to the Interior. A great deal is said of all the things that have taken place. If this Chief Interior Development Officer is going to stop these things that we hear about, perhaps...

Surely, we deserve to know, what is Government's policy in respect of the Local Government Board? Maybe it is an anachronism, but let us hear whether Government intends to scrap it. Why is there this piecemeal policy, the abolition of the posts of Commissioner of Local Government and Deputy Commissioner of Local Government? Who is going to be Head of the Local Government Board? Why is it that, in the case of the Interior Department, we are going to have a Chief Interior Development Officer and in the case of Local Government, we are going to have a Principal Assistant Secretary?

As the Hon. Member Mr. Cheeks pointed out, there are so-called specialist posts. The holders of these posts are people who have had a certain amount of experience in Local Government and Interior administration. Surely, if the Government wants to abolish the post of Commissioner of the Interior, why is it not being done in the same way as the post of Commissioner of Local Government? Perhaps there is some special reason; let us hear it.

I wish to make another point. I think this piecemeal method of handling the whole situation is not satisfactory. It is not as if the Government is approaching the job for the first time; it has had four years of dallying with this question. First, there is the question of the Local Government Board. What is to happen to it? The second question is; what about the Marshall Plan? I am not an expert on the Marshall Plan, but I believe that one of the points made in the Marshall Plan was that technical specialist officers will be required for the administration of the Marshall Districts because we are going to deal with some, so to speak, *de novo* larger districts. There will be more responsibility; therefore, more specialist officers will be required.

What are we going to do about the post of District Commissioner? Are we going to abolish those too or are the holders of those posts going to continue while their heads are chopped off? I should like to make a point

*en passant* - here is this question of the District Officers. That is why I said that this matter should have been dealt with as a whole. Perhaps the Prime Minister is too busy. I do not blame him for bring this alone, but other Ministers should have advised him properly so that this question could be dealt with comprehensively. We have been talking about development for a long time. Economic development, of necessity must incorporate local development and rural development, including Interior development. I think it is agreed that before we plan centrally we must also have local plans, and in this respect, the Local Officers are very vital.

One handicap which I found when the P.P.P. was in Government was that, in many cases, one did not get the kind of coordination one needed in the rural areas because the person who was supposed to be head of this coordination team, the District Commissioner, in many cases did not have the qualifications and thus did not merit the kind of respect from other specialist officers like agricultural officers, geologists, engineers, etc. Thus there was this watertight compartment in the rural areas. I refer to this because I feel it is very important we take the picture as a whole.

No doubt, the Government is going to give us more taxation in a few minutes and it will be important to see how the bureaucracy can be cut down so that the people of this country do not have to pay more taxes year-to-year. For the bureaucracy to be cut down, one needs to have an overall picture of the whole thing.

At one time we are examining the idea of dispensing not only with the Local Government Board but even with the whole District Commissioner system, to have perhaps, a Community Development Officer, not the little boys, the P.N.C. organizers in the districts, but a Community Development Officer of high calibre, high status, a person with perhaps an economic degree who knows about planning, who can bring about the necessary coordination in the different regions of the country with specialist officers in their own areas.

That brings us to the next point which is whether the time has not come for us to bring together local government on the coast and local government in the Interior. I am not denying the importance that must be given to Amerindian development, but here again it is necessary to look at Guyana's development from two points of view, what must be done on the coast and what must be done in the Interior.

Development has to take into consideration the whole country, the resources, the people, and so on, and thus it would seem we have gone a long way by trial and error methods. We have gained a lot of experience throughout all these years. The people have more or less grown up by their own experience in local government, both on the coast and in the Interior. And so it would seem that one needs a fresh look at this whole question of the Interior, of local government, of the development of the place, of these separate entities like the Local Government Board, to see in what way one can have the best form of coordination at the least cost, so that we can get over-

all planning done in the interest of the people and the country as a whole.

Sir, as I said, it is not that we are opposed to what is being sought but what we are really opposed to is the way in which this is being brought before the House. We read in the newspapers that an Interior Development Corporation is to be set up. No debate, no discussion, no consultation.

Make it like a fool. Continue to waste the taxpayers' money and then tax them more. This is why the country is drifting. This is why we are presenting that nonsense before the House.

The Ministers should get together and coordinate their activities particularly on these fields. I think much more should be done for the people of this country.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** Yes, I said this before but it needs to be repeated. They go all over, gallivanting all over the place. They have no time for coordinating. We do not want anything being done harum-scarum. Why do you not tell us about the Local Government Board?

## Budget Debate - Approval of Estimates of Expenditure: 13<sup>th</sup> March, 1969

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, we have been fully entertained by the last speaker and behind the entire emotionalism and the rhetoric, what does one find in the country today? We have heard a great deal about how much has been done; how much has been achieved and what the P.P.P. Government did not achieve. But if one were to take just a cursory glance at the Guyana scene today; one would see that what is being said as accomplishment is empty mouthing.

The Minister of Housing and Reconstruction (Mr. Ramsaroop) has just been telling this House about houses here and houses everywhere. But what is the reality in Georgetown? He speaks derogatorily about the disciples of Castro on this side, but in Castro's Cuba people do not have to pay rents today. What do the people in Georgetown have to face today? One-third of their wages is set aside for rentals and that is if they can find a house. One man told me the other day – an ordinary worker – that he has to do all the boarding up to get this room in an empty space. This is the reality.

That is not true? Go around the Breda Street and you will find people living in half of a bottom of a house which is not wider than 35 feet and the rental is \$72 a month.

The Hon. Minister has been telling us how much land the Government has been negotiating for. A house lot in the suburbs today is \$9,000. Any part of the suburbs of Georgetown - you just name it. A man telephoned me only this afternoon and told me that he had negotiated to buy a house lot in Prashad Nagar for \$9,000 and he and others were removed and one individual took the lot, no doubt at a higher price.

The Hon. Minister said that \$1 million more than the previous year has been given, but did not tell us how many big shots received loans.

One could go further. The T.U.C. Housing Project required a deposit of \$1,546 and a monthly payment of \$462. The workers – many of them are sawmill workers and the Government has enacted a Minimum Wage Order – can they pay this? One can go from housing to health, to education, and to other social sectors. In spite of the entire talk one can still see that the people of this country are ill-served. Their position is far worse than it ever was. This is the reality. Measure the cost of living; measure all the other factors, we see people now have to pay large sums of money to the doctors in hospitals in order to get attention. The Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Talbot) said it is not to be expected that the Government could solve all the health problems of the people. What is this? One would have hoped that the Government would have told us something new. A budget time is a time of stocktaking - the actual review of long term strategy perhaps.

About a year ago, the Prime Minister told us that there was a big recon-

sideration of the whole Development Plan, etc. That was a year ago. During the election period we were told that the P.N.C.'s hands - the so-called socialist party's hands were tied by the capitalist United Force, so the people must not expect all that had been promised in 1964. The Government's hands are no long tied. A year ago the Prime Minister told us about economic review; all that we can get from the Minister of Finance is a fiscal review for the future. We are always getting these empty promises - reviews, committees of enquiry, more and more.

Let us see where we are going because we are dealing with a Budget which seeks to put more burdens on the people of this country. Expenditure has been mounting. One does not mind taxation. One does not mind expenditure if one could see a general upliftment in the standard of living of the people, generally speaking.

We see unemployment increasing; we see crime increasing as a consequence of the high incidence of unemployment. We see other factors such as people being frustrated and leaving this country in larger numbers, some of them being very skilled people whom we can ill afford to have leave the shores of this country.

We have previously made our position very clear in this House: We are not opposed to the Government imposing taxation, but we want to be assured that this will result in the general upliftment of the people of this country.

If we study the Development Programme we will find in the Ministerial Paper appended to the back of the book that the Government had set out the contemplated spending year by year. If we add up the figures in the Current Expenditure for the first four years, the total comes to \$354 million. This is as set out in the Programme. Thus far the Government has spent \$105 million.

In the Development Plan it is stated that there will be a deficit of \$10 million in seven years to finance the whole Plan, and the amount will have to be raised by taxation, but in four years the Government has already raised \$58.3 million roughly in cumulated taxation.

It is clear that the people in this country cannot help but have a hard time and this is expressed by all lips today. In this same paper, on the subject of the very high incidence of taxation in Guyana, it is said:

*"More finance can be found only from increased taxation. But this is already very high. When the taxation- holidaying manganese and alumina projects begin to pay income tax, the Government's revenue will amount to about 25% of the G.D.P. The Government is therefore taking a very large share of the country's income."*

In most countries the share of the G.D.P. taken in taxation is around 20 percent and this is where the economy is generating in the productive sector not merely in infrastructure as we are doing.

A point which needs to be made is that when the advisers on this Plan, Professor Sir Arthur Lewis and others, recommended this Programme they said Guyana was already a very highly taxed country. They anticipated taxing the people of this country in seven years a total of \$10 million. We have had accumulated taxation amounting to \$58.4 million already, that is, \$58.4 million extra taxation in the face of excess expenditure amounting to only \$23.7 million. Where has the expenditure taken place? That is the next question that we should ask. The Budget Statement of the Minister of Finance last year mentioned some of the quarters in which additional money was spent – a bigger bureaucracy, the Police and Army, Prisons, debt payments. This is where most of the expenditure is going over and above what was planned. Here we see excessive taxation in order to finance a Plan which is not producing what it was intended to produce for the people of this country – employment, higher living standards.

We come to the Development Programme itself. We see that debt charges are mounting, not only the bureaucracy, but debt charges. This past year it was \$18 million. I note that the Minister has earmarked only \$16.8 million for 1969. Perhaps he will explain how it is that during this year debt charges will be lower than they were last year.

These two factors, a growing bureaucracy and increased debt charges, are becoming a millstone around the people's necks and that is why, in spite of all the bluster, when we come down to the social services- health, education, pensions, housing – we see the sad state of affairs in this country.

It is of no use perpetually going back to the past and asking what the P.P.P. did. Go into the markets and ask the people what prices they have to pay! Milk, which they were supposed to get free – and cassava, as our Prime Minister promised, was also to be free - is now 16 cents for a half pint of chocolate milk. This is in the advertisement. Why did the cost go up when you have dropped the price of milk paid to the farmers by 12 cents a gallon? My friend from the Pomeroun, Mr. Van Sluytman, has forgotten to tell us how the Produce Depot refused to buy oranges from the farmers at one time, how the Depot insisted that the farmers must put them in crates.

He does not seem to know that the price of milk has been reduced by twelve cents per gallon. Surely, the Produce Depot can show that it has a turnover and, because of this turnover, it has cost the Government less in terms of subsidies. Surely, you will always have this if you pay the farmers less for coffee, less for milk, less for citrus. Surely you will make a profit at the R.M.B. if you pay the farmers less and withdraw certain grades. There is no magic in that. It is no use coming here and telling us that you are doing so well. What about something you are running, like the R.D.C., where you have sole charge? You cannot pay up your debts and meet installments.

We have been hearing a great deal about what is done, about how much is being achieved, but the Development Programme itself is lacking in many respects. First of all, while expenditure has been going up in the current

Budget, not in the vital sectors affecting the people, it has not been keeping pace with what was contemplated. At the beginning it was contemplated that an average of \$44 million would be spent annually to finance the \$300 million 7 years Development Plan. But what is the position so far? If we include the walloping \$62 million this year, we would get a figure of \$132 million for four years, which is an average of \$33 million per year, and not \$44 million.

For the past three years, the Government has resorted to deficit financing to finance even less than was anticipated to be spent and, at the end of this year, deficit financing will be \$30 million. This is why we have to look at the economy as a whole. Government is resorting to borrowing from the banks, to borrowing short term. The result is that private sector investment is going down, as is admitted, and little money is going to the small people of this country by way of loans and so on. The Credit Corporation is merely lending out what is coming in, as is stated in the Bank of Guyana Annual Report for last year. There is no new capital, although during elections we were told that it would get \$6 million.

If the bankers have to finance the Government for deficit financing, there would be less productive expenditure. The bankers have a predilection for commercial lending business. Since the Government is not coming in to prime the economy because of the shortfall in private investments, we are going to find that the economy will be running down further and further. We are getting figures from the Government which, year by year, speaks about increase in the Gross Domestic Product. But G.D.P. figures can be very misleading and they do not always show the reality, as the Minister will have us believe.

The Government has said a great deal about surveys, that these are essential. Nobody is quarrelling about this. In fact, I would venture to say that the Government has not embarked on anything new even in the field of surveys. Let the Government name one Scheme that it has gone into *de novo*. The Minister told us about the forest inventory. This was planned by the P.P.P. The position is the same with respect to the soil survey.

What are the new services? The Tiboku hydro – electric project was also started. Just a minute, the Prime Minister does not do his homework, we can excuse him. Who brought the hydro experts in: a Dutchman and a Canadian who come from the United Nations? These hydro experts came here to do feasibility studies and estimate what is available in this country in terms of water resources. It is out of these reports that the suggestion was made that Tiboku is the Scheme which has the greatest potential. Yes, have you ever heard of a man called Smetledge?

Topographic surveys were necessary; other surveys had to be embarked upon, to be completed. This is what I am saying but, as one Hon. Member said, it is no use telling us about surveys. Didn't we get the impression during the election campaign that this Scheme will be embarked upon by this Government during this term? Wasn't that what the electorate was made

to feel, and not that this was one of the pies in the skies? In this report we are now being told that the hydro- electric development project at Tiboku will be feasible only if there was a metallurgical demand. Every schoolboy knows this.

If it had been only for domestic consumption, we would have gone ahead with the Tiger Hill project as Price Cardew and Ryder recommended. But we were talking in terms of our timber resources, wood pulp, which requires a great deal of electricity. But now we are told this is still in the dreaming stage.

What we want to hear is not surveys. The P.P.P. started out the survey because there was nothing before the P.P.P. got in. But it was not the intention of the P.P.P. to remain at surveys. That is not what the quarrel is about. What about wood pulp? As regards wood pulp and timber development, 70 percent of our resources are forest. What are we doing about it? I remember when I was talking to the people in the Forestry Department about doing an inventory; they said it would take five years to do it. I said, "*All right. Go ahead with an inventory but why cannot we get a few square miles done intensively, quickly, so we can plan industrialization for that particular area?*" We realized that this was one of the most valuable assets of Guyana.

The Cubans at one time told us they were interested in wood pulp to combine with bagasse pulp to make paper. Okay- this Scheme did not come through for reasons which are understandable today, because the British Government was not interested in such a project, considering that it was taking orders from the United States, which did not want any relationship between this country and Cuba. As the Prime Minister asked us, would the Cubans have been willing to take in more rice? Leave that on one side. Has the Government made any effort to approach the Cubans on this kind of deal?

We have wood, we have all kinds of mixed forest which can make wood pulp to combine with hundreds of thousands of tons of bagasse which the people have. We wish to hear about that, we do not wish to hear about surveys. The people in this country cannot eat surveys. We are not saying that surveys are not necessary. We must know what we have before we can develop. But, Sir, there is nothing new in this Budget indicating that we are going anywhere at all.

The agricultural sector – we have the banana project. That was the first balloon that the last Government blew. This has been pricked already. This is burst. As my Hon. Friend said, the most vital sector is agriculture in this country and \$40 million is earmarked in the development plan for drainage and irrigation. \$900,000, less than \$1 million, was spent in the last three years. This year the Government has lumped it all together, drainage and irrigation and everything else – sea defence, water supply- and that comes up to \$13.5 million. The bulk of that will no doubt be for sea defence.

What new crops are we talking about? Sugar we hear about, rice we hear about. It does not take much ingenuity. We do not need a Minister for



this. In fact, the Minister is a hindrance to the rice industry. What are we doing about new things? Soya beans, for instance, milk, beef. They tell us that we hid the report from Dumont. Dumont made mention that milk and beef are the twin areas in which this country should begin to plan. It is not as my new Member friend seems to think, that we did not want to develop the Rupununi – as he distorted it. It is a question of how and where. He may know law but as a Member of this House, he will take a little time to learn economics and the two are not always compatible.

It is said we are importing \$5 million worth of milk products every year. Yesterday, the Leader of the House (Mr. Bissember) said that we have raised the duty on milk in 1962. Clearly, this was a protective tax because those were the days when milk was flooding the place, being given away. That is why the Prime Minister said that when he got in, free milk would be given away. Certain things are beyond the comprehension of certain people.

What clear cut policy does the Government have for the development of this vital section of dairy milk farming, cattle and agriculture in the Ebini area? Research at the Ebini middle savannahs had been done even before the P.P.P. got in. Experts from F.A.O., experts from New Zealand and Australia, came here and wrote reports that with proper pasture management, proper control techniques, dairy cows, beef cattle and food crops can be produced economically. Where is the plan?

We are talking about capturing the trade with Carifta in Carifta countries, sending them agricultural goods because, in industry, we are not able to compete against them. As far as I can see, the scheme of things is such that they will be sending the goods manufactured from there to here.

Let us take agriculture. Cassava and sweet potatoes were coming from Barbados and St. Vincent to this country and selling here for between 12 and 18 cents per pound in the markets. They were coming from the Caribbean countries. I read in the papers that the Prime Minister said that we should develop the Interior and grow such things that will bear high air-freight and I think tomato was mentioned. When I was in Montserrat, I was told that they gave up tomato cultivation because the company which was caning was only willing to pay the people a penny per pound. The whole cultivation had gone down the drain.

Why did the banana industry go down the drain? Because we cannot compete against the small islands! Are we going to have industries all over the small islands? We are yet to see that. Time will tell against the pipe dreams of this government where Carifta potential is concerned. Produce crops here to send to the West Indies.

I repeat milk and beef are the areas which have been recommended, not only by foreign experts but by our own experts. Are we to be told, now, that the Government has no plans for the development of bananas, that they have no plans for cattle on a big scale? Where is this plan, if there is one? Aside from the internal market for milk, beef has a potential market not only in the West Indies but farther abroad. We find that in countries,

even such as the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Canada, beef prices are equally high. What we want is some initiative by this Government. The Minister of Agriculture should put forward, through the development section of the Budget, some definite Scheme.

In the field of industrialization what has been done? We hear that the Government has now participated in two Schemes – one is the Pegasus Hotel and the other is the flour mill. We have not been told to what extent the Government has participated. We have not been told whether we are minority shareholders or majority shareholders, but I would assume that, perhaps, we have a small shareholding. Was this the intention of creating the Guyana Development Corporation with their big bureaucracy there? What are they doing except putting some advertisements in tourist magazines showing how one can get cheap labour in Guyana, how one can get tax holidays and so on? We would have expected, by now, more from the G.D.C. in terms, not for participating with the imperialists, but, if necessary, of taking over and setting up Government-owned enterprises.

Of course, this is a new day of participation with imperialism, our dear Minister of Labour (Mr. Carrington) on leave from his presidency, now talks of harmony. There must be harmony – no industrial strikes! So in this harmonization process, the Government must also be a junior partner in the process of exploitation. Workers must not strike for better wages and working conditions least it not only affect profits but also Government's profit. This is the new stage, the strategy of this so-called socialist party in the Government. One would have expected these things for they were laid out in the New Road manifesto: that the Government, when entrenched in office, when they had their feet on the ground, would move on even to those sectors controlled by private enterprise.

Why have we not touched the other Schemes on which there were feasibility studies which people like Dr. Dar from the United Nations had made and which had been investigated later by the Guyana Development Corporation itself through their economist? Feasibility studies which were checked, crosschecked and re-checked were sent out to private entrepreneurs to set up industry; glass, cement, bicycle tires and so on. But nothing! No wonder there is so much frustration in the country today.

Is the Government afraid? Has not its hands been untied now? We were made to believe that it was tied by the United Force before. Then why is it that, in this Development Programme in this year's Budget, we have not been told of a new departure in the industrial sector so that jobs can be provided for the people of this country who suffer from such a deal of unemployment.

If the Minister of Finance, I believe he is in charge of industries now, will look through the files he would see that the P.P.P. Government had proposed to put into the Guyana Development Corporation, \$5 million for the establishment of industries; \$4 million of which was to be used to set up Government-owned industries. Considering that these factories could have

been had on a down payment of 20 percent, it would have meant that with \$4 million, the Government could have financed \$20 million worth of factories. One million dollars was earmarked for loans and joint ventures of the private sector that is the Guyanese private sector, not of partnership with Pegasus Hotel and Flour Mills. This is socialism?

Despite what the Prime Minister and other Ministers would say about decolonization, they do not intend to decolonize the economy. They would decolonize the fringes. Among those who are wearing light shirts now is the Prime Minister. This is a good sign. In another sector, we see that Mr. Sydney King is recommending to other Afro-Guyanese that they change their names to African names. He is also recommending that they abandon the idea of wearing European clothing. I am certain that the Minister of Information and Culture will tell us that culture is not only on the fringes of dress, but it is to incorporate the whole society, including the economy of the country. One cannot have economic and foreign domination and hope to have cultural freedom, and social freedom.

One has only listen to the radio everyday, which is under the control of the Minister of Information to hear what Ambassador Armstrong has to say on the programme called "*Thoughts against Evolution, etc.*" Yes, this is also culture and it is educational too. But it is clear that the Government does not want to decolonize the main sector. What about Garnett James the man who was in charge of the Decolonization Institute? Where is he? He is the one who heeded the Prime Minister's "*back home call*". The Prime Minister said that socialism is going to blossom out in the country now. Where is Mr. Garnett James today? There is frustration, corruption and nepotism in this country. We heard he has gone back to England because of frustration.

I hope that I am wrong. But whether I am wrong or not, the fact of the matter is that there is no decolonization of our country more so than it was in previous times. If one looks in the bank and insurance sectors, one would see that more foreign companies are coming in this country and the Government is joining with these imperialist enterprises, as a junior partner. What is most important for the imperialist is that there should be no opposition, as in France and Canada, to the economic take-over of their country. Because they see growing resistance, they now seek to incorporate local people, and better still, local government.

Recently, the Demerara Tobacco, and the Diamond Liquors Companies sold shares to Guyanese. This is a country which needs capital; but this Government allows Guyanese to buy shares in these imperialist concerns which take the money out of the country. We are not developing because we are taking orders; we cannot break out of the imperialist embrace.

Let us take the rice industry for example. One Hon. Member on this side in his speech referred to the large number of experts who came to carry out investigations into this industry. How many have come here to advise the Government about setting up industries and about going abroad to find

markets to arrange package deals?

This morning I heard on the radio that the new President of Venezuela Rafael Caldera was speaking with the socialist countries. We see that other countries are sending trade missions to negotiate agreements and aid with countries in Latin America. What is wrong with our Government? We have said already in this House that the Czechs and other socialist countries were willing to sell factories to this country on credit and to take payment in materials produced in this country. We cannot produce bananas, but we can produce soya beans. The Czechs told me that they were prepared to take unlimited quantities of soya beans. Has the Government brought industrial experts, and not only from the Western countries but from the Eastern European countries as well?

I was making the point at the suspension that now initiatives were necessary if Guyana was to move forward again, for if one looks at the Government's Budget Statement one sees a situation which is not by any means optimistic in terms of the future. If we take the field of private investment, since the Government is committed to a Programme in which the private sector will play the greatest role, naturally the scale of private investment is important in retrogressing.

The Ministry himself in his speech referred on page 21 to a decline in private investments. He said that private investment declined from \$80 million in 1967 to \$67 million in 1968. In the same speech at page 27 – I do not know whether this is a misprint – the Minister speaks of private investment for this year being what it was last year and the figure is cited at \$99 million. I do not know whether the Minister's homework was not properly done and as a result we see all these inconsistencies in the statement. There was a reduction, it is stated, from \$80 million to \$67 million last year and then we are told that the level of expenditure in the private sector will be the same as last year.

If we look at the Budget Statement for last year we will see the same further inconsistencies. I will read this section from page 8:

*“Since 1965 this country has attracted foreign capital – private and official- to the tune of \$102mn. In 1967 alone capital inflow reached \$50mn, some \$16mn higher than that achieved in 1966. In 1968, the anticipated inflow is of the order of \$44 million . . .”*

I do not know which figure to believe. If it is private and public, as the Prime Minister said, it should be even higher than the figures given,

The point I am making is this; if it is private and public, as the Prime Minister is reminding me, then it should obviously be higher than what is stated. We are told that investment, private and public, in 1967 was \$50 million whereas in this Statement we are told that private investment alone was \$80 million.

The whole Budget Statement is full of these inaccuracies and no doubt it has a lot of jumbled and padded figures, like the one which deals with the cost of living, namely, that the cost of living rose last year by two percent. Clearly that is impossible. There was devaluation and there was \$7.9 million raised by taxation, of which only half a million dollars fell on the capitalist class, with the taxation that fell on molasses and shrimps. The rest were consumer taxes.

As I have pointed out, we have not heard anything significant now in this Budget Statement. If there is going to be a drop in private investment, then the Government will make this up by further expenditure in the public sector, in the construction field. But this is where the Government runs into another dilemma; on the one hand, because of the loss of confidence in the Government, people are not investing; those who have money are trying to get it out of the country. Government, at the same time, must keep up the rate of expenditure in order to provide employment.

Herein lays its dilemma. It goes aboard to borrow funds and, as the Minister of Finance admits in the Budget Speech, these loans are not only tied to specific projects but they are tied in the sense that, generally speaking, only the overseas component of the project cost is met by foreign aid and the local cost of the particular project has to be met by local funds. We have seen the steep jump from last year to this year, because of the fall in private expenditure. Obviously, there is need for more money to be found within the Budget, thus the Government's taxation policy.

Let us see how this is mounting. In 1966, \$2.77 million in taxation, mostly consumer goods, fell on the people. In 1967 it increased to \$5.4 million. Last year it was nearly \$8 million and this year it is practically doubled again - \$15 million. If we follow the overall picture of what is happening in and out of this country, we would see that this will be a recurring decimal every year, and one excuse or another will be given.

Last year we had a development tax, a special tax on business. This year we have a defence tax. My friend says, "*I suppose that was working class.*" Let him take a fine tooth comb and analyse how much of the total taxes levied fell on the working-class people of this country. He has all the statistics, the statisticians, all the people; he certainly must have that information. It is clear that the incidence of taxation is falling very steeply on the working class because most of the taxation is indirect taxation.

If the Government was really sincere in what it said, it could have brought forward some new proposals in this Budget in place of the consumption taxes and the Bill of Entry Tax. Mr. Odle, acting head of the Department of Economics, University of Guyana, speaking of the kind of taxation which should have been imposed, makes the point - and I quote from the *Guyana Graphic* of Saturday, March 8, 1969:

*"The value of capital allowances granted in Guyana in 1965, in the terms of tax revenue foregone by the Government, was approximately \$8½ mn."*

This was the first year of the concessions to big business. I am not going to bring in the bauxite deal and some of the deals made with the C.D.C. and so on. From the first year of concession, 8 ½ million could have been obtained. So says Mr. Odle. He goes on to argue why it is not necessary to have this kind of subsidies for the capitalist class. He points out that mechanization has been taking place in this country, for instance, in the sugar industry. We saw it in the bauxite industry and these are the centres which, in some respects, are being subsidized. He talks about subsidizing labour instead of capital.

He makes another proposal: export taxes which he says could provide the Government with \$6.5 million. Last year we made a suggestion to the Government to impose an export tax on these products – sugar, rum, molasses, gold, diamond, bauxite, timber – which were going out of this country to Canada, U.S. and to some countries in Europe which had not devalued when the pound was devalued. We pointed out that, as a result of devaluation, the capitalist class was likely to make about \$10 million in extra profits. Last year we suggested to the Government that an export tax should have been imposed. Mr. Odle has taken up this point and he gives an estimate of \$6.5 million which could have been obtained from such a levy. Adding the two figures together, \$8.5 million in terms of capital taxes foregone and \$6.5 million, would give a total of \$15 million. The Government could have got its \$15 million in taxation – which let us say for a moment it must have – but not from the backs of the poor people.

Let the Prime Minister tell us that the Bill of Entry Tax and the consumption taxes are not going to hit the poor people, in spite of all the talk about black marketers and so on. We have already heard this talk of jailing the sharks. The Government is only trying to fool the people. Okay, we have argued on the strategic realities, etc. with respect to defence. Let us say that the Government needs the money. Why doesn't it tax those who can afford to pay?

Mr. Odle mentions another tax, deposit tax on banks – \$ 1.5 million. We are talking about decolonization banks. Sydney King wants to change the colour in the bank; we are not opposed to that.

Surely, we are in favour of that, but do more than shout about decolonization. Do something to stop the money, profits, and savings, from going out of this country. Then you will have the money not only to defend our country but to carry out a programme which will generate employment for the people of this country.

In the employment sector, Mr. Odle said:

*“What is particularly disturbing, however, is the fact that no explicit mention is made of the way in which Government expenditure will help to alleviate the severe unemployment problem (20%)*

*Now they have many more economists than when the P.P.P. was in Government. Any plan must also calculate what employment possibilities will accrue*

from the expenditure of funds. "

Where are the figures? Mr. Odle ended up –

*"The time for paying more lip service to the need for a reduction in employment is over."*

We hear talk about defence. All of this is weight and burden on the grounds of defence. Another individual, Dr. Richmond, former Member of this House, wrote an article which appeared in the *Sunday Graphic* of the 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 1969 on this question of Venezuela. The article is entitled, "*Aren't we being too nice to hostile Venezuela?*" He makes the point and quite correctly, that a small country like this cannot only rely on building a bigger and bigger army because we do not have the resources. Taxable capacity is limited and already taxation, as the Government's statement proves, is the highest in the Caribbean. Dr. Richmond suggests in this article, new diplomatic initiatives in terms of our defence. He says and I quote:

*"It is best of all to have powerful friends whose interests are served by supporting us. France and Russia could be first among them. To the best of my knowledge France does not have extensive Venezuelan investment. In addition, de Gaulle is always willing to extend his influence, and when this can be done at the expense of the "Anglos" the urge can be made irresistible. The advantage to Russia is too obvious to require explication. There are those among our brethren who go into intellectual paralysis at the sound of Russia. They will need to be reminded that the issue is the survival of disappearance of our country."*

If a one time chairman of the United Force, a capitalist party, can talk about new initiatives in the diplomatic field, surely, our so-called socialist friends can take some new initiatives. But no! When an estimate was produced to provide for new diplomatic posts, when we tried to find out where these posts were to be, the Prime Minister said we will know. He knew. There was no debate. Nothing! We heard it was in the West Indies. No diplomatic initiative. A conservative is more progressive than these so-called socialists. They do nothing.

What are they doing about resources for trade and aid and development so that we can get factories? They ask, "*What about markets?*" These possibilities are there to be explored and as I said, we have not explored them. When we talked about nationalisation, we had a member of the Critchlow Labour College, Mr. Sancho, going out the streets corners talking against nationalisation. Yet they talk about socialism and do nothing.

I mentioned that the new President of Venezuela, no socialist, belonging to the extreme right-wing party, the rightist party, has now said that new diplomatic initiatives will be taken. I have the *Newsweek* to 3<sup>rd</sup> of March, 1969, referring to the situation in Peru where a military dictatorship, which

traditionally is backed by the United States – and those Governments are generally put into power by the United States and maintained in power - has nationalised the International Petroleum Co., a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey.

According to this article, if no compensation for expropriated property is made, the United States Government under the Hickenlooper Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, can cut off aid and also cut off trade. The Peruvian sugar market in the United States is threatened but the people do not say, *“Because we are afraid we will lose our market we do not go after the imperialists.”* Even a dictatorship which is normally pro-United States does not sit. The article states:

*“The document signed with such fanfare in Lima last week seemed to be less a commercial treaty than a declaration of independence. The first trade agreement between Peru and the Soviet Union, it provided the Peruvians with a line of credit for the purchase of as much as \$100 million worth of heavy equipment from Russia. More importantly, declared Peruvian Foreign Minister Edgardo Mercado Jarin, the agreement marked ‘the end of an era in which our trade was channelled in only one direction.’ ”*

One direction, of course, means the United States of America.

In the Budget Speech, the Hon. Minister of Finance made reference to U.N.C.T.A.D. and its development. What he did not tell us was what happened at the New Delhi Conference where the countries were not prepared to reverse the trend of the widening gap between the rich and the poor. Something more fundamental should have been done at the last Conference if the poor countries are to get out of this rut – the rut of declining standards and increasing debt charges which creates the problems every year for additional taxation, as we see in Guyana today. Incidentally, the Prime Minister said some time ago that the debt charges that this Government has to pay now were what were contracted by the P.P.P. Government. If he refers to his own Development Programme and Ministerial Paper he will see that there is on page 7 of the Ministerial Paper a projection of debt charges arising out of this plan: \$2 million in 1964; \$4 million in 1968; and \$7 million for 1969. So he was not correct when he misled the House. But the Prime Minister is always accustomed to doing this type of thing. I do not know who is his adviser or who write these figures for him, but the facts are always inaccurate.

I repeat, new initiatives are needed on the diplomatic front, not in the same thread worn areas. A little bit more expenditure, not qualitative, but a quantitative change. Quantitative-looking judgments will not solve the headache because you would have a recurring decimal every time. Diplomatic initiatives are not necessary only for the purpose of defence as Dr. Richmond argues, but also for economic development which clearly ties economic development with trade for industrialization, and with selling



the products which you produce.

The Government's budget is getting bigger every year. The gross domestic product is increasing every year. This is like a big bubble blown every year. In Pakistan, one of the areas of the world where US imperialists had a foothold, my dear friend and ex- colleague (Mr. Burnham) when we were in India in 1953 told the Indians that the United States was causing them many problems by arming Pakistan etc. for ten long years. The whole world was made to believe that Pakistan was making great progress and it was an economic model for stability and prosperity in the whole of Asia and Africa. The *Daily Telegraph* said in 1967 that Guyana's economic development planning strategy was also a model from Africa

It is not use giving G.D.P. figures and how the rate of economy is growing at 6 percent a year. What is now coming out is inequality. Not only a gap between the rich and poor countries, but a gap inside the country because of imperialist domination of the economy. The gap is mounting between the rich and the poor in Guyana, Jamaica and many other countries.

We have moratoria. We have one and two percent soft loans, but as night follows day, the time comes when we will have to pay. South American countries, India in 1967, had to ask Aid Donors for more time to repay debts. As Pakistan is finding out that more than half of the aid has to be repaid as debts, so will Guyana soon find out.

Last year, the Prime Minister told civil servants that the bureaucracy was eating up 50 percent of the Budget; and now with a bigger defence bill etc., it is going to be more.

Let the Government give us a projection of the debt charges. What are they going to be as a percentage of the Budget? In 1967, when the debt charges were only \$15 million, they were 6 percent of the Budget. Last year the debt charges were \$18 million. Give us the projection and then we will see what is ahead for the Guyanese people. We do not want explosions as in Pakistan to take place in Guyana. We do not want such explosion, the harmony of the interests of workers and capitalists, and despite the need, as he sees it, to bring a law to ban strikes, when things get very bad for the people laws will not help. Ayub (Khan) had all the military might; but the time comes when you cannot shoot down all the people in the streets.

We were unpatriotic, as the Prime Minister said in one speech. The Government which beats its breast in the name of patriotism and nationalism is today selling out the rights of the people of this country. We are willing to cooperate. I agree with the Members of the Government when they say that self-help and community development and other such Schemes can do a lot. I agree, but you cannot expect cooperation and real community effort when you have discriminatory practices, when you have Schemes in which people have no confidence. Even your capitalist friends now do not have confidence in the Government. You are betwixt and between, where neither the capitalists nor the working people have confidence in you. Those who now have confidence will lose it as time goes on.

We agree with self-help and community development but see the difference between what is done in other countries and your approach to cooperatives and self-help. Despite all the ballyhoo about cooperatives, they play a very small part in the economy as a whole. They have a marginal role.

If the Government of this country had the confidence of the people, then we would not see all the huge machines on the roads. Never have I see so many huge machines making roads as I see now. You should have sent your Development Officer not to Taiwan but to People's China to see how they build roads. You should go to Tanzania to see. The Chinese are now showing the Tanzanians and Zambians how to utilize surplus idle manpower to build infrastructure schemes such as roads.

That is your dilemma. The Minister tells us about persons in prisons at page 71 of the Budget statement. He says:

*"Why should they not produce goods like chain link fencing, for the manufacture of which I understand that the Georgetown Prison has a suitable machine? Couldn't they make or repair boots and shoes needed for the Guyana Defence Force?"*

To whom is the Minister of Finance posing these questions? To this side of the House! To the people? Why did you not talk to your Minister? Or, do you not talk? Who is running this?

We have told this Government over and over that we need a Prisoners Earning Scheme. A Judge has sentenced one man to life imprisonment with twelve strokes. Is that a solution to the unemployment problems?

This Government is in a dilemma because of its bankrupt overall policies. The cost of living is going up. The Government will be perpetually plagued with demands for higher and higher wages, but that is not going to solve the problems either of the working class or of the country as a whole, because, whenever you go and talk about prison labour doing things to earn money, immediately the Trade Union Council and others say, *"What about our workers who are unemployed?"* and the Government sits in the middle and does nothing.

The Minister comes and asks, *"Why this can't be done?"* Let him ask his colleagues and bring the proposal. The Government is obviously inept, inefficient and corrupt. As I said, we will cooperate whether it is self-help or community development, provided the Government changes its course, provided the Government takes a genuine, patriotic, national, anti-imperialist course. We will give you all the backing. Don't worry with Dubceck, worry with Burnham. Look at what the Prime Minister told the people. He said, *"I promise equality and if, immediately after I get into office, if I do not see that there is no hungry man or woman, you can remove me from office bodily"*. Well, *"immediately"* has passed. Five years have gone. I appeal to the Minister to change his face otherwise like the Pakistan dictatorship; this dictatorship will be removed bodily as was said.

## Estimates - Head 1- Governor-General: 17<sup>th</sup> March, 1969

**Dr. Jagan:** The Hon. Prime Minister a moment ago indicated to the House that Guyana should become a Republic next year. He mentioned also that His Excellence the Governor-General will head a Committee. We are not certain what this Committee's functions will be, whether it will be to plan for celebrations or whether it will be to ascertain what kind of Republic Guyana should have. I say this because I have read in the papers that Guyana would be having the Indian form of Republic.

One wonders whether, for a small country like ours, it is important to have the same form of Republic as that of India. We know that, in India, the President's status is merely ceremonial with limited functions set out in the Constitution, and he is not the head of Government. We know that, in countries as large as India which has not only several States under a federal type of Constitution but which has diplomatic representatives of many countries, it may be necessary to have such a post distinct from that of Chief Executive; but it must be considered whether, in a country such as Guyana, where one does not have the same amount of work, it may not be more economic to combine both positions in one person.

I know that in the United States and in many Latin American countries, the Chief Executive, that is the President, is also the ceremonial head. He meets all the diplomats, he goes to all cocktail parties, et cetera, in addition to having the right to vote Bills passed by the Parliament

I don't want to go into it in detail. What I would like to know is if the Government has any intention of sounding out the people of this country – roughly \$54, 000 is being spent and, while this is a small but significant amount for a country like Guyana, one wonders if such a sum could not be saved. I throw this out for consideration: will they sound out public opinion?

## Head 4 – Parliament Office

**Dr. Jagan:** I would like to speak on item 4. The Government now has an offset printer and it should be possible for the Government to get out the *Hansard* much more expeditiously.

I do not know what prompted the Government to include in the Estimates last year the post of *Hansard* Editor. What is he doing? I do not know that it is necessary to edit *Hansard*. This is a matter of merely typing the *Hansard*. It is written by the Official Reporters, and getting them to the printers to get them printed is all that must be done; if we are talking of proofreading that is a different matter and that should be done at the printers. As I said, I do not know what the Government conceives of this person. The editor of a newspaper writes an editorial; what does the *Hansard* Editor do?

We find that the bottleneck is not here. If there is a question of a shortage of Official Reporters we should get more, but I do not think that the shortage is here; the shortage is in the printers. That is why we cannot get the *Hansard*, and, if there is a shortage there, I do not think there is a shortage of machinery. The Government should consider employing a second shift because machinery must be put to capital use; if we cannot get the work out in time then Government must consider the second shift. If more people are employed we can get the *Hansard* out in time and it seems to me that money will be better spent in the printers than to employ more people here.

I do not know if the Hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs (Mr. Bissember) who is dealing with this matter will give us some answer. What is the function of the Editor of *Hansard*? What does he edit?

As I understand it, whenever *Hansard* speeches are made here, they are typed by the Official Reporters and send for correction to each Member and, after these are returned, I presume it is then retyped and sent to the printery to be printed.

When we had the Hon. Member Mr. Eleazar speaking in here in the old days, I do not know if it was the function of the editorial department to put what he said into first-class grammatical English. Is that the function of the *Hansard* Editor? What is he editing?

## Head 17 - Attorney-General – Deeds Registry

**Dr. Jagan:** This is one of the Heads which I am concerned about particularly in relation to what the Minister had to say a while ago. He said that the object of this Head was for the Ministry of Information to communicate information through the various media of information. The radio in this country is certainly one of the most effective means by which people could be brought to an awareness of what is taking place in this country. If we are to spend taxpayers money on this purpose, is it to be used mainly to channel one point of view, and that is the Government's point of view? If the P.N.C. wants a radio station surely the Government has the power to give it to them. We hear almost every week one Hon. Member from this House speaking on a programme called *View Point*. Mr. Nascimento's name was mentioned. He was a candidate of the P.N.C. at the last elections. If we are really interested in disseminating information there are various points of view which one Hon. Member who just spoke mentioned - the various streams of culture - in ideology, in economic strategy and development strategy. There are various points of view, how are these points of view going to be put across if the Government banishes certain people. I understand that because of certain commentaries made during the election broadcasts Messrs. Miles Fitzpatrick and David DeCaries were banned from the radio. We understand that Dr. Richmond was also banned from the radio. We understand that Dr. Richmond was also banned from *View Point*. During the election campaign the Prime Minister used the radio stations; others used the radio to put forward their points of view. When I requested time it was refused. The other radio station was told that it was not supposed to carry any political broadcasts. It is therefore clear that this Government is using the radio stations to put forward its own point of view.

In the same way films are used to show Ministries opening this and doing that. Criticisms have been raised about the field of culture and that of sports. There are other fields. For instance, scientific and technical where creativity could be used to show people how to do things effectively but we do not see any such films. In the radio section, we see that only one point of view is heard. From the BBC., we know of controversial issues. It should not only be persons like Mr. Sancho who should get on the radio and speak, but possibly the members of the Opposition should have an opportunity, perhaps jointly on the radio stations, to give different points of view so that the public could be enlightened. This is not being done.

## Office of the Prime Minister and Cabinet: 18<sup>th</sup> March, 1969

Head 7, Public and Police Service Commissions - \$246, 431 - agreed to and ordered to stand as part of the Estimates.

Head 9: Question proposed that this Head stand as part of the Estimates.

**Dr. Jagan:** I should like to raise this question of the Public Service Commission as a matter of principle. I have had occasion in the past to raise the question of certain people who are qualified for appointment in the Service being bypassed and it seems that nothing is being done about it. We are told that those Commissions are supposed to act without political direction, to act impartially.

I have had on one occasion, when we debated the Estimates in this House previously, to refer to the case of a doctor. Doctors are in short supply in this country. All over the country there is need for more medical practitioners. There is no doubt about that. There is someone who has a temporary registration from the Medical Board and yet, no doubt for political reasons, the Public Service Commission refuses to offer that person appointment or to say that the person would not be employed.

I do not think this is good enough. Either the Public Service Commission acts impartially or we should scrap it and not have this country being burdened with all this expenditure. Now that we have a Public Service Ministry let that Ministry run it from there; let it be run from the Prime Minister's office, if the Public Service Commission is to be run on directions from the Prime Minister's office.

Another point on principle which I should like to raise is the question of the Chairman of the Public Service Commission. I am not being personal by any means. I understand the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, who is paid a fairly substantial salary, has other interests. I think he is the senior partner of a firm and I am wondering whether a man who is to be a full-time officer of the Commission can perform his duties satisfactorily when he serves in another capacity elsewhere.

As I have said, I do not have anything personal against the individual concerned, but I raise it as a matter of principle, because I do not think it is right that certain persons should hold a big job in the Public Service and at the same time hold other positions privately which take up much of their time. I do not know to what extent these other interests may have any bearing, for instance, in his public functions as Chairman of the Commission.

I again repeat I am not raising this on a personal basis, but as a matter of principle. I think the Government should look into this matter and wherever possible sees that these things do not happen in this country.

The Hon. Prime Minister suffers from a lapse of memory. He comes here with hand on heart and says that he does not issue instructions and this

body is an independent body, etc. Perhaps he should be reminded that he made the observation, which was in public print and which was brought to the attention of the Commission, that no one, so long as he is Prime Minister of this country and has anything to do with this Government, who has been on a P.P.P. scholarship will get a job in the Public Service. It is all well to say all the niceties between registration and employment. The fact of the matter is that the Public Service Commission is carrying out the Government's instructions in this matter. Let us be rid of it. Let them run the Public Service through the Prime Minister's Office and let us save the taxpayers' money.

We heard the criticism about pensioners working in other places, the comment being made that people are unemployed today and pensioners are getting work and so on. Are we to get people mainly to carry out the Prime Minister's orders and pay them \$10,320 a year, and then they earn maybe \$10,000 more in other jobs? How can they do their jobs properly? Of course, because they carry out instructions, then they can take a long time. They can do what they like.

That is why this whole county is so corrupt today because of the kind of example which the Government is setting. The Prime Minister says the individual concerned can practice privately. He does not know but a temporary registration was given to this individual by the Medical Board only permits her to work in a recognized medical institution and because the Government refuses to employ her in the hospital, other instructions take the cue. They do not want to offend the Prime Minister.

In the case of the others - agronomists, engineers, etc., - they are told their degrees have been evaluated. In this case where there is an evaluation, the Public Service Commission, in my presence, told her the moment she got registration she would get the job. But now we are told, "*We do not know whether she has the kind of degree or kind of suitability for employment.*" Why does not the Public Service Commission tell the individual concerned, "*We cannot employ you?*" But it keeps silence three years in the matter.

Hypocrisy is not going to solve our problem. The Prime Minister must come out straight. The person concerned cannot practice privately. If the Government does not want to give her employment, then it must give her the right to be able to practice privately. Let the Government amend the law. The Prime Minister makes the statements in here, appearing to be always neutral. The fact of the matter is he is blocking these appointments and the Public Service Commission is carrying out his instructions. That is why I say these things must go.

## Division VI - Public Service Ministry

**\$300,000 agreed to and ordered to stand as part of the Estimates.**

**Dr. Jagan:** I wonder whether the Hon. Minister will let us know what was intimated in the Budget statement, whether the Government in fact will be participating in the flour mill and also in the Pegasus Hotel. Will the Hon. Prime Minister inform the House, what is the extent of the Government's participation through this Corporation in the Pegasus Hotel and the flour mill, what are the conditions, etc.? That is what you said in the Budget statement.



## Division VIII - Ministry of Economic Development

Head 14, \$355,135 agreed to and ordered to stand as part of the Estimates.

Question proposed that Division VIII stand as part of the Estimates.

**Dr. Jagan:** I wish to make a correction to what the Prime Minister said that there were no surveys and levels taken. The Hon. Prime Minister must be excused but then there he must not speak out of turn on things he does not know about. The Tiger Hill project was surveyed by the Demerara Bauxite Company and they turned over all ahead with that hydro- electric project. That is the Preece, Cardew and Rider Report. I just state this for the information of the Prime Minister.

The Hon. Members on the Government side will not be so uneconomical as to go over and resurvey an area which was done by competent persons already because the kind of people they are hiring are the same kind of people who have done the survey before.

The point I am making is that Preece, Cardew and Rider said it would be most economic for the Government to tie in the Tiger Hill hydroelectric project with the steam plants; to purchase one, which we did when we bought the electricity undertaking and not to proceed with the mire steam plants, to supplement with cheap electricity power from Tiger- Hill.

We appreciate the point and this was why the P.P.P. Government agreed with the idea of carrying out surveys because it was thinking of industrial purposes beyond domestic lighting. The Government now seems to be indicating that it has no bird in hand in terms of industrial usage for the Tiboku Project, so it may want to consider the point my Hon. Friend is making about the development of Tiger Hill because it would then be much cheaper.

We want to know if the Government has any industrial Schemes- whether wood pulp, aluminium smelting, and so on – what are the possibilities, and when we are likely to get these. I remember when the Hon. Prime Minister was in Canada he said that an aluminium company was interested and Mr. Thomas, who was then Minister of Economic Development, contradicted him. Perhaps that was the reason why his head was rolled. As the Prime Minister said, God forgives but does not forget.

We would like specific information because we do not want to keep buying. Plans are seen; probably we will hear that they are coming from the U.S.A. and they will have to pay, as industries are now complaining that they are being called upon to pay 25 percent more on the prices. We are not opposed to taxation. We are talking about unnecessary costs to industry which will make industrialization uneconomical in this country.

\$4,475,000 agreed to and orders to stand as part of the Estimates.

## Head 19 - Ministry of Home Affairs

### Question that the Head stand as part of the Estimates

**Dr. Jagan:** The Hon. Minister, in trying to defend the work of the Election Commission, certainly has given this House the wrong impression of what was done. He knows, as one of the early Members of that Commission, that for many months the Chairman and the other Members of the Commission were merely twiddling their thumbs doing very little.

It was not that they did not want to do something but they were not allowed to do what they were supposed to do by law. The Minister knows about this. He has seen the letter which the Chairman wrote to the Minister complaining that, in the early stages, the Commission was not allowed to participate in the compilation of the voter's list. He knows that the then Minister told the Chairman that the Commission will function when the election legislation empowering them to operate was passed. He knows all of this.

He knows also that the Chairman and the P.N.C. Member voted on one side and the U.F. members and the P.P.P. Member voted on the other side to have the list revised.

But you know about that. The Chairman used his casting vote to prevent this from being done. Everyone knows that the list was corrupt. It contained the names of dead people, people who were under age and many others who did not even exist.

If the Commission is working so well, why has the Chairman of the Commission refused to make available to another Member of the Commission the proxy list which was supposed to be made available and published four days before voting day? Why tell us that we have to vote money, that this is a statutory body and it has statutory functions, etc.? This is all to fool the world. The reality is that this Commission was not allowed to function in the early stages when the Chairman wanted it to function and later on he was muzzled.

This Government operates on the basis of coercion and bribery. Those whom it cannot bribe it pushes with bayonets at; it pushes them against the wall, and others they bribe with \$ 1,000 per month. We had a case this afternoon.

I would not use that word but we have to call a spade a spade in this country and stop beating around the bush because people in high places are being corrupted today and, had it not been for these big salaries, it is likely that these people would behave morally, justly, according to the positions in which they are put. This is why these big sums of money are voted.

They are quack politicians. Let us assess if these are statutory positions, if these are constitutional positions. Let us find out whether the salary be-

ing paid is commensurate with the job that is being done. This year and the coming year there will be no elections. What will be the job of the Commission? Does the job of the Chairman deserve a salary of \$1,000 per month and the other Members \$250 per month?

Yes, and for your information, it is given to the party, the P.P.P., of which she is General Secretary. It is not used for corrupt purposes.

As I said this afternoon, let us dispense with all the paraphernalia which goes with the pretence of respecting the Constitution and at the same time save the taxpayers the money. If the Government wants to run all the things as it doing on orders from the Prime Minister's Office and indirect orders from other Ministers, then everybody will know exactly how the country is run. We are not fooling anybody. We do not see that it is necessary to spend this amount of money for functions which are not very large, for work which does not take too much time.

Consequently, we feel that the Government should reconsider the salaries attached to these posts, because, as I have said already, big salaries tend to corrupt people in this country, especially people in these big positions.

Before we turn to Subhead 1, I should just like to ask a question under Subhead 3, Miscellaneous. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the amount set out under this Subhead includes compensation paid to dependent off a person who dies by accident in his service in the Army. I do not see any other Subhead dealing with this aspect of the matter, apart from Funeral Expenses. In my view, if a person whilst in the Army and in active service dies as a result of an accident, his family is due compensation.

Looking at the Estimates over the past few years, I notice that under this Subhead the actual amount spent in 1966 was \$2,173; the actual amount spent in 1967 was \$1,708; and in 1968 the revised estimate was \$4,000; and this year the Government is asking for an amount of \$1,000 only. Does the Government contemplate that there would be less Funeral Expenses this year?

#### **Item (1), Subhead 1.**

I am rather surprised at the inclusion of the votes for the Chairman and Members of the Elections Commission. It may be convenient to deal with these two items together with Subhead 9 - Expenses in connection with the Elections Commission; one would find that the Government intends to spend a total of \$41,000 with respect to the Elections Commission.

Your Honour, we have seen during the last election that there was some dispute between the Government and the Opposition as to the functions of the elections Commission.

*"The Elections Commission shall have such functions connected with or relat-*

*ing to the registration of electors or the conduct of elections as are conferred upon it by under this Constitution”.*

The registration of voters, as you well know, for the last election was not done under the supervision or control of the Elections Commission. The Commission itself had nothing to do with the conduct of the election. There was some dispute as to the interpretation of article 69 (1) of the Constitution.

We on this side of the House interpreted it to mean that the Elections Commission should have had the right to consider persons who were qualified to be electors and they should also have been entitled to deal with questions of claims and objections of persons entitled to vote at an election. Apart from that, we also found that persons were registered abroad although the Chairman of the Elections Commission had said that he knew nothing about what was happening. Our view was that the Elections Commission should have had a right to deal with all these aspects of registration.

Apart from that, the Elections Commission had nothing to do with the elections. The Government, in our view and in our interpretation of the Article, eroded the functions of the Elections Commission. On the other hand, the Government's interpretation of article 69 (1) is that the Elections Commission is just there to see that the registration is done by the Government, that the Government would go ahead and select registrars to do the work. We do not know what are the functions of the Chairman and Members of the Elections Commission.

The Hon. Minister of Home Affairs (Mr. Hoyte) was at one time a Member of the Elections Commission and I think he will agree with me that the Elections Commission had nothing whatsoever to do with respect to the registration of voters or with the question as to who were entitled to be electors at the last election. The Commission had nothing whatsoever to do with the question of selecting persons who were selected eventually as election agents and deputy agents, and with persons who were employed at the polling stations.

Mr. Chairman, if the Government's argument is correct, that this Elections Commission does not have any real duty to perform in respect of the election, we on this side of the House feel that this is a waste of the taxpayers' money to pay the Chairman the sum of \$1,000 a month and Members of the Commission, \$250 a month. Apart from that, as I said, there is an extra \$20,000 with respect to the expenses of the Elections Commission. The provision dealing with the payment of the Elections Commission is contained in article 68 (1) of the Constitution. I remember when I dealt with the question during the Budget debate, the Hon. Prime Minister asked whether the Constitution makes provision that there should be an Elections Commission and whether we wish that the Commission should not be appointed. If the Commission's duty is that as the Government contends,

then we contend that the Government should not reappoint the Elections Commission. It should go out of office three months after the last General Election.

My interpretation of article 68 (1) is that there shall be an Elections Commission and it should not be appointed within three months of the last election but nothing is said therein that the Government is forced to appoint the Elections Commission at the expiration of the three months. My submission is that there would not be in the near foreseeable future any duty for the Elections Commission to perform. There should not be a General Election until five years from the last General Election unless the Government thinks fit to resign and call another General Election. Knowing the Members of the Government, I do not see that they would like to do that but in fact, they might try to extend the period of their time.

That being apart, can the Minister tell us what would be the duty of the Elections Commission say within this year. It is not like a Boundaries Commission, which has the duty of deciding on shift boundaries where a country is divided into constituencies. We do not have constituencies and therefore I can see no necessity for the reappointment of the Chairman of the Elections Commission immediately, since I do not foresee any work that they would do within the next years.

In 1967, the Government spent \$3,223; in 1968, the approved estimate was \$2,400 but the actual revised estimate for 1968 was \$2,763. Here, again, we see there is need for two more watchmen, May I ask the Minister, if in 1966, in 1967, and in 1968, the Government spent more than \$2,400, why it is that the Government is now working for only \$2,400?

May I be permitted to deal with item 22 at the same time? Normally, if the Government was spending this extra sum for overtime, I could understand. I note that there is a separate item dealing with overtime, but I think that overtime should be added to item 19; maybe the Minister could give an explanation.

My understanding of the Standing Order is that even if a matter is *sub judice* a person should still be able to refer to it in the House if it does not prejudice the interests of the parties thereto.

Mr. Chairman, the Attorney- General some time ago made great play about the International Commission of Jurists. If I remember correctly that Commission recommended the proportion in which people should be recruited to the Police Force according to ethnic grouping. I have seen that there are quite a number of new posts to be created. First of all, I wish to find out from my good friend the Hon. Minister whether in the past Government carried out the recommendation of the International Commission of Jurists and whether Government will also take those recommendations into account when the new batch of persons are to be recruited.

I hope also that my learned and Hon. Friend will advise his Police Force as to some of their duties in respect of rights of citizens. A few months ago we saw that persons were arrested, kept for nearly 24 hours, released and,

as soon as they get to the street, re-arrested, kept for another 24 hours and so on. In one case the person was detained for over 3 or 4 days and when the Police heard that *habeas corpus* proceedings were about to be launched they said, "*Don't worry to institute proceedings, we have decided to release him.*"

Surely the Police are abusing their powers in arresting people on the pretence that a crime has been committed and then, when they are treated with litigation, they decide to release such persons? We have no objection, if a person has committed an offence that he should be charged and prosecuted, but we do not think that people should be persecuted because they belong to a particular political party.

During the debate on the Miscellaneous Enactments (Amendment) Bill a few weeks ago, some members of the People's Progressive Party were arrested for on the very minor charge of disorderly behaviour. Those persons were taken to the Police Station, Brickdam, where their photographs were taken on three occasions. They were refused bail, and taken to Court on the following morning handcuffed. The Senior Superintendent of Police in giving evidence on these matters said that during his long period in the Force his experience was that no photograph was ever taken of anyone who was charged with the minor offence of disorderly behaviour. There was no question that these persons were violent during the morning when they were taken to the Court and therefore were required to be handcuffed. This should not be done to persons because they belong to a political party; the Police should consider the offence for which people are charged and should treat them as citizens regardless of what particular party they belong to.

One other item I wish to refer to: A few weeks ago I had referred to the question that citizens cannot sue the Government where a tort has been committed by the Government. The Hon. Prime Minister said he was quite aware of the drawbacks of private citizens and Government would try to rectify this as soon as an opportunity was available because the Law Officers are now tied up with preparation of other legislation. Until the position is rectified so that a private citizen can sue the Government on a question of tort, where a tort has been committed, I wonder whether the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs would not consider it advisable to recommend to the Government that when police vehicles are involved in accidents and private citizens are injured or killed, then the Government should try to compensate the person who was injured or the deceased who died as a result of the accident.

The practice right now is that one has to go to the Attorney-General's Chambers and negotiate a settlement with the Officers and the person has to accept whatever the Attorney-General's Chambers offers, regardless of the amount that would have been rewarded in a Court of Law.

In view of the fact that Government vehicles are not insured and therefore a private citizen, who is injured as a result of an accident involving a Government vehicle, cannot be compensated - we have seen lately that quite

a number of persons have been injured by Police vehicles the Government should undertake to compensate these people. Also, if the person takes the Servant of the Crown to court and judgment is awarded against the Servant of the Crown; does Government not consider it advisable and equitable that it should identify the Servant of the Crown so that the injured person does not lose anything?

## Approval of Estimates 1969 Budget Debate: 20<sup>th</sup> March, 1969

**Head 31, Ministry of Trade - \$167, 813, agreed to and ordered to stand as part of the Estimates.**

**Dr. Jagan:** I just want to ask a few questions. From 1966 to 1968 the sum of \$90,000 was spent. Could the Minister tell us where these development sites for tourist attraction are? How many tourists visited these sites during the last three years? I should also like to know how much money was spent on these sites and how many tourists actually visited these sites.

### **Head 32- Ministry of Communication**

**Dr. Jagan:** There has been a grave violation of the rights of the people of Guyana. The Government has taken to looking into people's personal business- I mean telephone tapping, opening of mails and so on. This has been admitted by the Government in a recent statement. This is a very dangerous practice and the Government must give an undertaking to the country at large that will cease. I do not know if this is still going on.

**Head 33- Ministry of Communications – Post Office - \$2,566,420 agreed to and ordered to stand as part of the Estimates.**

**Dr. Jagan:** It would seem to me that, with some additional staff even if done on a part-time basis, there are many persons in Guyana who are unemployed at the moment who could be taken on by the Government to work if a second shift is necessary.

The same machinery could be used fully so that at this work could be brought up to date and as soon as it is brought up to date then, if necessary, the printers could go back to its one shift arrangement. Aside from *Hansard* we have Reports from Government Departments which are also late in coming before the House; again, the usefulness of these Reports is lost when they are so old. Members of this House will be able to give a better contribution and constructive criticism; they could if they have the Reports for 1965 and 1966 as well as for 1967 and 1968 to know the latest position.

Many times I would like to read the Report but when they are old one puts them aside. Is it not possible to get this work done expeditiously? It is no use telling us that there is an improvement on what it done before.

**Mr. Bissember:** You do not like to hear that.



**Dr. Jagan:** The Government is supposed to have expanded this department and we all know the difficulties which face the Government in connection with strikes and so on when a lot of work could not be done.

But now you have peace, you have tranquillity and order. Let us hear why it is not possible to bring these things up-to-date and so on when a lot of work could not be done.

## Approval of Estimates of Expenditure: 24<sup>th</sup> March, 1969

### Budget Debate: Head 12 – Ministry of External Affairs - Appropriation

**Dr. Jagan:** As I look at this Estimate I note an increase in this Head from roughly \$1½ million to \$2¼ million. The question which this House and the people of this country should ask is whether this country is getting value for the money.

We see expenditure on various Heads going up, more personnel, more money for entertainment, more money for this, more money for that, but what is the sum total effect? I do not think we can say that this country has got very much for all this expenditure. Perhaps the P. N. C. has gained. No doubt that is the reason why we have an increase from 11 Assistant Secretaries to 16. Many of these persons have gone around doing P. N. C. work. Many of them were rigging at the last Elections.

There is nothing to laugh about. Pat Thierens, John Seymour- most of these people were in charge of the Elections abroad. It is clearly established now that they have rigged the Elections. They were responsible for sending out the ballot papers. In the second Granada Television film the observation was made that the offices knew which of the voters were nonexistent for ballot papers did not go to them. Pat Thierens is the brother of the ex- Minister of Education. How long are the taxpayers to pay to have public officers do the dirty work of the P.N.C.? No one can have confidence in these officers.

There was another one who went around gallivanting all over the West Indies and he is a blue-eyed boy now. At one time he was sitting on this side of the House with the P.P.P.

The London *Sunday Times* on April 23<sup>rd</sup> said that the C.I.A. bribed one ex- Jagan supporter with an insurance of \$13,000. One wonders if this is the kind of morality in politics that these people practice, while the Attorney-General and Minister of State talks about the rule of law and the P.M. talks about constitutionality.

The blue-eyed boys of the P.N.C. in this Ministry are fattened; they are given all kinds of allowances and all kinds of benefits. Those whom the Government does not like it squeezes. One Permanent Secretary has now been acting for 15 months. Is that the way they run the Public Service?

There was a Miss Jardim - I do not know if her post is now Counsel at the United Nations – who was on the platform of the P.N.C. at the last elections. Is the Minister of State saying that it is appropriate for a public servant to be on the P.N.C. platform? Clearly, this Ministry is not being run in the way it should be run, and perhaps confusion reigns in the fact that the Prime Minister as well as the Minister of State is responsible. Maybe if there was one person responsible there would have been less confusion.

Every now and then some of the blue-eyed boys are given favours, given promotion. Sir Lionel Luckhoo has been awarded K.C.M.G. Englishmen robbed and exploited the whole world, but they do not like to be caught. Like Profumo, when they are caught they have to go. Sir Lionel Luckhoo was caught red handed - every Englishman knows about this - and this Government has the gall to honour him further by awarding him K.C.M.G. This is disgraceful. Whom are we trying to convince?

Two Heads of Posts have been added under Head 12. When we were discussing supplementary estimates, and there was provision for a new Head of Post, we asked, "*To which country will this person be posted?*" We were told by the Prime Minister, "*wait and see; you will hear.*" We have seen that an ex-Minister was posted to the Caribbean. I presume that that took care of the four: One in London, one in the United States, one in Caracas, and one in the West Indies. Now there are two more. Where are these two to be posted? We have not been told anything.

I understand that it is intended to post one individual to Surinam. I do not know if this is true. Surinam and the Caribbean are not very far from here and we know the Cadillac-style in which our Ambassadors want to live. This poor starving country can hardly find money to get a doctor for the Palms, to buy drugs, etc. and yet we are going to spend money to post Ambassadors to the Caribbean and perhaps to Surinam. This work could perhaps be done just as efficiently from headquarters here. Our Minister of State is a great traveller; he is a man who is at his forté when it comes to travelling and personal public relations. I am sure he would not mind adding on the Caribbean and Surinam to his future journeys.

Perhaps we are creating these posts to help ex-cronies who are no longer required in the front benches; therefore, we have to find jobs for them - jobs for the boys. This is how this Government is being run. This is why there is no confidence in the Government. It insults those whom it does not like. We saw how the Ambassador to Venezuela was humiliated because he did not toe the P.N.C. line. He was brought to Guyana to cool his heels and up to now a statement cannot be made. This is not the way to treat people. What do you want?

I will just make a passing reference. In 1967 the actual expenditure was \$49,000; in 1968 the sum of \$65,000 was voted but the actual expenditure was \$82,000; and this year the Government is asking for \$123,000. You could build a factory with this. Anyhow, that was the point I wanted to make.

### **Subhead 13, Expenses for Printing and Distribution of Information Materials:**

**Dr. Jagan:** There is not only an Information Department but also a Ministry of Information. Why do we have to spend \$15,000 when we spent only \$10,000 in 1968? Why must we spend \$5,000 more? Here again an officer of the Government, who is supposed to be a specialist, who is re-

nowned in this field for information, and was transferred from the Guyana Information Services. Perhaps because he is not a crony. So you have an individual and the expense has to go up. The taxpayers have to pay more and more taxes every year because the bureaucracy is growing. Why not have information centralized in the Ministry? That is where it should be.

#### **Subhead 16, Expenses of Guyana Boundaries Commissions - \$30,000:**

**Dr. Jagan:** Are we still going along with this farce of the Mixed Commission meeting? Or is this another means of handing over perks to the Chairman who is also the Chairman of the Elections Commission?

Any intelligent Guyanese would say it is too long a time to go on with this farce. But it does not matter; the poor people will have to pay - \$30,000. Where is this Commission going to sit? Are they coming here or are we going to Venezuela? I hear they are moving to Jamaica or Barbados. We must begin now to examine whether we are getting value for money from some of these things and I think the time is long past to keep fiddling with the Commission while the Venezuelans have been occupying our territory, subverting our country and some of the peoples of the country. Government has said so.

Why has the Government not taken the issue to the United Nations Security Council? Do they not want to have it settled or do they want to use it eventually from time to time? This Government cannot hoodwink the people perpetually. The time has come when new initiatives have to be taken. Why does the Government tell us about Africa or Asia or the Communist Bloc? If one is going to talk to diplomatic representatives, one thinks nowadays about areas of geopolitics. If you want support at the United Nations, you do not have Sir John Carter going through cocktail parties from Washington to Canada. We know the Washington circuit keeps cocktail parties. And knowing our representative and his capacity, we can see there is very little time for him to be making the kind of representation that is required at the United Nations.

Africa, Asia, the Socialist Block those are important areas from us to have representation in if we are thinking in terms of winning friends and influencing people. Then there is the question of where we are putting our personnel. We must put six if we can afford six. But the question is where are we putting them? In our view, the Government is spending a lot of money to no avail because most of these people are churning in waters where we can hardly get more support than we are getting at the moment.

As I remarked at another point in the debate, diplomatic representation is not only essential in terms of our border problems but also in terms of economic development, trade, aid, industrialization. What has this Government done in terms of exploring in the Afro-Asian markets, the possibilities of trade and aid? In the Socialist Bloc countries, what initiatives? In

the Afro-Asian countries it is possible that certain arrangements can be made in terms of trade. Perhaps this is not the Minister's field. Perhaps he does not understand. Certain countries have one-crop economies. Maybe there are two crops. Some of them need our products like rice. It is possible we can sell and buy products from them in return. We have to begin to think in terms of a crop, of finding that the price falls by half. We have to think of working out long term arrangements.

The Government is telling us that it is spending money, increasing the votes for these new bodies, then the House will be satisfied, at least we will say the Government is making an effort to get this country out of the rut, but tell us, with an Ambassador in Barbados, another one in Surinam, what more are we going to get from this kind of diplomatic representation? Perhaps they have to supervise the continuous rigging that will be going on.

I hope when the Minister replies he will call us where the two new Heads of Posts will be sited and I hope he will also tell us why it is necessary to have so many Assistant Secretaries, sixteen of them in these Estimates, in this Ministry. This is a waste of the taxpayers' money.

## **Head 12, Ministry of External Affairs – 2,250, 031 agreed to, and agreed to stand part of the Estimates**

**Dr. Jagan:** I notice that, under Subhead 1, there is a proposal to spend \$79,400 and the legend says:

*“To provide for the purchase of a station wagon and equipment for the Information Sections and a motor car, furnishings and miscellaneous equipment for the overseas offices, including two new such offices.”*

I would like to know if this motor car is for the Georgetown Office or for overseas. The Minister did not take the point which I made about the bringing of all Information Services in the Government together under the Ministry of Information. I would like the Minister to say something about this suggestion. Maybe he could tell us why this was not done.

While on my feet, I would like to raise this other point. There is a Subhead for Redecoration of High Commissioners/ Ambassadors Residences Aboard and the vote is for \$56,000. There is also a Subhead for Restructuring and Furnishing of Overseas Offices to provide for such services at two new overseas offices. I presume that the last item deals with Surinam and Jamaica. I do not know why the word “restructuring” is mentioned there. One can understand “furnishing” if these is two new offices. Will the Minister tell us why it is necessary?

I presume that Subhead 2 refers to the office in London and the one in Washington. Why is it necessary, so soon after these offices were redecorated and these residences furnished, to refurnish and redecorate? The

Minister said, a moment ago, that the Government was being economic when it had one person in Washington who served at the same time in the New York office. I appreciate this, but what I cannot understand is why we have to make provision for six posts.

I am not going back but it is the intention to fill the posts at a later stage and they will come with supplementary estimates; but do not ask to fill six posts now when they only intend to fill five.

May I just make one little comment as a result of the Observation made by the Minister in relation to something said by Mrs. Da Silva?

I am referring to this "*squandermania*" Head which the Hon. Member (Mrs. Da Silva) referred to when she said that she did not want to go back to the old days. Perhaps the Hon. Member would be in the minority in this House. I wonder if the Hon. Minister knows that we would not go back 20 years but we would certainly go back to a long period before that. If you look at the people who represent Guyana today in London and in New York, as well as the one to be posted to Surinam, you will see three people who went to London to praise the English Government for suspending the Constitution of British Guiana in 1953. What kind of image are we presenting aboard?

What I am trying to say is that we are not getting the value for money spent on refurnishing and redecoration. The Hon. Minister told us that we shall attend the Third World Conference. Diplomats represent the foreign interest of any country as to what happens internally. You cannot get a reactionary, conservative group of Ambassadors representing the country's foreign image while you have a so-called socialist Government at home. It is highly impossible. It is no use fooling the people of the country that they would not go back to what happened twenty- five years ago.

## **Income Tax (In aid of Industry) (Amendment) Bill: 27<sup>th</sup> November, 1969**

**Dr. Jagan:** The Bill before the House deals with the whole question of strategy of development which the Government has set its mind to. One would have thought that after five years of being in power the Government- especially with the experience gained not only in Guyana but in countries in a similar state - would have, perhaps, modified by now its policies. Clearly, the Government is proceeding on the same old beaten track. Indeed, what we are finding is an extension now of what we promulgated many, many years ago during the colonial era.

The five years' tax holiday was introduced in this country many years ago, even before the P.P.P. came upon the scene. One would have thought that, with Independence, we would have had a new type of thinking, that with Independence we were breaking new ground.

In the last five years, particularly, there has been much information on this question of foreign investments, of private enterprise being encouraged by tax holidays and other incentives and increasingly one finds that even Governments and parties which were prepared to go along with this, are now looking askance at this kind of strategy of development.

If we draw from the experience of Latin American and South American countries which have a longer history of this kind of so-called incentive legislation to attract capital, to attract development as they put it, what do we find today? In the Caribbean, following the introduction of five-year tax holidays, there was a large competition taking place. Some countries gave a tax holiday of seven years, some gave a tax holiday of ten years, some gave a tax holiday of fifteen years, and some said, "*Come along, you do not have to pay any taxes at all.*" In spite of all of this, the Caribbean territories have not been industrialized. The same thing applies to South American countries. The result today is abject poverty, backwardness, illiteracy, misery.

A staid, well respected, bourgeois, glossy publication, the *Life* magazine, in an editorial headed "*Why the Latin's don't love us*", in the issue of July 18, 1969, stated virtually that U.S. policies were largely responsible for the instability in present day Latin America. The main point made was that U.S. investors made more profits every year since 1962 than was being invested in the area. In 1967 alone, repatriated profits exceeded private by more than one billion dollars. This is the general pattern. More money going out of these poor countries than coming in!

Dr. Gallo Plaza, Secretary - General of the Organization of American States, made the same point at a recent meeting when he was addressing the United Press international editors and publishers at Hamilton, Bermuda. Even he who got his job virtually through the instance of the United States, he was forced to become critical of these policies which are causing such a

large drain and outflow from Latin America of capital in a form of profits and interest.

This is precisely the strategy which the Government has been following, as my colleague just said. All right, let us have the experience. What has been the experience in the last few years with this kind of policy? Perhaps we have not got the statistics; we have not had time to work it out. Well learn from others. Are you going to do like a child and get your fingers burnt when others are getting themselves burnt by the same policies?

Foreign investors do not come to countries like Guyana to invest unless they see quick returns to make enough profits so that they can recoup their investments in three or four years. This has been admitted in Jamaica and in other parts. All these incentives - tax holidays, duty free concessions, quick right off, depreciation allowance, not to forget free outflow of capital, freedom to move capital out, and many other things - have resulted in the degradation of this area right next door to us called Latin America - a net outflow almost every year of nearly one billion dollars.

Based on this same policy of attracting investments, Caribbean countries are not industrialized. Latin America is not industrialized by this bankrupt policy and we are now told, *"Let us give a tax holiday of five years to secondary industries, etc."* My colleagues on my left have observed that, in the last five years, not much has been done in this country by way of industrialization. Surely, the Government breaks some new ground. Why can't the Government establish its own industries on a credit turn basis? If you cannot get a factory from the western countries the, surely, you should make some new initiative, probably the countries in the east may be willing to help you to become industrialized.

One of the election gimmicks was, *"We are going to have the multimillion-dollar Tiboku hydroelectric Scheme."* This was told to the electorate. Now we are told that there are great difficulties in the way. A.U.N. team came here and said that, in ten years, an aluminium smelter could pay for itself out of profits. The Government has the report. What is it doing about it?

Instead of giving tax holidays of five years and ten years, try to get a factory on credit for ten years and you can pay for it out of profits. Why give people a tax holiday of five years and ten years when they can recoup their investments in five years, when experts tell you can pay from profits in ten years? But no, your masters in west are not prepared to allow you to become industrialized. They all have balance- of payments problems.

Dr. Gallo Plaza declared:

*"This inflow into the United States was a positive contribution to reducing the balance-of-payments deficits of the United States."*

So they sell you their industrialized goods. They do not want you to become industrialized and when they do come to set up a few branch factories you give them five-year and ten-year concessions and, after a while,



they take out more money out of the country than they put in. This is a bankrupt policy. This policy has been proven to be bankrupt in Latin America so much so that even the friends of the United States, *Life* magazine, Dr. Gallo Plaza, are forced to come out and speak of the realities.

Now you have complete power. You do not have the U.F. holding you hand. We were told at the elections, "*we want a majority so that our hands will be freed of the capitalist elements.*" Where are they now? They are over here. They are not holding you now.

It is a disagreement. Fooling people with slogans. "*Hold on boys, things are going to get better. Carifta is going save us. The Cooperative Republic will help us.*" Nothing will save us so long as this Party which has sold its soul to big business and united imperialism holds the seat of power.

Sir, even those who are now going along this road are saying, "*Let us have a new policy.*" West Indian economists, Guyanese economists, are saying, "*Let us get rid of slave house-politics.*" That is what they are calling them, house-slave politicians. Read the *Rattoon*, first issue. Like the good old days of slavery, one slave used the long whip on the other slave. All the West Indian academicians are saying this - the Puerto Rico model is bankrupt. Dr. Neville Linton, the Guyanese teaching at the St. Augustine campus of the U.W.I., when he passed through Guyana earlier this year, said that Guyana should follow the model from Tanzania or Cuba, but the Guyana Agreement follows any model except that dictated in the United States of America.

We see not only Tanzania and Zambia but even countries in South America traditionally ruled by dictators, Peru and Bolivia, now charting a new path. Dictators, who were traditionally friends of the United States of America, who were part and parcel of the hierarchy, with the big clergy and the landlords in South America are charting a new path. They have nationalised three American companies, oil, sugar, and telephone. I took out a clipping from the *Trinidad Guardian*. Senator Church from the United States warned his own colleagues, "*We must stop beating the dead horse, the bogey of communism. The President of Bolivia was the one who gave the order to shoot Che Guevara. A few days ago he seized power and he seized American oil companies also. He was wined and dined only a week ago.*" The point is you all know to slap people. Force, fraud and big stick. Well, the big stick is not working.

The United States has the power to apply sanctions against Peru but up to now, over a year, it has not been able to apply those sanctions. These policies are enunciated in this Bill are bankrupt. Cooperatives, self help, community development, and birth control. Ten years they have been practising that in India. The India Congress Party has been talking socialism. Only talk but no practice. In India, they developed so much so they picked up people on the street and gave them a few coins to be sterilized. We see in India today the growing influence of the United States in the last decade, and a political crisis where the ruling party is torn asunder, where the

President is dismissing the Leader who is dismissing the President.

We see the Prime Minister of India nationalise banks. The same thing we see in Africa. Kaunda nationalised the copper mines. Last year he nationalised twenty-four companies. Last year in Tanzania Nyerere nationalised sisal factories, banks, import export trading. But what are these doing? Slogans- Cooperative Socialist Republic. Symbols- Afro-shirt, change of name like Sydney King to Eusi Kwayana! What we want are new policies.

As I told your Prime Minister on one occasion, "*You do not want to go to China, to Cuba, or to the Soviet Union. Well, go to the Third World countries, Latin America, Africa, Asia, and follow those progressive states, if you must be socialist.*" What do we get grinding out of the mill? The colonialists gave five years. They want to give ten years. They say they are decolonizing. They are decolonizing in name and dress only. It is a disgrace, a shame, a betrayal of the trust which not given to them but which they seized.

We cannot see how this Government can come at this time in its life to this House with this kind of Bill. When we were debating the Budget earlier this year, a Professor from the University of Guyana, the Head of the Faculty of Economics, said that the Government could have found the \$15 million, which it was putting on the poor people from the wealthy classes. But no! The Defence Levy was put on, 3 percent, which has caused the cost of living to rise all over the country and now we see a supplementary vote. Additional burdens.

I recall Dr. Richmond at that time talking about building a bigger army, a bigger police force. If the motivation, as was declared by the Government benches, was true, that we are preparing to repel attacks, he made the point that we would never have a big enough army or air force to cope with attacks, particularly from Venezuela.

I am dealing with this Bill. I am coming to the point which Dr. Ramsahoye was making for security, but tied up with that is from those countries one can get factories - not only weapons, but factories. The socialist countries have helped many countries to become industrialized. Egypt, India, other places. We have just heard where Tanzania and Rhodesia have signed an Agreement with China to build a new railway to make the country more independent from Rhodesia. But nothing is forthcoming from this Government. Thus I would say that this side of the House cannot at this time support such a measure; cannot, for in concept this is wrong.

One would have thought that the Government which has had a great deal of experience, a great deal of advice in front of it, a large amount of analysis over the last five years, even the work done before that at its disposal would have clearly indicated a new way, a new direction. We are spending a lot of money on many bureaucratic organizations; we have set up the Guyana Development Corporation. Now we understand that we are going to have an Interior Development Corporation and so on. But nothing tangible is coming out of all this because presently the Government's

overall strategy of development is hamstrung. Even the machinery that was set up is hamstrung. Therefore all that we can do is to advise – Government has a majority, they will steamroller it. All we can do is warn them. All we can say is that this is wrong. But we know that they will not listen. The time is long past to strike out from the Statute Books this legislation, especially by those who call themselves “socialist” and who are interested in creating what they call “*making the small man into a real man*”.

The Minister responsible will speak and then nobody else will speak. The Leader of the House does not understand.

Sir, I make the point that Parliament is supposed to be a deliberative body and if points are made by the mover of the Motion and then certain points are made by the Opposition, one expects answers to be given by another Minister perhaps and not wait for the reply. Now then can the opposition make further contributions to the debate? This is the farce to which the people have reduced Parliament.

The Hon. Ex- Minister of Local Government (Mr. John) has a democratic right to sit in the House but he was told to resign.

My colleague, the last speaker, made some very important points and I wish to make some statements which will show that the points he made have a great deal of validity. We have another institution called the World Bank. One sees the same kind of control through the manipulation of voting. The major powers, especially the United States and United Kingdom, can virtually monopolize the decision-making process by playing on a few Members - giving a favour here, giving a favour there, and winning over the necessary majority vote. We see the same thing being perpetrated here. There is not going to be a Caribbean Development Bank. Let us give it the right name. This is going to be an arm of the imperialist banking system.

Again, I must draw from experience elsewhere for the benefit of my Hon. Friends. In South-East Asia a big Colombo Plan was boosted to help to develop those areas. There was a South-East Development Bank. What is the end result? Today the puppets of Imperialism cannot stand on their two feet without American bayonets in the whole of South- East Asia after a decade of the Colombo Plan.

When is the Government going to stop fooling the people? This Development Bank is going to be just another bureaucracy, another institution created to no avail, more money for overheads. We have a Cooperative Credit Bank, when the same institution could have set up a section to deal with cooperatives. It is another bureaucracy. More jobs for the boys.

There is a private investment fund in this country in which the Government participates with United States money. What is happening about that? The last report from the Bank of Guyana which I read said very little use is being made of the money. Money is there and not being used because of the onerous conditions.

We are now going to have another bank but, as my colleague pointed out, who will control the policy? To what purpose! Private enterprise! Is

this to be another arm of the Import-Export Bank of the United States, or another arm of the World Bank, or another arm of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development? The word “*international*” is being used without meaning international – controlled by the United States and Britain.

Who is going to be the chief bottle-washer? We are told by the press that the head of the Bank is going to be Sir Arthur Lewis, the man who was the architect of the Puerto Rican economic model of development for the Caribbean which is an admitted failure. He is going to administer the Bank.

Slogans and flippant remarks are not going to help the people of this country. All this Government is doing is adding one institution on top of another one, more and more bureaucracy.

The Prime Minister told the C.S.A. that the bureaucracy is already eating up 50 percent of the Budget of Guyana. He used that as an excuse for not giving the civil servants increases in salaries. We were told by Gorsuch way back in 1958 that the bureaucracy should eat up only one-third of the Budget. In Guyana it is already eating about half and we are adding on more and more institutions which are not necessary. If they were necessary, if they were going to man real development, then of course Guyanese people will gladly bear them but I do see where this will help. The Minister said that we must concentrate on infrastructure. That is what we are doing now.

Is this just a means of helping out Canada and the U.K. so that they do not have to deal with one of the boys at a time, so they can put the responsibility, the onus, on you and play one against another, when they want to put the squeeze on one they take the vote from another one? The Organization of American States was penalizing Cuba. They needed one vote and got a big airport because the one vote was essential to the U.S.A.

Bring up all the irrelevancies; you are famous for that, but you cannot fool all the people with this nonsense.

Let us give it the real name it deserves – not Caribbean Development Bank. This is an arm of the imperialists, their aid system. There is not going to be any change in the strategy of development. A bank is supposed to be an instrument for development, provided the strategy, the policy behind it, is determined beforehand and the directors are told to pursue a certain policy. The bank will then be performing a useful purpose, but it is clear that there is no policy; or rather we are going on in the old policy – Professor Arthur Lewis, the chief architect of that old bankrupt policy. Thus I can see, as my colleague said, that this is just another waste of taxpayers’ money and, of course, another means of fooling the people, another means of telling them, “*Hold on boys, something will come. A bank is being set up now.*”

I should like to add my criticisms of this measure – not that I am opposed to the idea of a development bank, not that we do not see the necessity for having financial institutions to help in the development of a country, but this institution is not going to be one of those which can materially help in the development of Guyana, indeed, of the Caribbean.

## Approval of Estimates of Expenditure for 1970 – Budget Debate: 14<sup>th</sup> January, 1970

### Development of Beef, Cattle and Other Livestock. Diversification and Development of Agriculture

**Dr. Jagan:** I wish to refer to Subheads 15 and 16. The expenditure with respect to Subhead 15, Development of Beef, Cattle and Other Livestock, is required:

*“To provide for the establishment of a breeding station at Matthews’ Ridge and continuation of work at Ebini. Foreign loan anticipated.”*

I should like to ask the Minister what is being done now in the Rupununi. Is the cattle industry still progressing, or is it retrogressing in this area? What is being done about developing the cattle industry in this area? The point I should like to emphasize, taking Subhead 16 within the purview of my comments, is that the Ministry is doing very little to increase the range of our products in agriculture particularly. We read in the Budget Speech that sugar has increased, bauxite has increased, but rice is virtually at a standstill and no great progress has been achieved with respect to the other agricultural items. One would have thought that, in the course of the past five years, we would have had something much more definite and specific.

We notice that there is a lot of expenditure under the Head Ministry of Trade but we are not producing enough to justify such a large expenditure under that Head. Sugar is marketing for itself, bauxite is marketing for itself, and Connell is looking after rice, but we do not hear anything about new products. As regards sugar Britain is likely to go into the Common Market. There are large surpluses of beet sugar in the world today. If Britain enters the Common Market, the Commonwealth Agreement goes, and where will we be?

Will the Minister tell us what is being done in his Ministry to diversify our agriculture to the extent that we can move fairly rapidly? The Agricultural Agronomist from F.A.O. who came here some time ago said that we should aim at self-sufficiency in milk production, that we have a home market, we do not have to think of selling outside. We have not got anywhere. We are still talking about experimentation, about the establishment of a breeding station at Matthews’ Ridge and at Ebini. I am told – and the Minister must say whether or not this is true – that the pure breeds and the half-breeds are being sold to Kwakwani for beef whereas the same animals should be used for further work in developing cattle farming. Has the Government thought about setting up a state farm at Ebini? I do not mean just for experimentation but for production. Research has been carried out for years and years and we have got nowhere. This is one

possible field in which this country can make a breakthrough. I am afraid that we are not doing as much as is possible and we are continuing in the same old way.

I submit that we cannot have diversification and development of agriculture unless we tackle this archaic problem of land holding. The Government is spending a lot of money at Matthews' Ridge. We agree that the Government should do something to help the people who lost their jobs as a result of the shutdown at Matthews' Ridge. But we raised the point, when the Government was going to throw away millions of dollars at Matthews' Ridge, that it is economically feasible to develop the nearer areas.

My colleague has already referred to the area south of Crabwood Creek. I do not know what the Minister has to say about Mara and Brandwagt Sari which were started out during our time. Go along the river banks, there are acres and acres, miles and miles of lands. They all fight like dogs and cats to get land. Why does the Government go into the Interior? No one knows who owns these lands. We should be able to take area by area quickly in order to determine who owns the lands. Sometimes nobody owns the lands. Sometimes they have no titles and the Government should put people on the land.

It is an established fact that in countries in South America, agriculture has suffered. Formerly, they produced but they are now importing food from the United States of America and the same thing is going to happen here unless we solve this problem of land quickly. There was a case where we had to see the Minister when one set of people were thrown out and another set of people put in. They have gone to the court to get a decision. I hope it is solved in due course. Whether this was done for political reasons, the question is, we have a lot of land in this country. This is one country in the world where there should be no land hunger. Instead of manipulating one group against another, let us go up the banks of the rivers. There are miles and miles of land where the people would be glad to settle.

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** The Government can find out who owns the land then clear it. We are wasting money here. More should be spent on these things but the little the Government is spending is simply wasted because the Government is going on in the old traditional manner. Breeding Station at Matthews' Ridge – forever and ever. The time has come for state farming at Ebini. Let us break up the 2,400 square miles of land leased to the Rupununi Development Company and give it to the Amerindians, give it to the small ranchers. Let us move from the area and withdraw the 300 percent increase the Government has put on the small farmer before he could get land. In the time of the P.P.P. it was 25 cents per acre to have title for a 10 acre plot, including surveying fees, it was \$22. Now it has been increased to over \$125 for surveyor's fees and so on.

The small man must be allowed to go on the land. The Government will get the money back in production and in indirect taxes. It should not penalize the man. This is a penalty the Government is placing on the farmer and in so doing it is not encouraging diversification and what have you. To increase production, the Government has to embark on policies to help diversification but the overall policies are such that we are continually getting into a position where the commodities in this country which can be produced by the small man are not being produced. The things that are being produced are sugar and bauxite. The foreigner is the real man. Let us come down to a policy which will lead to diversification, which will lead to real development, and in time we will get to the position where we will increase production significantly. Beef and cattle have a ready market all over the world. We have the people, we have the land, but we have the wrong man in the wrong place. The wrong Government.

### **Head 31 – Ministry of Trade**

**Dr. Jagan:** The point just taken by the last speaker, I would just like to say that the Government would do well to study the recent legislation in North America with respect to advertising, false advertising, fake advertising. Many products now have to state specifically their contents. Inside a can, for instance, specifications have to be given as to quality and so on.

It is a known fact that many things which are prohibited from sale in North America are pushed into countries like Guyana for sale. This is because we have no such protection and it would be very easy for the Government merely to get in touch with its friends in the United States to determine what recent legislation has been enacted in this direction to protect consumers. We do buy a great deal of things which are produced from abroad and, quite recently, something remarkable has been done in some of these countries, something which has been agitated for many years. At long last the Government in the United States has succumbed to pressure and has decided to move to protect the consumers.

### **Subhead 11 - Exhibition and Fairs**

**Dr. Jagan:** I should like to refer to Subhead 11, Exhibition and Fairs. We see that an expenditure of \$5,000 is required. This is a reduction in the amount that was spent last year. I should like to ask the Minister whether this includes foreign exhibitions and fairs. I ask this because only a few minutes ago the Minister of Agriculture and Natural Resources told us that if we are to produce we must sell and, clearly, there is need for diversification. The biggest problem in the world today is the marketing of products and here I agree with the Minister, but one arm of the Government

says that we cannot produce because we will have difficulty in selling, and there is no coordination with the other arm which is responsible for selling, trade, let us say. We will not get anywhere.

A little while ago I spoke about sugar. There is going to be a surplus of sugar if the Cubans produce about ten million tons of sugar by the middle of this year. The surplus beet production has to be heavily subsidized and protected against cane sugar and, as I mentioned, if Britain goes into the Common Market, we will find ourselves in difficulties. Only yesterday on my way home I read in the *Financial Times* that even rice is likely to be in surplus this year. I have just returned from Canada where I found that there are 1½ billion tons of wheat in surplus. Farmers are resorting to all kinds of methods in order to sell their wheat. They are selling it at cut down prices to get money to carry on their business. Dumping takes place in the European Common Market. There is destruction willy-nilly of crops in order to maintain existing prices.

I refer to this not because I want to digress but because I see the necessity of doing everything possible to explore new areas, new markets, new products, if possible. As regards timber, we have some of the best hardwoods in the world. Seventy percent of our country is forest. Where are we selling? Perhaps we are selling a little bit outside of the West Indies and maybe greenheart in the traditional areas. What are we doing? At one time we were exploring the possibility of having our hardwood sold in the Eastern European Common Market. Experiments were being carried out to see whether our woods can be put through a steam process so that they can be sliced and made into veneers. I mention this because I feel that the Government should attempt to go into other areas.

I refer now particularly to the Leipzig Fair in Eastern Europe. These are among the biggest fairs in the world. Even West Germany, which is antagonistic to the regime in East Germany, the German Democratic Republic, has a very large pavilion there. I recall that at one time the Czechs and others were talking about buying soya beans in unlimited quantities in exchange for small factories which we wanted in this country.

We are not industrializing. The Minister of Finance in a statement said that nothing much is being done by way of private investment itself and in his last Budget Speech he said that nothing much was done, except in the field of bauxite. There is a limit to bauxite expansion, especially if there is going to be recession in the USA and Canada, and so we do need to explore the possibilities of alternate markets which can be tied with the possible industrialization or with the industrialization of our country, which is certainly necessary.

I would think that the Government should come out of this self-imposed ideological restriction and begin to expand its area of operations in this particular field of fairs and exhibitions. I do not know whether the \$5,000 listed here is mainly for exhibition at home but I would think that some useful purpose will be served in exhibiting our products. I am not refer-



ring to East Germany alone, I refer to Japan and other places where there may be possibilities for some of our products.

Canada is now thinking of selling surplus wheat on a barter basis, in exchange for certain products which are needed. This is the way we have to go about it, otherwise it would be useless to just throw out the Minister of Trade, we might as well throw out the Ministry of Trade. We must take a new initiative and see to it that our trade policy is tied up with the whole question of development, markets and industrialization.

## Ministry of Trade, Division XIII - Tourism

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, I am wondering, following on the points made by the last speaker, whether we have enough facilities for accommodating tourists, internal as well as those coming from outside. How much work is being done to attract people to those sites, even internally? Only yesterday, I was talking during the trip from Antigua to Barbados, with a gentleman from Canada who runs a small agency. We began talking about tourism and where the people were going. As you know, most of the people are going to Barbados, the Bahamas, Bermuda and Jamaica. In Antigua, I thought that maybe, because of the political situation, the turmoil which took place there not so long ago on the labour front, that would have an effect on tourism; he said that was not so as many people were going there. He said that this was not the reason. He pointed out that people were continuing their trips, for instances, to Greece although it was an unsettled country politically and he deduced the fact that they were going to Jamaica and Barbados merely because more advertising was done by those countries. In fact, I say in one of the newspapers – I think it was in Montreal, a Montreal newspaper – which I read in the plane, there was an advertisement by the Barbados Government.

I have always held the view that while we may not have the beautiful beaches and the blue waters to attract North American tourists, nevertheless, we have conditions in this country whereby we can offer tourists something entirely different to what they get in the Caribbean. After lying down on the beaches, after the swimming pools and after taking in the beautiful white sands, one gets tired and would like to go on to something else. One would think, therefore, that our beautiful waterfalls and surrounding areas are attractions in terms of hunting and fishing – a new type of experience for those people. This would be a great attraction if it were more known. Unfortunately, many people do not know much about Guyana except on the political side and so it seems to me that more needs to be done by way of advertisement. But, perhaps, not only advertisement is needed. Something should be worked out with the tourist boards of the other areas. Some passage arrangement should be worked out so that the tourist can spend some days of his vacation in one or more of the islands and spend the rest of the time seeing something entirely different in Guyana.

I hope that the Government will pursue this because, as I understand it, this is in keeping with thinking with respect to development. The Jamaicans and Barbadians, particularly, earn a tremendous amount of money from tourism. I would like, therefore, to speak of these two aspects: one, advertisement and package deal tours in conjunction with tourist boards and two, how much facilities we have in terms of internal transport. I know of someone who came from Curacao and wanted to go to Kaitetur but who

could not go. He had a few days available. This means that enough work is not being done in this field to coordinate all aspects of this work, and I am now thinking particularly in terms of internal tourism. I read that, during my absence, a large number of Guyanese came home from somewhere and, for the first time, they went to see Kaitour Falls. One understands this. When one goes away, one is asked about Guyana and, immediately one speaks of the wonders of Kaitour, something which one probably never saw. So it can be understood when persons come home, they want to go to Kaitour so that when they go back they would say: I have seen.

So, this side of what I call "*internal tourism*" should be encouraged. Countries like Cuba are now getting away from this emphasis on foreign tourism which has its other aspects. In the aeroplane last evening, one man asked me "*where can I go to see so-and-so in Barbados*" – I would not refer to that any further – so we know that external tourism, in addition to creating this sort of parasitic and even promiscuous existence, leads to a kind of society which, in some respect, we want to get away from, that is, where we have \$30 and \$40 a day hotels which Guyanese and West Indians can never enjoy. This is why countries like Cuba which, prior to the Cuban revolution were glorious countries, have embarked on a massive campaign of internal tourism.

There should be external tourism developed to the point where workers on their two weeks' holiday can get away from the monotony of their daily routine and from their places of employment and go off to some other part of the country to see the beauties of their country and so on. But I am not aware that this Government has even thought of such a thing. The concentration is to ban strikes, but let us think of giving the workers some additional benefits. The Government should certainly think in terms of say, giving trade unions grants and loans, if possible, to build cabins, little resorts of their own, so that when their workers get their two weeks' holiday they can go to these places. In the socialist countries this is done regularly. Trade unions through their own funds build log cabins and other things in different parts of the country where the workers can enjoy the beauties of their country.

In addition to this, transportation should be subsidised. Cheap transportation is also offered in these countries whether by rail or by air. The cost of transportation in Guyana is really prohibitive and this is another avenue where perhaps the Government can encourage the workers. There can be two rates. Holidaymakers from abroad can probably pay a different rate because in terms of Guyana dollars, in relation to Canadian or American dollars, it is not very much. But for people like workers, students, cooperative societies and others, there should be special subsidised rates and I do hope that the Government will consider this aspect of the question. While much can come by way of development of external tourism, a great deal can be achieved by internal tourism. This needs careful study and a well coordinated programme on the part of the Government. I do hope that this Government will embark on this in the future.

## Congratulations to Two Ministers on Eve of Their Wedding: 15<sup>th</sup> January, 1970

**Dr. Jagan:** As the Prime Minister said, I have come just in time. Naturally, I should like to join with other Members of the House and with you, Sir, in expressing very good wishes to the two Ministers who are to be wed tomorrow. We have known these people for some time and, of course, we have seen them performing individually. (*Laughter*) I do not think I need say any more. However, it is said that two units perform better than a single entity and so we look forward to better performance inside and outside of this House, and higher productivity.

One thing bothers me. A learned gentleman said the other day that two ideologies cannot mix: Islam and communism. Well, we understand that one of the partners is a socialist. Of course I do not think we need to define the kind of socialism.

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** Oh, cooperative, I see the difference. I do not think that there will be irreconcilable problems. I take the Prime Minister's words, "*let us hope*", because it is said that marriage is like a besieged city, easy to get in but very difficult to get out again.

With all the joking aside, naturally, we wish them well and all the happiness and prosperity. I now ask you to rise and join me in drinking a toast to these two Ministers.

**Request for leave to move the Adjournment of the  
Assembly on definite matters of Urgent Public  
Importance: 9<sup>th</sup> February, 1970**

**Dr. Jagan:** I beg leave to move the Adjournment of the Assembly at the appropriate time for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent importance. The matter concerns the denial by the police of the constitutional rights of Guyanese to peaceful assembly on Friday, 6<sup>th</sup> February, when a Conference of Amerindians was being addressed by the Prime Minister. A group of Amerindians who had gathered earlier to deliver a petition to the Hon. Minister without Portfolio, Mr. Jack, arrived at the Public Buildings and attempted to carry out peaceful picketing. The Police immediately arrived on the scene and prevented them from picketing and took away their placards. I regard it as threatening the rights of Guyanese citizens. I hope the House will be provided with the opportunity to debate this matter.

**[Motion Negatived]**

## Continuance of Miscellaneous Enactments (Amendment) (No. 2) Act, 1969 (No. 33)

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, the Hon. Minister indicated that increases were justified firstly on the basis of expansion of business as in the case of the banks; and secondly better roads in connection with trucks. The Hon. Member on this side of the House who spoke just now mentioned the question of these increased charges being passed on to the public at large. We are concerned about this especially in view of the ever-increasing cost of living. It is no point the Government coming here and telling us that the people or the users of certain facilities must pay more because, clearly, he must know that all of this can be passed on quite easily to the public.

Let us take the question of the banks. Banking interest rates today in the country are fantastic. They range from eight and a half percent to ten per cent for any kind of normal business operation, be it house building, industrial, agricultural or commercial activities. We know, as a fact, that such high interest rates cannot stimulate production of any kind, development of any kind. People will be reluctant to borrow money at eight and a half percent to ten percent rate of interest. If they want to do anything, they would prefer to do nothing because these rates act in an inhibitory manner. The business has to see a twenty percent profit or more before they can begin to venture by having recourse to the banks at such a heavy rate.

We know of one Minister who, only last week, said that the private sector was to expend about \$60,000,000 – I speak subject to correction – for development in this country but only about \$12,000,000 was expended. The Government must not only come and give us these bald statements. They must give us more serious analyses. We expect from the Government that they will put forward an analysis of the whole situation examining, through their advisers and consultants, all the aspects such as banking policy and fiscal policy and so give us a lead forward. But what do we have? Hit and miss operations! One Minister hitting in one direction increasing – I am not saying that the banks must not pay more – charges, but by the same token the banks have increased the interest rates for loans. What has the Government done to hold down interest rates in this country? What have they done? We have now about six banks. During the time of the P.P.P. there were only two banks. I remember in our time some other banking institutions were interested in setting up here. At that time I consulted one of the people advising the Government and the advice given was that it was best not to have any more banks come to Guyana and so the P.P.P. did not encourage the opening of the flood gates. Since this Government has got in we have about four more banks. There were only two before.

Clearly, if most of these banks are operating on the capital raised inside this country – they are not bringing as many people expect a lot of money

from outside – and, consequently, if there is open competition in one particular field, these banks, as in any normal business, have to cover their overhead costs which are generally very high. Bank Managers do not work for peanuts. If, in addition to all these duplicating overheads, there are increased taxes on these companies, what will happen? It is logical that there will be increased bank charges, increased interest rates and that is what we have found over the past few years. Interest rates are shooting up! The answer is not only to raise fees for banking in this country as Government is doing but to adopt other measures to safeguard the public, that is, by controlling interest rates.

The second thing I wish to say is on banking itself. Is the Government satisfied that more and more banks operating in Guyana is in our interest? Has the Government made an analysis of this and so on? This piecemeal manner in which the Government is handling this matter, I am sure, cannot help the situation because, in the long run, not only will public policy be affected but stimulation of development will be affected and the small man will have to bear the burden of increased interest charges.

Dealing with the question of increased charges for licences for trucks and for other vehicles, the Minister made an admission that in one case charges were reduced for articulated vehicles. But what he did not say was that it was under this same Government allied, no doubt, with the other party during the coalition days that this was done. We are glad to see that they are readjusting this to bring it in line with what was done before. What I am concerned about in connection with this question of increased licence fees for trucks is the sharp tactics, the sharp tactics in which the Government is indulging at the moment. It has come to my knowledge that most of the Government's work is being done by one trucking service, the Greenland Cooperative trucking service.

This company is subcontracting to the other truckers and charging them a fee of two dollars per ton load. This is a racket and it is disgusting that the Government has resorted to this kind of practice. If you feel that the truck owners must pay more, all right, for the enhanced facilities that they are going to enjoy, very well. But then they must be dealt with squarely and fairly and not in the manner in which things are done at the moment.

Today, from all sources in Guyana one hears the comment that our country is sick; we are living in a sick society. The Archbishop of Guyana referred to the fact the other day where he said that with \$5,000 you can bribe anyone today and get anything done. Not only the Archbishop but others, the public, are saying this and it is because of these rackets which are patent. Let the Hon. Minister say that it is not true that the Greenland Cooperative Trucking Service gets all the Government contracts or most of them, and it is subcontracting to people who used to tender before and they have to pay \$2 per ton load.

This is not a cooperative republic that this Government is creating. This is a capitalist enterprise sponsored by the Government to help some of its

friends. Monopolies are being developed in which the Government Ministers and others have shares. If they want to become capitalists then they must deal fairly and squarely with other people but not to use their positions in order to develop monopolies and squeeze everybody else. Truck owners today are being squeezed. Many of them are selling out because of these sharp practices.

If people are getting better services, all right, they must pay but let them have the opportunity like other people to tender for jobs etc. and not allow Government-sponsored companies and other outfits which are going fraudulently under the name of cooperatives whereas no cooperative principle is employed. When these things are done properly there would be no charges by the Archbishop and the other people. The Government is intimidating people because they speak the truth; pressuring them – people must not demonstrate.

### **[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** The Hon. Minister says that there is no right to demonstrate. Bribery and corruption all over the place.

We wish to object very strongly, not only as Members of the House but as people of this country, to the increasing burdens which the public at large has to bear and this is precisely because of the corruption, the waste, and the nepotism which is going on today. It is for this reason we voice our criticisms on measures like these.



# Interpretation and General Clauses Bill: 16<sup>th</sup> February, 1970

## Second Reading Republic Bill 1970

**Dr. Jagan:** On this issue of the right of appeal to the Privy Council there appears to be a number of inconsistencies. One is told that the P.P.P. is inconsistent because it supported the Motion for Guyana to become a Republic but it is not prepared to go along with the abolition of the right of appeal to the Privy Council. Then the Prime Minister not too silently from his seat said, "*look at the P.P.P. and the U.F. All of them are now taking the same position.*" This has led to the charge that the P.P.P. has now abandoned its position and has become like the capitalist U.F. While this is being done, the P.N.C. takes on the appearance of being a champion of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism.

We were also reminded in the course of the debate that when the P.P.P. was in the Government the then Opposition demanded guarantees so much so that it did not want Independence under the P.P.P. This was the slogan and one presumes, therefore, that by that was meant the retention of the Privy Council. Now that the P.P.P. is in the Opposition and the P.P.P. is now taking a position of opposition to the right of appeal to the Privy Council, it is said to be inconsistent, but if one were to use the same logic one would come to the conclusion that the P.N.C. is also inconsistent, because at one stage it was for the retention of the Privy Council and now it has come forward in favour of the abolition. The Hon. Mover of the Motion said that from our side I think he was referring to the P.P.P. – there has been a lot of radical talk but reactionary behaviour. Where does the truth lie in all of this? It does not go very well for the Hon. Mover of the Motion to take on the garb of progressive anti-colonialism, for his whole career has been associated with defending positions of colonialism. I do not want to be personal but only recently we say an example of inconsistency where a knighthood was conferred on him which he used abroad but fails to use at home. Who is more hypocritical under the circumstances? Who is more inconsistent under the circumstances? This is the role of the P.N.C.

What is required in this situation is a deep analysis, a Marxist analysis of the situation and a Leninist approach to this question. Anyone familiar with what is known as the state apparatus knows that the state and its superstructure, the judiciary included, work in the interest of one class or another – the exploited or the exploiters. We know for a fact that, despite the removal of the statue of Victoria and the many other symbols of colonialism, basically, the economy of Guyana today is capitalist and pro-imperialist. This is the reality. Of course we are in favour of the removal of all those vestiges of colonialism, but let the Hon. Mover of the Motion know

that colonialism does not only mean the garb, the top hat, the tails and all the other little things which must be removed, but colonialism implies basically, first and foremost, the economic structure of the country.

Every schoolboy knows – to use the Prime Minister’s phrase – that colonialism means an imbalanced economy, a lopsided economy, a raw material producer, a market for manufactured goods from abroad, foreigners controlling the whole economic life of the country. Will the Hon. Prime Minister or the Hon. Mover of the Motion tell us what move has been taken?

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** Any time you want to nationalise, it is there for the asking.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** Sure, you will steal from the small man. That is the policy of this Government.

The man whom they will exploit. From the big boys, you will see, they will not take, the men who put them there. They have only the appearance but they do not touch the reality. When we asked for Independence and the abolishing of the Privy Council, we were thinking in the context of the judicial apparatus in many countries obstructing progressive legislation, to wit, the Roosevelt New Deal, legislation which was opposed right up to the Supreme Court. Roosevelt realised the necessity for having people who were sympathetic with progressive measures, so he reappointed judges and created more judgeships and his legislation went through.

We know that when the P.P.P. introduced the Development Savings Levy, the judiciary here declared it unconstitutional. We have seen recently in India where bank nationalisation has been declared unconstitutional. These are all in keeping with the concept that the judicial apparatus will go against, especially if it belongs to the old order, if the measure is progressive in nature, if it is put in by a new regime. It was in this context that the Opposition, then speaking for vested interests in this country, opposed Independence and all that went along with it.

In this respect, one would say that they have changed their position. They have not changed their position. They are not today seeking the abolition of the Privy Council because they feel the Privy Council – starting out from that premise – will declare unconstitutional any measure adopted by Parliament. That is not the reason. I am not talking of merely small matters – crime and delinquency; I am talking of fundamental matters, which affect the whole structure of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

**[Interruption by the Prime Minister]**

**Dr. Jagan:** We know he tries to make a joke of everything, and this is

how he gets away with moving Guyana into a fascist state.

The point is that this Government has not done anything to date which will bring it into conflict with the judiciary in the United Kingdom. Why then does it want to abolish the right to appeal to the Privy Council? Because there are two areas in judicial practice. One is the question of the vested interests in this country, their rights, and the other is the rights of the small man, the right to vote, the right to demonstrate. Whose rights is the Government going to protect?

The United Force is not inconsistent when they oppose this. They are not inconsistent when they oppose the P.N.C. and P.P.P. regimes, because when the P.P.P. was the Government, they as representatives of the vested interests did not want any fundamental changes to take place immediately which would touch vested interests. They wanted bourgeois institutions in the United Kingdom to have the last word to declare unconstitutional, any progressive measure. Today, there is no fear on that score. Their fear today is the fear of the P.P.P. on the question of civil liberties, and that is why it may appear that the P.P.P. and the U.F. are on the same side of disagreement, and therefore, it would appear that the P.P.P. has changed its position.

The issue today in Guyana is not to tumble the structure of colonialism. It is not an issue of socialism versus capitalism. If that was the issue, we give our assurance to the P.N.C. that if they want to come to this Legislature with any measure or measures, not restricting the democratic rights of the people generally, but taking away, breaking up the economic structure of imperialism in this country, they will have our wholehearted support and we will change our position. But there are some fools who do not understand or refuse to understand because it does not suit their interest. Other fools are dogmatists. They do not want to take a concrete situation and analyse it. They prefer to proclaim everlasting truths, and so some of them write letters to the press, "*we have surrendered the principles of Marx.*"

I repeat, the issue today in Guyana is not a basic contradiction of a progressive regime which calls itself socialist wanting to break up the economic structure inherited from the days of the imperialists and being obstructed by the judiciary. The issue today is the erosion and denial of civil liberties. It is in this context that we say we must continue to have a right of appeal to the Privy Council; more so for the reason that the Courts of this country have been subverted by this Government. We have heard a detailed analysis of some of the things happening by one of the speakers, the Hon. Member Mr. R.D. Persaud, this afternoon. We all have experience. I remember a case which went to the Court – a clear case of libel – but the judge allowed the defence lawyers to bring in a world of things about communism and communists being violent, therefore, they are murderers.

Every day one reads in all the newspapers of corruption, bribery, influence, orders. This is happening all over the place. We are not championing a "Q.C." for one of our colleagues but for impartial judgment in this coun-

try. Dr. Ramsahoye is entitled, considering the others who have been given honours in this field. But what happens? It is not only that. We understand that the Judicial Committee made recommendations but a political decision was taken to override this decision.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** The Archbishop said that with \$5,000 in Guyana you can get anything done. This is the kind of justice in this country. If it is not political, it has become corrupt. Therefore, the citizens of this country have the right to preserve and defend their rights. Some men may argue that the judicial apparatus in Guyana and Great Britain are both defenders of capitalism. But I repeat, that is not the issue. The issue is one of civil liberties. We take the case recently of Greece. Greece, the cradle of democracy has now become fascist. Countries in Europe which make up the Council of Europe are all capitalists. Yet by a majority decision they were going to expel Greece from the Council of Europe; and therefore, she withdrew. Why did the capitalist countries wished to expel another capitalist country from their Council? It was not because of capitalism; that was not the issue. The issue is a question of freedom which has been traditional and respected; and this is not because it was the gift of the capitalist-class. The British people and other people have fought for it with their lives, with their blood – the Peterloo massacre, the Chartist movement and others.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** I am glad you are reading; it will help you.

At the suspension this evening, I tried to make it clear to this House and to Hon. Members that the P.P.P. was not being inconsistent in opposing the abolition of the right of appeal to the Privy Council and this did not mean that we were holding on to what the Hon. Minister of Agriculture referred to as the last bastion of imperialism. Because, Sir, if we look around Guyana we will see still very firmly established the main bastions of imperialism. I refer to Bookers; and I refer to the Demerara Company which was recently taken over by Jessel Associates; I refer to the bauxite companies, to the banks and to the insurance companies. There are the bastions of imperialism. What has the Government done about these bastions? Nothing! It has allowed Jessel Associates to come here and take over a company which was already in being and the main result of this has been retrenchment of people.

This Government has not got the guts to do as some of its colleagues are doing in the Caribbean. In Jamaica, the Shearer Government, no socialist Government, has prevented the sugar planters from mechanizing to the extent that they can throw people out of work as has been happening here.

The Trinidad and Tobago Government. Dr. Williams' Government, refused to allow Jessel Associates to take over a local company. In Guyana this is happening. The Government has allowed them to take over and they will continue to take over.

The Government has allowed the C.D.C., which has extensive holdings at Manaka and Winiperu, to take over all the land in the Pomeroon, the North West District and Moruca. It allowed two American companies to take over millions of acres in the Essequibo and Demerara Rivers, throwing out Guyanese people, small people, who were earning their living cutting a few logs there. And then the Government talks about the last bastion of imperialism. Government is only removing some of the symbols – and these are the symbols of the second-class imperialist power – while it is allowing the major imperialist power, the United States, to become more and more enmeshed in the economy of Guyana and to have more and more power in the cultural, social and political life of the country. This is a reality.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** You do not need to listen to Radio Moscow. Find out from your friends.

My friend the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs (Mr. Hoyte) talks about Russia giving Fiat rights. What rights? The Soviet Union has not told Fiat to come and set up a factory here. The Soviet Union has made an arrangement with a capitalist enterprise to build automobile factories in the Soviet State. There is a big difference.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** It is not a question of what you are selling; it is your attitude to capitalism. This is the question.

The next point is that the members of the Government like to mix up everything to fool the people, as we see today when some commentator was saying there is no difference between the P.P.P. and the P.N.C. because they both believe in the economy having three sectors – the public sector, the private sector and the cooperative sector.

We made the point not too long ago, during the discussion on the Republic, that the Cooperative Republic is bound to fail. It is not that we are opposed to cooperatives, but it will fail so long as the economic structure is in the hands of the foreign capitalists. Therefore, we have said over and over – it was in our Election Manifesto – that the Government should nationalise the banks, the insurance companies, foreign trade, the sugar plantations, the bauxite companies, but the Government's ideologist, Mr. Anson Sancho – he is not here now – came and said, "*we cannot nationalise. Where are we going to find markets?*" Did the Cubans, did the Peruvians, did the

Russians and all the others begin to examine where they were going to find markets when they wanted to tumble down the colonial and neo-colonial structure?

**[Interruption by the Prime Minister]**

**Dr. Jagan:** Maybe it is good to be a comic because you entertain people, but it is worse to be a puppet like you. A comic at least pleases people; a puppet is manipulated by another comic.

I repeat we do not oppose cooperatives; we do not oppose the concept of a republic. We have been in the forefront in the demand for this, but we repeat: the slogan "*Cooperative Republic*" is a fraud; it is a hoax and even some of their friends are beginning to see that this is so. I see Mr. Pollydore, at one time a strong supporter of the Government, is seeing the light. We are not like some who will close their eyes to the realities of our present situation. We are not mere pragmatists, who do not see the difference in the environment today in Guyana, in the United Kingdom and in the United States.

The United States Government seized passports as this Government is doing, but the Supreme Court in the United States returned the passports. Our Courts and our institutions do not operate as they operate in those bourgeois countries. In Britain and in the United States certain rights have been fought for and cannot easily be tampered with. Here, we know that if the Government wants it can have certain cases withdrawn. Orders go to the prosecuting attorney, or whatever he is called. "*Withdraw certain cases because these are my friends.*" Remember the gun case, the shooting case.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** Let us face the realities. The Government in our country is subverting and causing so much so that even the Judges are afraid. The Prime Minister's office issued a statement saying "*the Judiciary wants the right of appeal to the Privy Council removed.*" We know how this was extracted; so much so that you get the judges at corners saying they do not agree with this. These are facts which cannot be disputed.

The Guyanese people are concerned about their democratic rights enshrined in the Constitution. These are the things which are worrying the Guyanese people today and this is why the P.P.P. wants to hold on – not that we say that the Privy Council is going to save the people of Guyana. The Government may say that we are inconsistent because when we were in the Government we wanted the Privy Council to go, but we can see, as we have seen in India today, that the Judiciary can be obstructive. In India today, having resolved the political contradictions within the Congress Party, the Government is going ahead not only to nationalise banks and other things which it has in mind but also to let the Preventive Detention Act

lapse.

I remember when the Hon. Attorney General introduced this measure in 1966 he referred to the great democracy of India having this provision. We would like to hear from him whether the Guyana Government will now follow the Indian Government. "*How many years they had it?*" asks the deputy Prime Minister. The next question is, how many years American imperialism has been strengthening its position in India? For the last decade. Thus there were cooperatives, community development, self-help and birth control, the same things this Government is talking about today.

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** You are not talking about birth control? You said it, it was in the newspapers and the ex-Lord Mayor said that any man who preaches massive birth control in Guyana needed to have his head examined. You do not know what is going on in your own country, your own party!

I am saying that the policies this Government is pursuing have proved to be a failure in this other country so much as that they led to a political crisis in the Government of that country. Now we see real measures being taken first to respect the democratic rights of the people; and secondly, to topple the bastions of imperialism. But what do we get here? We get slogans, "*Cooperative Republic,*" and we will have slogan upon slogan. The sheen has now worn off from C.A.R.I.F.T.A., so the Government has come forward with a new slogan. It wants to fool the people by telling them that we on this of the House are being colonial-minded.

The Hon. Mover of the Motion referred to a book by Gordon Lewis who talks about evasion of responsibility and people who are having alibis for inaction. The Hon. Mover was trying to hurl this at our door but this is what the Government is responsible for. When Gordon Lewis speaks of this he is not speaking of the P.P.P. but of all these neo-colonialist regimes in the West Indies, including Guyana. He and all the other academics in the Caribbean are blaming these Uncle Toms for alibis for inaction. What are they telling the people now? "*Hold on, things will get better. The Cooperative Republic is going to save us.*" Another alibi is, "*oh, you know we are in the jaws of American imperialism.*"

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** We will come to the alibis just now; let us deal with the excuses first. We hear excuses, half-truths, excuses. "*We are in the jaws of American imperialism, we are too near to them, we have to be smart, we have to be clever.*" This is what your supporters, your activists, are telling people. You are pretending to be what you are not. You are trying to create an image of freedom fighter, anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist. You are being found out and, therefore, you are trying desperately to be something which

you are not.

When the Seven Year Development Plan was being debated I recall lifting up a copy of *The New Road* manifesto and saying that what was in the Seven Year Development Plan was not in the manifesto. We then said we were prepared to cooperate fully so long as the P.N.C. carried out its manifesto, even though it did not go as far as we did want it to go. Sir, what have we found? *The New Road* has been forgotten. In the year 1968, no manifesto was put out by the P.N.C. Two years ago the Prime Minister told the country that the Government was revising the development plan. Now, with the new slogan, we hear that we are going to have a cooperative development plan.

What we then said, we wish to repeat. That is, so long as this Government continues with the pro-capitalist, pro-imperialist policies, as the night follows day, things are bound to get worse. And as it continues to deny the rights of the Guyanese people, it will not be able to get the cooperation of the people of this country. No matter how many slogans this Government invents; no matter how many gimmicks it produces, it will not be able to move this country from the doldrums and depression. Its own supporters are disillusioned and dissatisfied. One can see evidence of this outside in Brickdam at the Passport Office – the exodus of people who are leaving the country.

We wish to say that we will continue to oppose any abrogation of the rights of the people. We will continue to voice our opposition here and elsewhere wherever the opportunity presents itself. There is no doubt that a great deal needs to be done in Guyana and the Prime Minister and his Government can go a long way to meet the wishes of the people of this country by honouring the commitments he has made to them; commitments which were to protect their liberties; to defend their living standards and made not only at election time but from the inception of his political career. So long as the P.N.C. Government does this, they can be assured that we will not hold on to what the Hon. Minister of Agriculture calls, the last bastions of imperialism.

We, because of our basic opposition to imperialism, required not only independence but the abolition of the Privy Council and we wish to assure this House and this country that if the Government were to honour its commitments to the people of this country, its pledges of going forward with the programme of really breaking the bastions of imperialism, it will have not only our support but on this particular issue of the Privy Council – the two-thirds majority which is required for the Amendment to the Constitution. But so long as it continues to serve imperialism, so long as it continues to deny the basic democratic rights of the Guyanese people enshrined in the Constitution, we will oppose it in this forum in this country, in other forums, in other countries. This is our position and we would like this to be clearly understood by the majority of the people in this country.



## Guyana's Attainment of Republican Status: 23rd February, 1970

**Dr. Jagan:** Mr. Speaker, on this Republic Day I rise to speak with mixed feelings. Universal adult suffrage, voting at eighteen, self-government, independence and republic - these were the dreams we dreamed. We want to cut the umbilical cord with Great Britain. We want to be free.

With the exception of voting at eighteen, these things have been achieved. We should be rejoicing, but unfortunately, there is little to shout about. The real freedom which we fought for has eluded us. Instead of a new liberation, we have a new servitude.

True, the Queen Victoria Statue no longer commands the Law Courts compound, the British Sovereigns, past and present, and the British heroes of yesteryear no longer adorn our august Chamber.

But these are mere trappings. Our masters do not really object to their removal. They have a certain historical flexibility. From the days of slavery to the present time, they have made certain accommodations, surrendering symbols and forms, but, substance never. Today, they prefer to use honeyed words like "*cooperation*" and "*partnership*" and to substitute black, brown and yellow men for white men, the better to achieve their objectives.

We do not see much cause for rejoicing, for what we see is merely a change of form, not of substance. Actually, Republican Status should have come on the attainment of Independence. Had that been done, there would have been no necessity for all the ballyhoo, the demagoguery and the gimmickry of today. Rather, there would have been for us today the necessity for a cold concrete assessment of where we are heading.

The fact is that our beloved country is retrogressing instead of progressing. All that independence and republicanism stand for are being violated in our country.

Conceptually, republicanism was a declaration of independence, an enunciation of the principle that sovereignty derives from the people and not from tyrants who ruled on the basis of the "*divine right of kings*" and "*the king can do no wrong*".

In Guyana, a minority regime has seized power by fraud and rides roughshod over the rights and aspirations of the people. Look around! A paralyzing fear grips our land. The Constitution is being subverted at every turn. The People's National Congress has made a mockery of the electoral process and the Government is being carried on with concessions being freely made to corruption, patronage and nepotism at all levels. Overall hang both the threat under the National Security Act of Restriction and Detention without trial, and the fear under the proposed Trade Disputes Bill of the abolition of the right to strike.

The state apparatus is a vehicle not for the suppression of those who exploit our people and plunder our resources, but for attacks on the people. Political opponents of the Government are daily being intimidated, harassed and discriminated against. The barbaric practice of housebreaking for arrears of rental is reminiscent of the cruel measures applied in the days of slavery, and indenture is resorted to at Black Bush Polder. Those who do not conform are ruthlessly weeded out. Pledges to the Amerindian people have been honoured in the breach and they have been treated as second class citizens, browbeaten and coerced.

Yes, fear stalks our land. Instead of freedom from want, we have a widening gap between the rich and the poor. Foreign vested interests have become more entrenched, more exploitive and more ruthless. For their support of these bureaucratic capitalist elite, they receive more and more concessions. Meanwhile, unemployment and underemployment soar and crime, delinquency and prostitution increase. The cost of the living mounts in the face of the wage freeze.

In this context of the empty stomach, discontent and disillusionment, the small man must be reassured. He will become the real man, he is told, under the Cooperative Republic. Cooperatives will become the dominant sector and will be the means which, they claim, will bring socialism to Guyana.

Mr. Speaker, when will they stop fooling the people?

The Prime Minister, the Minister of Information and I read the same classics in good old days. The fathers of scientific socialism, Engels and Lenin, long ago exploded the myth that socialism can be achieved through the cooperative movement in peaceful harmony with the monopoly capitalists who own and control the commanding heights of the economy – the banks, insurance companies, factories, mines, plantations and foreign trade firms. They made abundantly clear that it was utopian to think that contemporary society can be transformed into socialism without taking into account such fundamental questions such as the class struggle, the capture of power by the working class, and the overthrow of the rule of the exploiting class.

These things our ex-comrades know, but they choose to practice the politics of deception. Let them come out with the truth. There is no such thing as a Cooperative Republic. Republics are either socialist or capitalist. The slogan "*Cooperative Republic*" is a hoax, a fraud, to lull the Guyanese people into a false sense of security. It is a device to cloak and hide the reality of a neo-colonialist, capitalist-imperialist republic.

The truth is, cooperatives cannot succeed in such an environment. They will fail here as they have failed elsewhere. Four years ago, we told them that the seven year Development Plan conceived and made by imperialists would fail. Today, they have set it aside. The yet-to-be-born cooperative plan will die an abortive death.

The cooperative will not bring socialism. Rather, it is only socialism which

will permit of the growth and development of cooperatives. In Guyana, the cooperatives will only provide the cover for a new breed of privileged capitalist elite to use the state machine to get rich quick.

Mr. Speaker, our ex-comrades have killed a dream. Go back to the early 1950s. Ask the Prime Minister and the Minister of Information, the then Chairman and Executive Committee member, respectively, of the People's Progressive Party, whether our dreams when we had written socialism on our banner did not encompass economic emancipation and social justice, freedom from fear and freedom from want.

How can they honour our national hero, Cuffy, when they persecute those who are carrying on his tradition? How can they build a socialist society when the economic foundation and the political and ideological superstructure are becoming more and more under imperialist control; when our resources have been bartered away, and our country has been mortgaged and strangled by huge local and foreign debts; when the real producers are penalized, agriculture hindered and industrialization stifled; when agents of imperialism like Garner Ted Armstrong, daily from the Government radio station poison the minds of the people with anti-scientific, anti-socialist and anti-working-class ideas?

How can they build socialism when they refuse employment to those who have studied in socialist countries the theory and practice of socialism, and deny passports or the right to travel to others who are desirous of studying in universities in the socialist countries? Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to build a cooperative or socialist edifice on colonialist, neo-colonialist and imperialist foundations.

Yes, they have not only crushed a dream; they have also smothered hope. Thousands, disillusioned and frustrated, are leaving our country. They have silenced criticism. The young socialist movement, the youth arm of the ruling party has been bludgeoned into silence for its advocacy of socialism, of nationalisation, of diplomatic, trade and cultural relations with Cuba and other socialist states.

They have betrayed a trust. They have sold out the people. While serving imperialism and building a retinue of hangers-on and yes-men, they are feeding the people with half-truths, slogans and gimmicks.

The depth of the depravity, arrogance and callousness of the Government was visibly demonstrated last evening at the National Park. At a most solemn occasion, who should read prayers on behalf of the Muslim community? Not a representative of the United Sad'r Islamic Anjuman, but a hand-picked puppet, who like others today secure their positions through police intervention. Mr. Fazil became Chairman of the Bush Lot Local Authority simply because the police had detained Mr. Seegobin, himself a candidate, on the day of the election.

The P.N.C regime has brought Guyana to the crossroads. It must now make a clear-cut decision. The decks are cleared. It now has a majority, albeit by fraud. It is not restricted in anyway. There should be no more

excuses.

If the members of this Government cut out their Daimler-style living, abandon Duvalier methods, follow in the footsteps of Julius Nyerere and Fidel Castro and serve the people, we will march with them, we will back them. But we warn, if they continue with the imperialist, we will flight them. Our people deserve a better future, and that they must and will have.

**[Applause]**

## Congratulations to the President: 17<sup>th</sup> March, 1970

**Dr. Jagan:** Mr. Speaker, I will not use this very important occasion to descend to your level of launching out attacks on you, as you have just done against us. We respect the office of Speaker too much for that. So far as our duties are concerned, we will do what we consider to be in the interest of the people of this country and it will not be for you to decide whether we are right or wrong. History will decide our contribution.

In keeping with our Republican Status, Guyana now has a President. Needless to say, to our new President go all our good wishes. Although he was the choice of the ruling party, he is now the President of the Republic of Guyana. We hope that this will always be borne in mind.

Now that the drama and suspense linked with the election of the President has come to an end, attention will now be directed to the functioning of the Head of State. This brings us to the question, "*What role does a non-executive Head of State play?*" Some say that he has very little power with not much to do. Others say that forceful personality can be a great force for good. I have had occasion to tell the late Governor-General that the office was not meant to be simply decorative, to rubber stamp Government Edicts.

Parliamentary democracy becomes a farce if consultation is perfunctory and if independent bodies such as service commissions and elections commissions are subverted and not permitted to perform according to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution.

The Head of State who simply does what he is told, in our view, is not performing his function. He then becomes a useless appendage, an appendage which the poor people of Guyana cannot afford. So strongly do we feel about this matter that immediately after the fraudulent election of 1968, we suggested in a debate during the 1969 Estimates that we might as well consider the setting up of an Executive President as in the United States of America and Latin America. We indicated our displeasure by refusing to attend social functions at Guyana House.

Symbolically, the President is the upholder of the Constitution and the fundamental rights enshrined therein and the embodiment of the hopes and aspiration of the Guyanese people. As such he should ensure that the letter and the spirit of the Constitution is honoured and respected. He must in duty bound be prepared, if necessary, to create a constitutional crisis when measures are being taken to erode the Constitution and to subvert the institutions which protect the fundamental rights of the citizens.

Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to refer to the programme as regards ceremonials and the inauguration of the president? We seem to be following the traditional practice of military and police parades. True enough, the President is Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces and there can be no objection to this being part of the programme but it should not provide

the main emphasis. One would have thought that on such an occasion the working people would have been involved in a more significant way now that we hear so much of the Cooperative republic. The event could have been made the occasion of the dramatization of some central theme of great special significance in the lives of the ordinary people and their hopes for the future.

Sir, I repeat, to the President of Guyana go our very good wishes. We see from his stature that he is not a very big man but little men have been known to do big things. And I am sure, Sir, as we look at his beautiful and charming lady that much of his work, much of his labours in his new office, will be lessened in the sense that he will have a helping hand in carrying out his responsible duties. Again, we wish him all success in his new job and to him go our congratulations for this high office.

## Debate on President's Address: 2nd April 1970

**Dr. Jagan:** From the speech made by the Mover of the Motion on the President's address, one gets the impression that a great deal of progress has been made in Guyana and that we are in for a great deal of tidings in the future. In fact this seems to be the main trend of the propaganda campaign.

Today we have a well-oiled propaganda machinery at home and abroad. I have here no doubt a very costly brochure put out by the *Financial Times*. The Government must have paid a lot of money for this. In the very opening gambit we read of this great progress being made. I quote from the *Financial Times* of London, Thursday, 30th October, 1969:

*"As the decade of the 1960s comes to an end, it seems as if everything in Guyana is being thrown into the melting pot. In Georgetown, there is an air of expectancy. It is as if 1970 were going to see much greater changes in Guyanese life even than those of the 1960s when the former British Guiana moved through civil strife, racial clashes and suspended constitutions from colonial status to Independence as the only Commonwealth territory on the South American Continent."*

Well Sir, the Hon. Mover of the Motion referred to the peaceful atmosphere in our country in this context in which we have this euphoria, this expectation of great things to come, but looking through the President's address, I must frankly say that we are disappointed, because there is nothing in this which one can hold on to say that in 1970 this Republic will usher in something great for the future.

Indeed Sir, I don't understand, I cannot understand, who is right. From the Mover and from the Government benches, from the Propaganda Department, we get the impression that great progress is being made, but here is a statement from the economic adviser to the Government, Dr. David, and this is quoted from the *Weekend Post* and *Sunday Argosy*, March 1, 1970. This is what Dr. David said:

*"We have had growth without development."*

Note these words.

*"This problem has been exemplified by the high level of unemployment and foreign dependency.*

*Our production structure continues to be oriented towards exports and imports of goods and services, many of which can be locally produced; our tastes for food, clothing and similar items are still dictated from abroad; we depend on foreign firms for investment, management, technology, skills, and foreign markets,*

*for protective shelter for our export products.*

*As a result, there has been a neglect of local agriculture and industry and their diversification, and a lack of development of indigenous institutions and mechanisms for mobilising domestic savings for productive investment."*

This, Sir, is not from the P.P.P. This is from the Government's economic adviser who is saying that all the hot air they are blowing is incorrect; it is only hot air.

One would have expected that after six years we would have come now in the Presidential era with a bold plan to present to this House and to the country. But what have we got in this? No mention is made about the unemployment problem or how to tackle it. Dr. Williams in Trinidad at least is putting on a tax of 5 percent; the money to be set aside is \$10 million, for a crash programme to solve the unemployment problem. We have had a 5 percent tax here on companies but where is it? It is merged with the other finances and we have seen nothing out of it. Nothing about the unemployment problem is said.

What about industrialisation? Not a word in this speech about the key sector of the economy, industrialisation! We are not denying the importance of agriculture. Indeed, when the P.P.P. was in the Government, the then Opposition, the P.N.C., asked, "*Where is the industrialisation? Where are the plans?*" It was virtually insinuated and said that all the Government was doing was concentrating on agriculture and drainage and irrigation and land. Others put it crudely and described it as a "*Coolie Government*" and said the Government was only trying to help its supporters in the country.

Where is the industrialisation? You had the I.D.C. functioning, not in the trial period, the formative period, as under the P.P.P. Government, but in the period when the growing pains were over, yet not a word is in this speech about this vital sector of industrialisation.

We know the trend today in international affairs, in trade. Goods from industrial countries are constantly rising in price whereas goods from agricultural countries and poor Third World countries are constantly going down. The only way to recover from this imbalance of trade is to go in for industrialization, but their bosses over there tell them no industrialisation so that, although they criticised the P.P.P. for agricultural concentration, they have now fallen back on agriculture. What a shame!

For the first time in modern history of this country, the country is being governed without any economic plan at all. Six years ago when they brought forward the Seven Year Plan we told them it would fail. They brought Professor Arthur Lewis here. We told them all this advice in Ghana from 1957 onward has produced nothing and it was a waste of time to bring him here. Two years ago we were told the Plan is being revised. What do we get in the President's Speech? It says the Government is still working on a Plan.



*“A new Ten Year Development Programme is now being prepared by a team of Guyanese.”*

What a disgrace! We had told the Government that the past Plan could not produce results. Two years ago, this country was told that the Plan was to be revised and that a fiscal committee on taxation, etc. would be set up. What do we get after two years? An empty statement that a new Plan is being formulated! This is not good enough for this country, considering the many grave problems that beset us today: unemployment, lowering standards of living, disillusionment, dissatisfaction, emigration, people leaving the country, the best brains leaving the country.

Government should have had, for this so-called Cooperative Republic year 1970, this new decade, something concrete, something new, to put to us. No wonder when we were talking about how long this debate was going to be the Hon. Leader of the House (Miss Field-Ridley) said, *“Well, why worry? We have just had a debate on the Budget so this should not take long.”* Are we going to go on year after year telling the same thing, doing the same thing? This is a policy of drift, not a forthright and forward policy in which one can see that some solution will be found to the problems of the country.

I wish to make it categorically clear that a country which is governed without a Plan is a country misgoverned. Only the highly developed countries can afford to do this because they are already up in front, but even they are talking about planning these days.

Every day we are hearing about new corporations being formed – more and more bureaucracy. This is only adding to the burdens of the people. We are now going to have a new Bank. We read on page 2 of the President's address:

*“The objective is therefore to staff it with well qualified persons who will carry out professional analyses when projects come up for approval.”*

What about the Credit Corporation? It has field staff all over the place. Are we going to pile up more field staff on top of that?

Dr. Eric Williams in Trinidad has just decided to nationalise a bank, but he will use the Post Office. If the Minister of Finance looks through his files, he will see that we were contemplating using the Post Office and the Credit Corporation to do commercial banking work. There are institutions already established in this country to do what you want to do. But no! This Government must create another institution, another bureaucracy, more jobs for the boys. But that is not going to solve the problem.

We need bold steps, balanced economic growth, priority being given to agriculture and industry, but this is not being done. The Hon. Mover of the Motion (Mr. Saffee) referred to the fact that agriculture is doing so well, it has reached 25 percent of the gross domestic product, and that the figure has increased from \$191 million in 1966 to \$224 million in 1968. But, to

quote Dr. David again, "*We have had growth without development.*"

In a speech made in 1963 the Prime Minister said, "*Are we going to be constantly looking for bauxite and sugar for growth.*" Who owns them? Sugar is increasing. We have had a record production, 360,000 tons. Glory to Guyana! But unemployment has increased. The labour force has dropped from 33,000 in 1943 to \$17,000 in 1970. Dr. Clive Thomas gave figures in relation to the profits sugar is making, but there is no mention of these facts by the experts on the other side. The problem is solved by not quoting statistics. You have to see what is behind the statistics. There is growth in the sugar industry, but there is serious unemployment. More profits are being made through mechanisation, and vast amounts of money are being taken out of the country.

Where is the Minister? There was a recent strike called in the sugar industry for the workers to get something. Settlement was reached at \$2.4 million, when the Minister was prepared to press the sugar planters for \$5 million. The figures are there. There is growth without development, growth without social benefits. That is not growth, that is not development.

You can quote a lot of figures in this House; you can publish a lot of booklets. The Ministry of information has just issued one, "*Everybody Wins with Burnham*". The jobless wins, the worker, the youth, the aged, the poor man, the student. This is the kind of propaganda put out at elections.

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** This is a new version of it, a new print. We were told that everybody was winning with the P.N.C., that a multi-million hydro Scheme was going to be set up. We were going to have smelting of alumina in Guyana. We do not hear a peep about those things any more. We are hearing about all the new crops; they are growing apples and everything now. Tell us the cost of growing them.

We are not opposed to interior development, but please tell us what the economics of the Scheme are. How much are you spending? What is your yield?

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** I leave the rice experts over there to tell you about rice. But the long and short of it is that this Government has ruined the rice industry. The rice expert over there who spoke did not say anything about rice because he knows that the rice farmers will murder him if he gives fancy figures. Rice produce has gone down and the farmers are getting less per bag of rice produced.

Sir, we need to have some new departures. The President in his speech had this to say: "*...my Government will continue to be guided by the principles*

*of nonalignment which have been the foundations of its foreign policy."* Where can we see this nonalignment policy that they are talking about? Is it in trade? Is it in aid? Is it in cultural representation? It is nowhere except in the fertile imagination of the Ministers of the Government and they have the poor President to say nonsense like this. If the Government is really interested in nonalignment, let us see practical results. The Prime Minister will be going to a conference of nonaligned countries to be held in Africa. Big speeches will be made, like the ones made by the Minister of Labour when he goes to Geneva.

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** I will tell you about Cuba. Dr. Eric Williams does not pretend to be nonaligned. He does not talk about nonalignment but he sends a delegation to Cuba. What does the delegation report? Bold headlines in the *Trinidad Guardian*. They tell us about livestock. Listen to this:

*" 'Their livestock programme has made considerable progress', said Dr. Lawrence Iton, the Trinidad Government's livestock officer, 'they have done more work in the 10 years from 1959 to 1969 than we have been able to accomplish in the last 50 years'."*

They say here that the Cubans use for stock feed, molasses, bagasse, and yeast which is made from molasses. Theirs is a revolutionary departure. They aim to produce ten million head of cattle. They buy buses from England by selling eggs in exchange for the buses. They are making use of their indigenous resources and utilising their natural resources. If the Government claims that it is nonaligned, let us see some evidence of it.

The Minister of information is in charge of culture. What cultural exchange is there with socialist Cuba, one of the territories of the Caribbean? We want greater contact with the Caribbean. What prospects of aid with trade have been explored? What diplomatic representation has been made on that question and on such questions as our border dispute?

I say nothing has been done and this therefore brings me to the point that it is no use talking as the Mover of the Motion talked about depending on our own resources. We all know that. He said if you can get the people to cooperate, you do not have to depend so much on foreign loans. He went on to say it is necessary to mobilize local resources. That is a truism, but how can you get the people to cooperate with the Government when there is a crisis of confidence in the Government, when the people are leaving the country in large numbers, when the best brains are leaving the country?

Setting up a small bank is not going to mobilise all these savings that the Government is talking about because, let us remember, the Government

already has a considerable part of the savings of this country in the Post Office Savings Bank. It is not true that the capitalist enterprises have all the savings and the Government proposes to correct this by setting up this bank which is neither national nor cooperative. What I am saying is that this small bank is not going to be able to touch the foundation of the banking system of this country because the big people who control the sugar industry and bauxite, the landlords and businessmen, who have business in this country are not going to leave the commercial banks and go to the Government bank when they have no interest in the Government bank.

If the Government wants really to mobilise resources, then it must nationalise all the banks. Take over all of them. The Government will get our backing on that. When the Government is talking of mobilizing savings that is only throwing dust in the eyes of the people. It cannot nationalise the local banks because the Government is highly indebted to them.

At page 5 of the 1970 Estimates, the balance of the current account increased from \$3,848,742 at the end of 1966 to \$14,659,575 at the end of 1969. But look at this one. The deficit rose from \$15,837,311 at the end of 1966, to \$42,324,290 at the end of 1969, and it is projected that the account will be overdrawn by \$58,730,290 at the end of 1970.

The Government is talking about capitalising our resources and setting up a bank. It is not going to be able to do it! Let us face realities. With the capitalist banks well entrenched in the country the Government is not going to be able to touch them and it dare not interfere with them because the Government is in the hands of the sharks to the extent of large loans from the banks on a current overdraft basis. Millions of dollars are involved.

In the field of production, if we are to gather all this, we are told about the Ebinu experiment, this has been going on for donkey's-years. The time has come for the Government to grapple with these problems of cattle rearing and set up farms. You will not be able to make it economical if you have to buy stock feed. The price of stock feed is too high unless you can revolutionise and approach it like the Cubans and use things like pegasse and molasses. Here again you will be stultified because pegasse and molasses are in the hands of the sugar planters and the sugar planters are selling these things cheap to themselves. They will not give you the molasses. Therefore, we can see that we are not going to have development; you have a wheel in a wheel and the thing must be looked at as a whole.

Here again we come to the basic question of nationalisation of the sugar industry. When the P.N.C. Government came into office in 1965 it told us that it was going to find its way into the sugar industry. It was going to decolonize sugar. We don't hear anything now. That is dead! We do not hear anything about buying out the industry. The Y.S.M. boys talked about nationalisation. There was silence. No wonder the boys threw out the Chairman and put in another one. Those in the saddle were towing the line too much; there was no one to carry out the wishes of the boys; they were confined.

## [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** To conclude in all seriousness: we are getting nowhere. More talk, more papers and more speeches will not help the situation. Time will prove, as we have seen in the past, that this country is heading for failure. We have advocated that the commanding heights of the economy must be nationalised.

**Dr. Reid:** Name them.

**Dr. Jagan:** Sugar, bauxite, banks, insurance companies, foreign trade –

**Mr. Jordan:** Starting with GIMPEX.

**Dr. Jagan:** Yes, GIMPEX included; take it over any time. Trade with all countries east and west. Practice what you preach.

Thirdly, concentration on industry and agriculture - set up factories. This is what the G.D.C was supposed to do. Put up exchange control which you removed in 1965, price control, and rent control. Only the price of sweet drinks is controlled but not essential foods and medicines! And, Sir, have democracy at all levels.

I repeat, if you get people to cooperate, you do not have to depend on foreign loans. People are essential and the people must be involved in the planning and execution. What people are they talking about? Local Government elections are supposed to be held in November/December 1969. The Minister had said so, but since then his head has been rolled and up to now we have not heard a word. How are you going to get confidence in the people unless you have democracy at all levels?

That is what I would say is a programme. We have said that we will not do like the P.N.C. did when they were in the Opposition. When the P.P.P. tried to implement some of these things, the P.N.C. joined up with the most reactionary forces in the country to bring down the people. We will back you on the progressive measures. But you go around telling people that you must take time, that the P.P.P. was in office for years. Well, this is your sixth year. Is it a question of will and/or power?

The P.P.P. had the will but no power; you have the power but no will. We have agreed to back you. What more do you want? I repeat, wasting money on a big propoganda campaign with all the flourishes will not suffice to rid this country from the deeper and deeper morass into which it is sinking.

## Protocol of Port of Spain: 22<sup>nd</sup> June, 1970

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, as I listened to the Hon. Minister, one phrase came to my mind: "*Much ado about nothing*". What a waste of time and waste of energy! So much time, so much energy, to clothe treason with such a flowery speech when the same time and energy would have been better devoted to getting some of the work done, important work, in the Attorney-General's Chambers.

To put, first of all, the record straight. The Minister seems, in having a guilty conscience – first about the Geneva Agreement and now the Protocol of Port-of-Spain – to want to implicate the People's Progressive Party, as if he were saying what the present Government has done, the treasonable acts, is merely a continuation of what the P.P.P. Government did.

As the Hon. Minister of State said, this matter was raised by the Venezuelans in 1962 at the United Nations. What was the act of the Guyana Government then? All that the Guyana Government did was to agree with the British Government that the records in the British Foreign Office would be made open to the Venezuelans so that they would be satisfied without any doubt that they had no claim to Guyana's territory.

The Minister knows that the Venezuelan representatives went to the Foreign Office, examined the papers and came out with nothing to reopen a closed, dead case. He knows this. The British Government said over and over, this is a closed case. The P.P.P. Guyana Government took the same position. This is a closed case, but since they were making noise we said, "O.K." "*You think that you have evidence; look at the records.*" They went; they looked; they saw nothing. Therefore, having looked, having seen nothing, the answer was to leave everything where it was.

This is what the P.P.P. Government would have done and this is why the coalition government failed to take the P.P.P. to the Geneva Conference because the P.P.P. knew they were committing treason and would not have gone along with them. The P.N.C. knew that, but now this is how they distort history. They are always distorting history. They are always distorting history, as in the Preface of the book *A Destiny to Mould*.

The Geneva Agreement was a sellout by the P.N.C./U.F. Coalition and the Protocol of Port-of-Spain is a second act of betrayal by the P.N.C. Government. They cannot any longer say that their hands are tied by the United Force. This is now a sovereign country, completely independent, and they and they alone are responsible for this second act of betrayal.

Who will deny that the mere signing of the Geneva Agreement gave status and recognition to the claim by Venezuela? If there was no claim, why sign an agreement? Why put the Commission to examine it? We all know the brilliance of the Prime Minister as a lawyer, but, Sir, this was not a legal matter. Had it been merely a legal matter he would not have signed.

This was a political issue, a conspiracy with imperialism, and therefore he was forced to sign. He had to sign. Part of the deal! The Prime Minister was saying in the good old days, *"not a blade of grass, not a square inch of territory."* What about Ankoko? What have they done about it?

The Minister says that we are always talking glib talk about referring to the United Nations. This is what he says. On many occasions we said, *"Take Venezuelan acts of aggression and threats of aggression to the United Nations Security Council."* When Ankoko was occupied, when Leoni's Government declared an Edict that their warships can patrol our waters, over and over the P.P.P. said, *"Take the matter to the United Nations Security Council."* But no, they forgot their brave words. They are afraid to go to the United Nations because they do not want the issue to be settled.

**[The Attorney-General and Minister of State:** It was taken to the United Nations four years ago.]

**Dr. Jagan:** Where in the United Nations? In the General Assembly where general speeches are made? Why not in the Security Council? That is where threats to peace and aggression are to be brought up. The Minister knows that. Why does he not take it there? They do not want to take it there because they are part of the conspiracy. Their Yankee friends do not want it to go there. The Yankees have three billion dollars invested in Venezuela and they do not want the matter to go to the Security Council. So we are told that we are talking glib talk.

Every country which is *"aggressed"* ...

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** ... every country against which there are aggressive acts – Don't worry! I am not a black Englishman like you all. I am not ashamed of my English. I have never apologized for it. As long as people know what I am talking about.

Every country that is attacked goes to the Security Council. That is what the Security Council was created for under the U.N. Charter. Why hasn't the Guyana Government gone there? Before the Geneva Agreement came to an end we read in the newspapers that the British said they wanted the Geneva agreement to be extended. That is all we have now.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** That is all we have here. What have we got is not the Protocol but an extension of the Geneva agreement – instead of four years to another twelve years? There was to be a mixed commission. We wasted a lot of money and time. Where is your report to this House, to the people of Guyana? What has been achieved. Not a single thing has been achieved

and we know that it was not intended that anything should be achieved. That is part of the window dressing. What we should be told now is how many hundreds of thousands of dollars were wasted on this exercise. Where is the report? What has the Mixed Border Commission achieved? Nothing! The truth of the matter is that it was never intended to achieve anything – that is a fact- except to provide window-dressing for the Geneva Agreement.

Now we are told that we are going to have peace for twelve years, and maybe another twelve years. Under the Geneva agreement we were able to have peace, but we had Ankoko and we had Leoni's Edict. They are still in Ankoko. What kind of peace is this? We must have peace with respect, not peace like a dog running away with its tail between its legs. That is what this Government has done to the people and to this country. This Government has betrayed the country and behaved in a cowardly manner, cowardly because it is a part of this conspiracy. To keep this country as a neo-colonial puppet state while it talks glibly about socialism and Cooperative Republic.

Socialism will not come to Guyana until this Government decides to take an anti-imperialist position, and if tomorrow this Government decides, really, honestly, sincerely, to move to an anti-imperialist position, the same agreement will be used against it. Do not let them fool you. The fact that they have signed the agreement to keep this issue footballing for another twelve years is an indication that they do not want substantial changes in this country. They know that as long as that agreement keeps hanging there, the Americans, through the Venezuelans, can always create difficulties for a progressive Government in Guyana.

Have we not noted that in Trinidad the other day, when the Government of Dr. Williams was under attack by patriots in that country, the Americans moved their warships into Trinidad's waters, the British alerted their warships, and the Venezuelans sent arms and moved their troops to the border adjoining Trinidad? Have we not noted this? Have we not noted that the Venezuelan Government is an instrument of Yankee imperialism, a puppet state like the P.N.C. Government?

The Minister says that this agreement is different from the Geneva Agreement. The only difference is that under the Geneva Agreement we had Ankoko, but under the Protocol of Port-of Spain we do not have Ankoko. That is the only difference. We are going to appoint other Commissions, committees and intergovernmental bodies to keep examining. That is what we have been doing for the last four years.

We are told that there will be peace talks. We are told that Venezuela has agreed to sit down at the table and talk and not make any claims on Guyana's territory. But that is like a robber who comes into my house, occupies one of my bedrooms, and then says, *"I have no claim on your house at all."* That is the kind of treatment we are getting, and we are told we made a wonderful deal.



In the statement read by the Prime Minister on this Protocol we are told that not only will Venezuela not make any claims on our territory but we also will not make any claims on Venezuela's territory. What a disgrace! The Members of this Government have made the aggressors into peace makers and the people who are attacked into aggressors. This is a disgrace and a shame! One would have expected that now they are free of the U.F. They say that they want to build socialism in Guyana. They would have taken the steps laid down in the agreement to bring this issue to a head.

The Minister says there is provision in Article 33 of the Charter for conciliation, for arbitration, juridical methods of handling this issue. Do we have to go along with Venezuela, talk to them while they are always stabbing us in the back? This is not in our national interest. The P.N.C. talks about free and fair elections but it intimidates candidates and voters. The Prime Minister himself goes all over the place telling people, "*You are not going to get any grants from the Central Government.*"

When you get a P.N.C. Council, they will be 'yes-men', just as you say yes to Uncle Sam.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** They do not have any grant to give to the people because they are stealing the money.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** The Prime Minister is the man who behaves badly in this House. We say that if a mistake has been made – let us give them the benefit of the doubt, that they made a mistake in signing the agreement. Then, if that is so, let them proceed to the United Nations because conciliation is not going to get us anywhere. Let us proceed to the steps which will take the issue even to the World Court, because Guyana is a small country. Guyana has to depend on the goodwill of world public opinion. Guyana has to depend on a good moral standing.

It has been proved over the last four years that you cannot talk and get anywhere with the Government of Venezuela. You are dealing there with a shifting position. A few years ago from 1958 to August 1960, there was a progressive Government in Venezuela but thereafter, because of the sell-out to imperialism, that Government has lost its popular support. The sell-out to imperialism is one; the raising of the claim to Guyana is another reason. The Leoni Government lost when the Accion Democratia Party (Betancourt and Leoni are the Accion Democratica Party), Caldera, the President, has only a majority of votes, a little over 20 percent. How do we know that what he signs here, will be honoured tomorrow by some other people who go in. Aside from that, we have seen that both the Accion Democratica Party and the Christian Democratica Party led by Caldera have a biparti-

san foreign policy; the same; no difference and we cannot expect very much difference in the action of these people.

We say not only the P.P.P. but the man in the street wants to have this issue settled once and for all. Otherwise we will have a recurring decimal every now and then. When the people are under pressure here, something is going to happen on the border to deflect attention from the problems at home. And when the Venezuelan Government has pressures, we will have incidents on the border. This is how we are going on. This is like the Kashmir problem in India. I remember when the Prime Minister and I went to India in 1953. The Americans were arming Pakistan which was intended to frustrate the Indian nation. Pakistan kept demanding every now and then a little invasion of Kashmir. The Indian Government has to spend over 50 percent of its revenues for defence. This is almost a parallel where 53,000 square miles of land belonging to Guyana is held in abeyance so that the imperialists can use it as a football any time it suits them.

This is why we condemn the Government, first for signing the Geneva Agreement and now for signing the Protocol of Port-of-Spain. The people of this country demand that this issue be settled and this matter should be taken to the Secretary General of the United Nations with the recommendation that it should be referred, if necessary, to the World Court. Apart from this, the Government of Guyana should try on this question to have a national consensus, not to have a partisan policy, because this partisan policy will not satisfy the national interest of the people of Guyana. It will only play for time but this playing for time is marking neo-colonialist time.

The time has long passed for Guyana to be a neo-colonial state. The time has come when we must break new ground and to break new ground at political, economical, diplomatic and other levels, it is necessary to bring an end to agreements such as this and to bring a final settlement to the border dispute.

## Financial Paper No. 5 - Supplementary Provision on the Current and Capital Estimates for the period ending 31<sup>st</sup> May, 1970

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, I thought that I distinctly said that I wanted to speak on item 4. I am sorry about that. I hope, in future, to speak a little more loudly so that you should not be mistaken about my intentions.

Sir, my colleague, Mr. R.D. Persaud, has made some points, which I would like to emphasize as regards the expenditure of money on this Subhead, Local Government Elections. One would expect that the Government would have fair employment practices so far as employment is concerned. Apart from the points made by my Hon. Colleague that people who traditionally were employed to do this type of work are being bypassed, and political activists of the P.N.C. are engaged to do these jobs, one would hope that when opportunities are given for employment such as on this extra occasion, so to speak, the yardstick to be used would be that a broad cross-section of the country's people should be employed.

This point has been made repeatedly in connection with forces such as the armed forces, the police force, and so on. But, at all times, we find that this practice or this principle is not observed and one cannot expect national cooperation, whether on this matter or on other matters, if the Government continues with its discriminatory practices in employment. \$50,000 is being set aside for Local Government Elections. We wonder why it is necessary to spend so much money for this. Had Government officers been used in many places instead of party political hacks, the taxpayers would have been saved a lot of this money!

But, Sir, my observation is that the taxpayer's money is being used to finance a political machine. I wonder how much money is being used for this purpose of bribing and corrupting people and to issue rigged proxies. These are very fundamental questions which we must raise in his Parliament for we see intimidation practised on a very wide scale. Even the Prime Minister goes into the street and intimidates the electorate and tells them that if they do not vote for the P.N.C. they will get no funds from the Central Government. It is practised at all levels, at the level of the police who go and pick up candidates, and take them to another Minister of the Government.

[Laughter]

**Dr. Jagan:** The Hon. Minister (Mr. Hoyte) laughs! But, Sir, he cannot doubt the fact! He should have asked his officers to investigate that Mohar Singh took people to Government House in New Amsterdam where David Singh terrorised them.

Apart from these things, people are going around harassing others who

are candidates and supporters of the Opposition, causing searches of their homes on the ground that they are looking for ammunition. This is the kind of harassment and, unfortunately, the public has to pay for it. The Government wants to pursue these tactics. It might as well dispense with elections and save the taxpayers \$50,000. Build a small factory or an extension to schools which the Hon. Minister of Education (Miss Field-Ridley) cannot do now for lack of money.

If the Government proposes to use fraud, to use intimidation, to use bribery and to use Government money for this, this is what we are saying. Then Sir, it will be a waste of energy, a waste of Government official's time to go through the Motions and a waste of \$50,000 of taxpayers' money, which will be spent, on this exercise.

We are aware, Sir, that the Director of Audit recently indicated in his Report for 1967 that \$19 ½ million was unaccounted for. How much of this \$50,000 will be accounted for? Will the Minister of Finance (Dr. Reid) tell us how this money will be spent? For what purpose? To pay how many agents? Civil servants could very well have been called on to do these jobs, to take a day off from their normal duties and save the taxpayers' \$50,000. The Government is using the taxpayers' money to pay its friends; and worse, no proper accounts will be given. When questions are asked, the Members of the Government sit without answering. This is the order of the day – not only intimidation but also bribery and corruption. I hope that the people of this country will wake up to the fraud that is going on in Guyana in the name of the Government.

## **Financial Paper No. 6 - Supplementary Provision on the Current and Capital Estimates for the period ending 30<sup>th</sup> June, 1970.**

**Dr. Jagan:** Item 1 - I want to raise the same question raised by my colleague in connection with the post of Special Assistant to the President. I hope the Minister will give us some information on this.

I did not raise this question to query who will get the post. What we are concerned about is the necessity for additional assistants, additional personnel in this office. The Government machine is costing this country a great deal. Nearly 50% of the Budget is towards personal emoluments. Way back in 1968, the Salaries Commissioner, by the name of Mr. Gorsuch, suggested that personal emoluments should only cost around one-third of budgetary expenditure. But we keep adding and adding to the establishment.

Now if the Collins Commission, or whatever commission or body is carrying out an exercise, makes certain recommendations, then I think it is the duty of the Government to bring forward the report, a comprehensive report, explaining to the House, to the nation, that these things are necessary. But we have no such report, we have no such document, no justification is given except to say that the President needs a Special Assistant. Has the volume of work in the Office of the President increased to such an extent that he has to have a Special Assistant, or is it because we have many square pegs in round holes who cannot do the jobs they are supposed to do?

I do not want to go into names but we have an expert in the Cooperative Department who was put to be the Head of the Establishment in the President's Office and, before that, the Governor-General's Office, because as I understand it, he did not want to go along with some of the rascality which this Government is practising under the name of cooperatives. If you are going to put square pegs in round holes, then maybe you need Special Assistants, Administrative Assistants and so on. We are told that in this Cooperative Republic much emphasis will be put on cooperatives, and yet a technical Officer who specialises in cooperatives is moved to do routine work. This is a waste of taxpayers' money.

The Minister of Finance has not given an adequate explanation why these posts are necessary. Why is so much money being spent for top-heavy administration? This is why we cannot have money to build schools and to do essential services. The Government is asking people to become involved in self-help and a few weeks ago parents were asked to give \$5 each to provide an extension to a school. This is a disgrace. This has become a practice now. We do not mind people being involved in self-help and even making a contribution, but let us spend the taxpayer's money wisely. Why another Special Assistant? This should not be in the Estimates.

I should like to speak on items 43 and 49. The legend with respect to

item 43, Ministry of Local Government, Telephones states:

*"Voted provision inadequate on account of Local Government Reform."*

It seems that under an item such as telephones, an increase of \$8,000 on an original vote of \$35,000 is certainly excessive. Surely, the Government must have known this year that Local Government Reform and Local Government Elections were to take place. Will the Minister tell us how is it that this vote was so greatly underestimated, and also for what purpose specifically one is called upon to spend so much more now, nearly 25 percent more?

As regards item 49 - Subsidy, Guyana Marketing Corporation, the note states:

*"To provide for an increased subsidy for 1970."*

A few days ago we read in the press where I believe the manager of the Marketing Corporation said that the Corporation has lost money because people have been selling it rotten produce. I do not know that it is the policy, or ever was of the Corporation to buy rotten produce. As far as I know, the officers of this Corporation who work in the country areas place very stringent conditions on purchasing produce from the farmers. That is why I was surprised to read in the press that losses are being made because the Marketing Corporation has to purchase rotten produce. My information is just the opposite.

I was in Pomeroun the other day and the farmers were complaining that one week they are told that they want oranges which are not too yellow in colour, and two weeks after when they carry oranges with green skins they are told they do not want oranges with green skins they want oranges with yellow skins. In Wakenaam, I was told that produce is being bought from the farmers - not rotten produce - and so meticulous are they that for things like cucumbers, they want a specific size and shape; others are rejected.

From my information, this is where the losses are taking place - and this is what I should like the Minister to check: they buy the produce and leave it in the open for days and days without adequate protection.

The more fundamental question on which I should like to get some information is why is there this increase? We had an original vote of \$500,000, then there was a previous supplementary provision of \$155,000 and now we are being asked for \$250,000. Why? Let us hear the explanation. Incidentally, while I am speaking on this point, I should like the Minister to say whether it is true that the Guyana Marketing Corporation has handed over to Greenland Cooperative Society the contract to distribute the flour. Obviously, this must be a very lucrative proposition, and if it is a lucrative proposition, one would assume that the profits from the distribution of the flour would help to meet the subsidies to the farmers.

I therefore ask whether the information, which I have received that this contract has been subcontracted to Greenland Cooperative society, is correct or wrong. How many buses, how many trucks does the Greenland Cooperative Society have that it is handed this contract to handle this flour? This is a racket.

Yes, I am assuming that if I am correct we should not allow what is likely to be a profit to the Government to become a profit to the people who hold influential positions in this country, who run companies, call them cooperatives, and wangle contracts, building contracts, public works contracts, trucking contracts.

This corporation should not be losing money considering it has this flour contract, and considering the very stringent measures it is now using. We do not have the huge surpluses of produce, which we had in the time of the P.P.P.

Why then does it continue to lose so much money? Why is the subsidy going up? Farmers' prices have been so fixed that there is not the increase in production which should have been there at the present time, as a result of which we would have expected that the subsidy would have been diminishing, instead of increasing. I hope the Minister will answer all these questions so that the House and the country may be properly informed about what is talking place.

## Motion: Financial Paper No. 6 of 1970: 30<sup>th</sup> June, 1970

**Dr. Jagan:** Items No. 72 and No. 73. I note from item 72 that the provision for Electric Power and Lighting of Buildings has increased quite substantially from \$325,000. An additional sum of \$260,000 is now required. I am wondering why this is so, whether it is due to an increased number of buildings and other facilities which have to be lighted or merely an increase in rates. I know that though there were strong protests about the increase in electricity rates, they have been increased. No doubt, the Government is also operating on the same basis.

This brings me to the point of asking what is the Government's intention as regards the development of electricity in this country which will help to bring down the rates rather than take them up? We see not only the consumers but also the Government has to pay increased costs. I recall when the previous Government was contemplating the purchase of the Demerara Electric Company, Preece, Cardew and Rider advised that after two 10-megawatt steam generators had been purchased there should have been further development through hydroelectricity. We heard the Government during the last General Election campaign say that it would develop Tiboku waterfalls with the \$100 million hydroelectric project. That seems to have gone with the wind.

I am asking, therefore, whether the Government intends to fall back on what Preece, Cardew and Rider recommended, the development of a modest hydroelectric Scheme at Tiger Hill in the Demerara River which would bring the generation of electricity to a very low figure and thus not only help the consumers but relieve this heavy cost on the taxpayers. It is amazing to see that a vote of \$325,000 has to be increased by a supplementary vote of \$260,000 at this time.

There is something wrong, first of all, with the estimate. It seems to be just plain "*guesstimates*". If the estimates are correct and this is due to the increase in rates this year, then it is the Government's business to look into this. It is the duty of the Minister of Finance to see whether this public corporation is being managed properly or if its future planning is done in such a way that it will relieve not only the consumers of electricity but also the taxpayers of these increased burdens. I hope that not only the Minister of Finance but the Minister in charge of the Electricity Corporation will say something on this score.

Item 77 - Free Places Secondary Schools. We see that an additional sum of \$10,000 is being asked for in addition to the \$48,000 voted for free places in secondary schools. This is the one item where I had hoped that the Government would have asked for an increased sum. Today, we find that a larger and larger number of children are receiving primary education. I believe the number is now in the vicinity of over 150,000 and a mere 7,000,



if as much as that, are getting free places. One would have thought that we would have, as an aim, free secondary education. I do not know how far the idea of comprehensive schools is going ahead, how soon they will be implemented, so that more and more children can have secondary education free. I cannot imagine that \$48,000 and now \$10,000 can provide children in this country with free secondary education, with the kind of education we need at this level.

The cost of living is rising rapidly and parents can ill-afford to pay for things like education after paying for food and rent. Nothing is left over of the little they get. Therefore, as the conditions of the working class deteriorate, it is incumbent upon the Government to provide more money under this Subhead. As I said, this is one Subhead on which Government would get the support of the Opposition in terms of providing free secondary education to all children in this country.

Item 78 - University of the West Indies – Contribution with Expenses - we note that an additional sum of \$9,600 is being provided for contribution to the University of the West Indies. I am sorry that my colleague who should deal with this question is ill today. But I should like to ask whether it is the Government's intention to continue to pay this, whether this is the amount which we are committed to pay annually. I remember that at one time the intention was that after setting up our own University we would continue to pay a diminishing amount until it would be virtually withdrawn.

I see that we are now to pay an increased amount. If, Sir, because of the facility we are getting in having some places provided for students from Guyana – I presume in the professional fields like medicine – it is necessary to pay this, I should like to question whether we are getting value for our money in the sense that Guyanese academics are being debarred from that country. There was the case of Dr. Rodney and more recently the case of Dr. Clive Thomas, two eminent Guyanese, who were virtually debarred from teaching at the University because of the Government's ideological position. Not content with their views, the Government placed restrictions on their entry into Jamaica and thus they could no longer teach at the University.

What was more shameful was that, in the case of Dr. Clive Thomas, the University refused to offer him another position in the University of the West Indies either in Barbados or in Trinidad. On these grounds we seriously object to making any increase in the contribution to this University. This is not a free University. It is clear, as happened in the past, that the administration is taking orders from the puppets of imperialism in this area. Had it not been doing so, it would have made a lot of noise about the banning these eminent Guyanese from Jamaica and even if it could not have done anything, as a result of noise and protests, it would have seen to it that places were offered to them in Trinidad where these gentlemen have not yet been banned. No doubt the same policy will apply there too.

For these reasons I strongly object to the increased contribution which this Government has now agreed to pay to the University. We want our Guyanese to go to an environment which is free, where they can get education which is not circumscribed, where witch-hunting is not going on, where professors are not hired and fired because of their ideology and where progressive people are not rooted out. On these grounds we seriously object to this increased contribution.

Now I come to Item 79 - Grant, University of Guyana. An amount of \$500,000 is now sought in addition to the \$1 million already voted. I wish to know from the Government whether this additional sum of half a million dollars will provide the necessary grants and loans which will permit the University to convert from an evening University to a day University. I ask this because one of the main reasons for moving from Queen's College to Turkeyen was to allow the University to have its own buildings where it would be able to provide instruction during the day. You will recall, Sir, that when the University was established at Queens College a lot of noise was raised by the then Members of the Opposition, the persons who now sit on the Government benches. Derogatory statements were made about evening school. We used the facilities which were available to us at the time because we wanted to move ahead quickly with a University and we did not wish to wait three years, which was the time the U.N.E.S.C.O. advisers said it would take to put up new buildings and to recruit professors. We were able to do it in one year, but we were attacked for using the Queen's College buildings not only for high school education but for university education. We were attacked for this.

We now have modern buildings and adequate facilities at Turkeyen. As I understand it, Sir, in the last two school terms, since last October, it was physically possible for the University to take on daytime instruction, but I understand it is Government's intention not to introduce daytime instruction for the new academic year beginning September this year but from 1971. If this is so, then it is disgraceful because the main reason, as I said, for not having daytime instruction before was that we did not have adequate buildings.

I understand there was a survey conducted by the University among the students to find out whether they would like to have daytime instruction. I understand that even though they are anxious to do so, many of them, for economic reasons, have said they would not wish to do so. In other words, only about a third, I understand, of the student body have indicated that they will be willing to enrol for daytime instruction. Clearly the Minister must know that for a student to teach or to work in a Government department, or in a commercial firm, the whole day and to take what is tantamount to a full-time programme is very difficult.

Those students who work abroad, they take part-time instruction. They may take half of the work load of a full-time student. Most students who have been to university know this but our students are asked to do a four

year degree which takes a normal student three years, or in five years to do a degree which takes a normal student four years. This is a tremendous work load.

We understand the students are doing well but we know that education does not mean passing examination. Education means having a wide knowledge of what is going on around you, not only reading a few prescribed books and passing the examinations. How can students who work a whole day in our kind of weather, go to evening school in a sleepy condition, tired, be expected to become fully educated persons, whether in the social sciences in other sciences, or even in art? It is asking too much of our students, and one cannot expect, therefore, the very best to come out of them.

We are talking of brain drain, of not having enough people in our country to man our services. Obviously, we want the best and to get the best there will need to be suitable conditions. I do not think that the students can get the best conditions under the present system. Of course, the Government may say that we were doing the same, but as I said, we started the University on an evening school basis because we wanted to get along with the job and not wait three years. Now that we have the buildings, it is a question of, as I understand it, grants and loans to the students. If the students are provided with enough grants and loans, then they will be able to change from evening school to day school and thus make a better contribution to the country in the future.

I should therefore like to find out from the Minister whether this \$500,000 is intended to provide the kind of assistance, to which I referred, to students so that they can commence day tuition from this academic year rather than from the new academic year, that is, beginning September – October, 1970, rather than September – October, 1971.

Item 77 - This deals with the question of status and pay for the graduates of the University. I understand that graduates of the University who teach in primary schools are paid less than those who teach in secondary schools. Perhaps the Minister would like to comment on this point to explain why this discrimination, so to speak, because one would have thought a graduate having got a degree, wherever he is teaching, would be paid the same amount.

If we continue to pay, as I understand it, less to persons teaching in primary schools and pay them more when they teach in secondary schools, then the graduates would always want to use the primary school as a jumping off ground and not make the primary school the root of their careers. Another point which was brought to my attention is that graduates in the social sciences are paid less than some other graduates. I should like to ask the Minister to say why this is so.

I understand that if social science graduates are not teaching in their particular field, that is, economics, sociology, and so on, then they are not given the same allowances which some other graduates receive, for instance,

graduates in chemistry or biology. I think that is what it is at the moment. My colleague has all the facts and I hope that the Minister will say whether I am correct in the points I have made.

I wonder if I can make an observation in respect of what the Minister said on Free Places at Secondary Schools, item 77. She did mention that these sums set out here are really not for the free secondary education Government is providing but for free places in grant-aided schools. I was wondering whether this amount represents an increase in the numbers or an increase in the amounts which are paid, because I notice recently that the Principal of St. Stanislaus College indicated that the grant which was given per student by the Government was totally inadequate in view of increased costs.

I do not know whether this point of view was upheld by the Association of Masters and Mistresses, but the point made by the Principal of St. Stanislaus College was that unless the subvention per head of student was increased one may find that the schools will have to raise fees to maintain salaries. This may affect the whole student population.

I was wondering whether the amount listed here is really due to the fact that increases are being given per student, whether it represents larger grants because more students are going to grant-aided schools or whether more schools are being given grants now than in the past. I should like the Minister to clarify this point.

I was rather surprised to hear the Hon. Minister say that the Hon. Minister of Health (Dr. Talbot) was in agreement with the idea of a Medical Faculty at the University and that the Government is considering this with the University of the West Indies to see what arrangements can be worked out. It seems that the mills of the gods move very slowly on this. I remember when we were setting up the University of Guyana objections were raised about what was called our "*breakaway*". I proposed to Dr. Williams, when he paid a visit here, and to others that what we should aim at is to give the University of the West Indies a sort of professional status, to make it a University created along the American pattern.

Later on, when this idea was rejected, I was speaking to Professor Arthur Lewis right in the building here. It turned out that he was also recommending the same thing. In other words, he was recommending that we run one "*parent*" University and Jamaica, Trinidad and Guyana could have done locally a lot of premedical, pre-legal, pre-engineering, and even one or two of the professional courses where it is not necessary to do clinical work. We could have had many more doctors trained here and we would not have had to bring in Koreans and all these half-baked doctors who are here in this country.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** This is what the P.P.P. suggested and we would have had this

by this time if this idea had been pursued with vigour. It is in the files; it is in the record. The idea was rejected out of hand by the U.W.I.

I was surprised to hear that Professor Arthur Lewis – who was at one time Head of the University and whose ideas apparently were not accepted so that he left in disgust and went to the United States to teach – had put forward the same suggestion. Now I understand from the Minister that they are still pursuing this. “*Pursuing*” in a very flexible word because you can take years. Here is little Surinam with a Medical School, a Dental School. Even if the schools do not have international recognition at least persons trained by them are as good as the Koreans and others who are coming here and they satisfy the needs of the people. Why cannot we do the same quickly? I do not see that it will cost us very much more than we are paying at the moment to the U.W.I. for these services.

I therefore hope that in this matter there will be some contest between the two charming Ministers of the two Ministries. We hope that the Minister of Health will be able, in view of the great need in Guyana, to use her influence on the Minister of Education to pursue to point made by my Hon. Colleague Dr. Ramsahoye. We hope that they will get on with this job of setting up a Medical Faculty here because this will go a long way, not only to meet the needs of Guyanese people, but to service countries like Africa and other areas where there are so many shortages.

We would like to help our friends in this respect. We see them recruiting typists here. Why not sent them doctors? We have so many people here. Why not train them in these professions? Train them as dispensers, male nurses and female nurses. Such people are necessary and in short supply in this country. We have people; we have the unemployed. We have students with several subjects in the General Certificate of Education and they cannot find jobs. They could easily be taken into the University if they are given assistance.

Item 86 – this item deals with Personal Emoluments at Bishops’ High School, Ministry of Education. I know it does not deal with this exact point but I hope the Minister will be indulgent. We are living in the southern part of the western hemisphere, therefore, Spanish plays an increasingly important role in this country. Bishops High School, in the lower forms, has no Spanish teacher. Spanish is taught in the fifth and sixth forms. I have recently been informed by the Headmistress that the school cannot afford a teacher for the lower grades. I hope the Minister will look into this matter. There are students who would opt out of French, if necessary, and take Spanish. They have no inclination to study French.

Item 3 - Industrial Development, Ministry of Economic Development. Sir, the sum that is now asked for is for the purpose of acquiring the *Daily Chronicle*, newspaper and for the establishment of a Shrimp Trawling Company and the East Coast Bus Service. We in the P.P.P. are not opposed to Government ownership, but what we are opposed to are the things which the Government will go into. It is trying to squeeze the small man out and

trying to spend money in fields which will not lead to the development of this country.

The *Daily Chronicle* Ltd., is not something which is going to lead to the development of Guyana. This is not for development; this is for propaganda, to continue the half-truths and the lies. Sir, what about the tax? Why is it that this House has not been given all the figures? How much was paid for this company? What were the terms? What is the financial turnover? Is it making a profit? Is it losing? Or are the taxpayers to subsidise P.N.C. propaganda?

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** The Minister of Agriculture is always irrelevant! *The Mirror* is not subsidised by the Government.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** The Government is going to spend taxpayers' money! What about the factories? Why do we not have factories in this country? Why do we not have factories in the area where they have now signed a 12 year Protocol Agreement? What about development of the timber industry – the complex of industries there? What is the shrimp trawling company? Can we get some information from the Government? Is this a wholly-owned company? Is this a part-owned company? Surely, Sir, the Government should not come to this House with supplementary estimates to debate small items like this when we cannot have a real debate.

You are always telling us not to speak on policy, Sir, but, clearly, the Government should treat the House in a much better manner by giving the House more information, giving the country more information as to how it is spending the taxpayers' money so that the Opposition can say whether this is the best way the money could be spent.

Clearly I cannot ask questions unless I know what is being done. The Government does not answer when the questions are embarrassing to it. I asked a simple question. The Hon. Member Mrs. Da Silva asked a simple question: how much is shared between the G.M.C. and the Greenland Cooperative Society? We get no answer from the Government. I should like the Hon. Minister to give us some explanation, to give some facts to this country and to the House. And I reserve my right to speak on this issue and then to pose some questions, if necessary.

I wish to deal now with the East Coast Bus Service. I have no axe to grind for this. The small man is going to become a real man! By and large these people are small people who have grown up from the bottom and they are not giant corporations. The Hon. Members on that side talk about socialism, etc. Why did they not touch the bauxite companies? Why did they not touch the sugar companies? Why did they not touch the big trad-

ing concerns? They are moving against the small companies!

In Trinidad Eric Williams' Government nationalised the Trinidad Bus Service but compensation was paid to the people. But, as can be seen with the East Bank Bus Service, the people's services were terminated and the service was given to the Mackenzie Company in which the Prime Minister's wife has shares, the Prime Minister's brother-in-law has shares, the Bauxite Company has shares, and some bogus cooperative society – you can ask where is this cooperative society – has shares. No one knows anything about it; we cannot get information. This is how this country is being run. It is a disgrace, Sir.

What is being done? First of all, many of these buses were constructed here. Chassis were brought and the buses were built here. This provided employment for a number of people in Guyana. This Government is not concerned about that; it does not care. The Yankees want to sell buses; the British wants to sell buses; they want to improve their balance of trade position, so the Government buys buses. We saw in a press release, I think it was yesterday or the day before, where the members of a cooperative society, which is supposed to have, I think, 23 percent of the shares of the Transport Cooperative Society, have said that they want nothing to do with it. Probably they realize that it is going to be a bankrupt organization. It will be corrupt as everything else which is run in this country by this Government. They perhaps feel that they will lose their shares.

As regards the people who own the buses, we are told that they have been offered shares in the Company. Even if the Government did not want to compensate them why did the Government not value the buses and give the owners shares to the value of their buses?

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** My Hon. Friend says, "*tin-lizzie*". This is the colonial mentality. He wants to ape the imperialists all the time. He wants to live in a glass house while the poor man at the bottom has to live in the mud. These buses have value. Let us accept the fact. In equity the men should have been compensated. I said earlier that I have no axe to grind about this. But the value of the buses should have been estimated and the equivalent number of shares should have been given to the people. These people should have been allowed to use the buses until they become unserviceable. Let us say that the services of the buses are not good, has the Government asked these people to improve their services? Has the Government told these people that they must bring better buses or construct better buses? No! All that this Government has done dictatorially is to tell these people, "*you are notified that you have to quit by June 30.*" This is the fascist method by which this Government is ruling this country.

The next question arises from the talk over the buses. We want to know what is to happen with the consumers and by that I mean the people who

travel by the train. Trains have been losing money for many years. The railway service was a form of indirect subsidy to the people of this country. In 1966 there was a White Paper in this House to the effect that the Government loses \$14 million annually by way of subsidies one way or another. Fares and freights were raised and now it is proposed to abandon the train service so as to save the Government some money.

But what is to happen to the taxpayers? Let us forget the bus owners for a moment. What is to happen to the people? Are they now going to be called upon to pay more to travel? We have not had a policy statement from the Government as to whether the buses now owned by the Government – the major shareholder – will be subsidising transport in the same way as the trains were subsidised, or whether the buses will now be run at a profit. If they are to be run at a profit then, knowing the bureaucracy and corruption wherever this Government puts its hands, we can anticipate that Peter will be called upon to pay for Paul. The public will be called upon to pay as they now are paying through their noses for electricity and so on.

The Government has been very silent about all these things. The workers have been promised compensation. The workers have been promised all kinds of things. They are now quarrelling. The union is saying that these men have not been given priority in employment. Don't worry about the vote. You rigged the ballot boxes. You used proxies. That is not going to save you. You will learn a lot of lessons from Trinidad. The time comes for all corrupt politicians.

To come back to the point: why has the Government not had a debate in this House? Why does it not debate essential issues? I have been told, for instance, that the Minister is going to adjourn the House today for a date two weeks from today. Debate the Motions that the members of the Opposition have tabled!

The Government does not debate the essential issues that affect the country today. It wants to railroad everything. The people do not know what is going to happen, what are the economics of this. Where is the feasibility study? Why it is not presented to this House? This is taxpayers' money. I know that in our time the Guyana Industrial Development Corporation, now called the Guyana Development Corporation, embarked on feasibility studies for everything – whether it was glass, cement, yachting shoes, bicycles – and these reports were made available to investors and others. Surely there must be feasibility studies for all these things. Why have we not seen them? Why have they not been tabled in Parliament? Why have we not had a debate on these issues? Are we going to be called from time to time to vote additional subsidies for losses mainly due to corruption and inefficiency?

I am concerned, as I said about two aspects of this. First, the way in which people who have performed services are being treated, and secondly, because of the travelling public. In addition to this, there are the children



who have to travel to school who used to travel fairly cheaply before by train. What is going to happen to them? I should like the Government to give us some answers to these questions. Let it tell us. Since it has embarked on this project, it must know what is to be the fare. Let the Government tell us. How will this fare compare with the fares that were paid on the train? Let us get the answer.

Under Item 4, Cooperative Development, we see that an additional sum of \$170,000 is asked for as a supplement to the \$100,000 already voted to honour guarantees given by the Government in respect of six cooperative societies. Can the Government give us some more information about this? Why is it necessary at this stage to come for an additional \$170,000? I notice that the Government is to spend \$50,000 under item 5, for the acquisition of Plantations Westfield, Dageraad and Mocha on the Essequibo Coast for land settlement. I should like to ask the Government whether all the lands which are now in the Government possession have already been beneficially and intensively occupied, that is, in the Essequibo itself, all the lands in the Tapacuma Lake Scheme.

We understand that the Ministers are now becoming farmers and cultivating big estates, with the help of Government machinery, through rice committees. With rice farmers' money they are buying equipment which is being used to level estates and rice farmers cannot get their lands levelled in land settlement Schemes, at Black Bush Polder and elsewhere. Their houses are being pulled down because they cannot afford to pay rent, because they cannot get enough yield from land which is not level, but profits from the Board are being given to hand-picked P.N.C. activists.

Some elections were rigged; in other cases, where they cannot rig election they bypass them. The R.P.A. wins every seat as they bypass elections and set up their committees. Now Ministers are taking over the land and the people fail. When the people fail because the prices are too low, when some of their own supporters fail to cultivate, the Ministers are taking over the land and using rice farmers' machinery and other things to cultivate the lands.

This is the racket that is going on in this country. Rascality is going to catch up with you. The Minister said last night you can fool all of the people some of the time but not all the people all the time. Well, that maxim will catch up with you. All this rascality is going on! Ministers of the Government are using their positions to get rich. It is a disgrace. The position is that a lot of lands which are Government owned – aside from those which the Minister has taken over in Boersirie – have not yet been beneficially occupied. There is poor drainage and no irrigation. In Mara people are giving up lands.

**[Intervention by the Chairman]**

**Dr. Jagan:** I am asking a question on this. I asked why it is that Govern-

ment has to spend more money to buy land.

**[Intervention by the Chairman]**

Perhaps there is a racket in this country.

**[Intervention by the Chairman]**

**Dr. Jagan:** This is the place to judge. It will be much more beneficial to the country to improve the lands which are already owned by the Government, to provide proper drainage and irrigation facilities, internal works, for instance, in the Boerasirie, to see that places like Mara are occupied beneficially rather than to waste money buying more lands.

We are not opposed to the Government acquiring more lands but first things must be done first. The Government tries to keep everything in the dark and then comes up with supplementary provision, major policy questions, and does not provide our country with the necessary information.

## Public Business Motion: 25<sup>th</sup> August, 1970

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, the Government has to bring such a measure to this House at this time against the background of very adverse comments by the Director of Audit, against the background of public non-confidence in the way that the Government is going about public business. One would have thought that the Government, in its own interest, would not have come forward to this House with such a measure. It is not that the Government has not got the money for Contingencies. It has \$½ million which is a big sum. Apart from the fact that there were these adverse comments by the Director of Audit we have had Government recently embarking on ventures such as the purchase of the *Daily Chronicle* Ltd., the purchase of H.B. Gajraj, the purchase of Global-Agri. in the Berbice River. The country is not wiser as to what is taking place. Are these to be regarded as contingencies? Surely, if the Government is to manage the people's business properly it must go in for planning and not go about with *ad hoc* expenditure of public funds, when we see that this *ad hoc* way of doing things is leading to vast sums of money going down the drain.

Sir, I know that during the time of the P.P.P. the Guyana Industrial development Corporation, as it was then called, did feasibility studies of things then published for general information. The public then knew what the Government was doing. There must be a Report available to the House! What do we know? What does the public know about Global-Agri.? How much money has the Government sunk into it? How much has been lost? Are these things to be done in secret corners, in cobwebs where no one knows what is happening; where fraud is going on? What do we expect the public to think when they read that \$900 [*sic*] is unaccounted for? If its hands are clean it would not want to come before this House to have an increase from \$1/2 million to \$2 million. Why? What are the fields of the Government? External Affairs? Sir, external affairs could not require this extra contingency; this is already planned in the Budget.

We are told that some of this money will have to go perhaps for defence. We understand that the Protocol of Port-of Spain has brought peace to Guyana, and that the Surinam talks with Minister-President Sedney has brought peace on our other border. If this is so, then where is the necessity for contingency expenditure for defence?

A sum of money has been voted for the Guyana Development Corporation. The point which is to be noted is this: the Government does not have before this House a heavy schedule of work. The House has not met for months and months. If the Government had such a heavy programme one could then understand that it must have authorisation to spend in an emergency. Therefore, since it cannot have the backing of the House then it must have authority to spend money. But there is no such excuse. It is not that

this House is preventing the Government from spending money, but at least if the Government comes to the House for whatever money it wants to spend, the House will then be able to say whether or not Government is spending money in the right direction.

Of course, the Government can go-ahead and steam-roll the expenditure. But if we are a Parliamentary Democracy as it is alleged, then the Opposition has a right to express its point of view; Government can ignore it if it wishes. But this is what we have a Parliament for. Therefore, Sir, whatever the field, whether it is external affairs, defence, industry or development, if the Government adopts a different procedure of coming to the House for supplementary expenditure from time to time, the House will have an opportunity to discuss and debate these issues and thus the public will be better informed of what is going on.

Members of this House do not know what is going on; the public also is not aware of what is going on. Sir, against the background of all these audit queries and unvouched for expenditure there must be suspicion that all is not well in Government's handling of the financial administration of the country. It is not the Ministers of the Government who are suffering; it is the people who are suffering. However patriotic one may be no one will want to expend money in this country whether it is foreign capitalists or local capitalists.

Sir, we see today the brain drain out of this country; the best people in this country are leaving. The people who have skills are leaving the country by planeloads. How is the Government going to run enterprises? How is it going to man the services? Party hacks are not going to do this. The people who are leaving today are not only those who are opposed to the Government but Government supporters. Let the Hon. Minister of Finance visit the Income Tax Department; let him go to the Passport Office and he will see how many people are leaving this country. Why are they leaving? It is not only a question of salaries. If people have the feeling that their country is moving forward, that there is a future for them, that there is hope for Guyana and Guyanese, if they see that they are playing a meaningful role in the development of their country, they will stay. But Sir, they have nothing to be inspired by, except stealing, bribery and corruption in high places. This is what they see and they see the country going down. This is why I advise the Government in the interest of the country not to proceed with this.

It is not that the Opposition can stop the Government from spending. The Government can steam roll everything – it has the majority, but let things be discussed, let plans and so forth come here for debate so that the public can say whether it agrees with what the Government is doing or not. Advice may be tendered which may not be accepted. One can see that the only reason for such a large contingency expenditure is that the Government does not want anybody to see what is going on. This is no doubt why D'Aguiar resigned as Minister of Finance and the United Force was

kicked out of the coalition; because the Government does not want anybody else to examine the accounts.

But the other side of the story is that a large contingency fund indicates lack of planning and lack of foresight. If there is proper housekeeping, proper budgeting and planning, there will not be the necessity for this *ad hoc* expenditure.

The Minister has not drawn up a list of specific items, which we can see. He has not told us why this kind of expenditure is necessary. He has been very vague. I do not think the business of this country can be run in such a slipshod manner. It is not that the Government has not got enough Ministers and Junior Ministers. It has many of them; there are many Ministries now, many advisers. Why cannot the Government make better plans and run things more efficiently. For these reasons I do not see how the Opposition can agree to increasing this amount fourfold.

The Minister says expenditure has gone up. Has it gone up fourfold? Has public expenditure gone up fourfold? Clearly Government has not satisfied this House, or the people of this country, that a measure such as this is necessary at this time. I would urge the Government, in its own interest, and in the interest of the people of this country who suffer and have such a lack of confidence at the moment, that it withdraw this measure and restore some of the confidence, which is sorely needed at this juncture in this country's history.

## Personal Explanation: 30th November, 1970

**Dr. Jagan:** I wish to raise a matter which I think could have been satisfactorily handled by the Government side. This is in connection with today's holiday, the celebration of Eid-UI-Fitr. A request was made by my colleague, the Hon. Member Mr. Ram Karran, to the Leader of the House and Minister of Education to the effect that today should not have been a day of Sitting. This is so, according to the rules. We realize that Eid-UI-Fitr is not a national holiday; this of course is an oversight on the part of the Government. However, that being so, we still feel that since the Government does not have a busy legislative programme, it could have easily not met today.

I would think this is not only an inconvenience for the Members of this House who are Muslims but also I think it is really an insult to the Muslim community as a whole. If the Government feels, as I said, very strongly that it does not want to make this a holiday, we feel that this should be a holiday - there is every justification for granting this concession especially as the Government does not have a very busy legislative programme. I am sorry that the Leader of the House did not accede to this request of my colleague.

## Public Business Motion: Financial Paper No. 7 of 1970

**Dr. Jagan:** On the question of Parliament Office, I just wanted to raise this matter of an office for the Leader of the Opposition. I did speak a moment ago to the Prime Minister and he said that he would speak a little later.

On item 12, Public and Police Service Commissions, I should like to urge the Government to look into this question of employment of persons who have graduated – I refer particularly to doctors who have graduated from socialist countries. Only recently one such person, after getting a registration certificate to practice in this country, but not to practice privately, had to leave the country because the Public Service Commission would not offer him employment.

The Prime Minister some months ago had indicated to me that the Government intended bringing forward a Bill which would allow such persons to practice privately if necessary. I hope that this will be done shortly and, indeed, that the Government would take up this matter with the Public Service Commission about the appointment of persons who are qualified and who should fill the vacancies which exist in the Public Service.

I should like to raise a question on item 14. The Prime Minister anticipated that I would have raised a question on this item. I was not going to refer particularly to the part dealing with the Prime Minister's visit to East Africa. I was going to refer to the part dealing with entertainment as such. It seems to me that the Government completely underestimated this expenditure, and I cannot see why this was done; except that the Government has embarked on a policy of frivolous and excessive entertainment. Because one notes on several occasions when the Prime Minister entertains and others entertain it is done on a lavish scale and it is costing the country a great deal of money. This is why perhaps the Hon. Minister of Finance did not anticipate such expenses. I would have thought that the Hon. Minister of Finance himself would have got up and objected to this item, even though he has put it here.

I am serious about this because clearly there are many pressing needs in the country and the Government must try to cut down on these items of unnecessary expenditure.

I should like to make a general observation dealing with several of these items wherever the note section speaks of provision for the Embassy of Brazil and then item 26.

That is a separate item. I notice there are several Heads under which Brazil is referred to and I was wondering why it is that in the legends against items 20, 21, 22, 24 and 25 we read, "*provision for the Embassy of Brazil*".

It would seem to me that it would have been better for the legend under

item 20 to state precisely what is being done. Item 22, for instance deals with Postage, Cables and Telegrams. The sum of \$74,000 was noted and now, there is an additional amount of \$46,000 to meet unanticipated increase in the volume of mails to be sent to missions and provision for the Embassy in Brazil. What provision do we mean? Are we talking about mails, cables and telegrams specifically when Brazil is referred to there? It would seem to me that the note section is rather confusing.

On item 26, Expenses of Guyana Boundaries Commissions, I wish to find out what is the reason for this very large increase of \$19,000 and an original estimate of \$30,000. It seems to me a substantial increase. While I am on this point, I wish to say that it has been our view that this is a complete waste of money. The Government continues to dilly-dally on this question of the border issue with Venezuela. The Government has signed a Protocol with Venezuela after rushing it through the Parliament in one evening. My recent visit to Venezuela disclosed that this Protocol has not yet been debated in the Congress and indeed there is severe opposition to it. When I say, "*not yet*", I refer to a visit there about six weeks ago. I do not know if anything has been done since. I know that there has been serious opposition to it even within the ranks of the Government Party, and as such, it is likely to be shelved. We are wasting a great deal of money with the same Commission to go over this same ground which is a useless exercise in our view and a waste of taxpayer's money.

This item deals with the contribution to the African Liberation Movements. The Prime Minister is no doubt aware that immediately this announcement was made the People's Progressive Party came out wholeheartedly in support of this measure and said that it was in keeping with the Party's stand of giving support to these movements in Africa and we welcomed it. This, of course, does not excuse the Government for committing the country to a payment without prior parliamentary approval. I raise this not in any way to go against the decision which was taken.

However, I would like simultaneously to ask what the Government is doing with respect to other liberation movements. I should have thought that the Vietnam Liberation Movement, which is one of the key areas of struggle against imperialism, needed the support of all freedom fighters all over the world. And if the Guyana Government is pretending to be a supporter of liberation movements, then it must be consistent and give, as we said, either a similar or a greater amount as a contribution to the Vietnamese struggle against imperialism.

I notice that the Prime Minister in his statement abroad mentioned the question of sanctuary in Guyana for these African Liberation Movements. We would like to ask, since we are next door to Brazil, the great subcontinent to the south, what we are doing with respect to giving sanctuary to the freedom fighters of Brazil. Surely the Government must know that torture and other vicious means are used against the people who are fighting for freedom in that country of Brazil. Even the I.C.J. has been refused per-



mission to send an investigating team. Even the Human Rights Commission of the Organisation of American States has been refused permission to enter that country.

It is not a charge which is made offhand, that there is torture. Nuns and others who have been tortured have disclosed the extent of the viciousness of this regime. What is the Government doing? What is the Government doing about offering sanctuary to these people, in being consistent with its policy of giving aid and succour to liberation movements? I repeat: we welcome this gift and we ask the Government to be consistent in its stand and to give a similar contribution to the Vietnamese struggle and also to give sanctuary to those in Brazil.

I note from the press that the Government has made a contribution of only \$5,000 to the suffering humanity in Pakistan. What is the yardstick by which the Government measures its assistance? As I said, we welcome this \$50,000 contribution to the African Liberation Movement, but surely, in this hour of crisis and need the Government could have found more money to give as a contribution to people, the large numbers who have suffered, who have become homeless and so forth. \$5,000 is a measly contribution on the part of this Government. Even if it is meant as a token contribution, certainly more could have been given.

I am not trying to make political propaganda. I know the members of the Government will be cynical and say –

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** I anticipate what you will say.

Therefore, I appeal mainly on the ground of humanity. Nearly half of Guyana's population has been killed, I understand, in Pakistan. Others have been made homeless and so on. The extent of the suffering is tremendous and the Government of Guyana should make a contribution which is in keeping with the good name of this country and thus, Sir, I wish to criticize sharply the Government for the token contribution which has been made.

The Hon. Prime Minister is misinforming the House. I should just like to say that at conferences, such as the World Peace Council and also the Stockholm Emergency Conference in Vietnam, at all the recent conferences, special appeals have been put out to the whole world for aid and assistance to the Vietnamese. It is true that the socialist countries are giving billions of dollars, but that does not mean that they do not require further assistance. He has misinformed the House.

Secondly, as regards aid to the African Liberation Movement, again it is not true for him to say that the socialist countries are not giving aid to those countries. I have heard at the Afro-Asian Solidarity Peoples Conference held recently in Tripoli, people from the Mozambique Liberation Front and from the other Liberation Fronts in Portuguese colonies all got up and spoke of the help they were getting from the socialist countries. Therefore,

the Hon. Prime Minister is misinforming the House. He is justifying giving aid to one side, and not to other people on the ground of need, that one side is getting plenty of aid and the other side is not getting. It is the wrong impression and I wish the House to be properly informed.

I do not object to this expenditure but what I object to is the way it is being done. More and more we see a huge administrative bureaucracy being built in this country and no country can be built from the top down. Already this country is paying nearly 50 percent of the budget when it should be about a third or 33 percent, for the bureaucratic machine. And now the same thing is being done with respect to Amerindians. Captains are being hand-picked here and there and a monthly stipend is given to them. Why is it that the Government, which talks of democracy and of cooperative development - which presumably develops from the bottom on a representative basis - does not hold elections, free and fair elections, among Amerindians instead of hand picking people and paying them? This obviously is in keeping with the general practice of the Government to buy support, to bribe and corrupt, to divide and rule. I have been to many Amerindian areas and this policy of the Government is creating contention and division among the Amerindians, not unity. Is that what is wanted?

If these people are to be helped, those to be helped should be captains and other leaders in whom the Amerindians have confidence, if development is to take place from the grass roots level. But any independent survey will disclose this, and this is being said, that people who have been called captains in the majority of cases are not the persons whom the people want. If free and fair elections were held, these people would not be elected captains for their respective communities. Therefore, while in principle we do not oppose the payment to captains, we are definitely opposed to the way the Government is going about this business, merely adding to the growing bureaucracy and the tendency to create administration from the top and not from the bottom. Once the Government continues with this, there can be only failure ahead for this country.

Speaking on this same point, I recall many years ago the *Daily Chronicle* was about to be closed down, in fact, I think it was closed down when the Directors gave up their business and the workers organized a cooperative which eventually failed. During the process, I remember that the workers appealed to the Government to give them a substantial share of advertising. I remarked at that time that in view of Government declaration of support of cooperatives, advertising should be pooled and shared on the basis of circulation, size of newspaper and so on.

It seems, Sir that that is what is done in certain countries. I believe France has this method of dealing with advertisements, but that principle was not accepted by the Government and thus the cooperative failed and ultimately the Government itself purchased this undertaking. I believe it was called the *Daily Chronicle* Ltd.

My Hon. Friend has just made a very important point and that is that

the readership of the *Sunday Chronicle* and the *New Nation*, to which a large amount of Government advertising is channelled, is severely restricted. Clearly, therefore, if the Government wants the people to know what is taking place – if, for instance, there are notices of some kind giving information to the public, or tenders which are advertised from time to time- it must embark on a fair policy of distributing Government advertising so that the public at large will be able to become aware of what Government intends to have done.

I certainly feel that the Government has embarked on a discriminatory policy so far as advertising is concerned. If one looks, for instance, at the *New Nation*, one sees a great deal of advertising. This is not a daily newspaper. This is a party paper and if it can be said as the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Natural Resources is now saying “*What about the Mirror*”, then, by what yardstick is it alleged that the *Mirror* is a party paper? The New Guyana Company is a public company.

But, even if it is alleged that this is a party paper, what yardstick determines that the *New Nation* should get a substantial amount of advertising and a daily paper, such as the *Mirror*, should not get even one-fifth of the advertising. In fact, it is getting none at the moment. What is the basis of the policy?

I wish, therefore, to raise the question of the basis of policy because the *New Nation* should be equated with *Thunder*, which is a party organ *per se*. As such, this policy needs to be re-examined by the Government if it claims that it is dealing on a basis of non- discrimination.

As regard item 79, Public Printing Regulated by Contract. Here again I do not know what policy is adopted by the Government, whether all the contracts are now awarded to the *Chronicle* which is now owned by the Government. I should like to know from the Minister whether tenders are called upon. If so, when was the last time that these tenders were advertised, and whether such tender board procedures are honoured and respected in respect of the granting of these contracts for public printing.

We hear a great deal of rumours and off –the-cuff statements outside and the public at large is none the wiser because of this. I should therefore like some clarification. It is true that a 3 percent commission is charged on all orders which are placed for goods which are imported from socialist countries and that this 3 percent has to be paid when the order is placed. Secondly, it is true that the Government also requires a 10 percent commission or tax, or whatever it is called, on the total value of the goods, including insurance and freight, and that the 3 percent and 10 percent are added and then passed on to the consumer? We would like to know the answer to these questions.

Will the Minister tell us what has been the effect of this innovation since it has been applied earlier this year? Has it resulted in a fall in the price of goods? We were told that one of the objectives of this exercise was to help to reduce the cost of living since merchants were buying goods from so-

cialist countries at cheap prices and making exorbitant profits thus, contributing to the increase in the cost of living. From what I have seen in the press of figures published about the cost-of-living index, I see a continuing rising trend; therefore it does not seem that this policy is bearing fruit. Perhaps the Minister will clarify this point. I should also like to know whether this intervention on the part of the Government has resulted in a drop in trade from the socialist countries because I understand that some people who had quotas from last year were allowed to bring in goods without these additions of 3 percent and 10 percent, and others who are now called upon to pay these sums feel that they will be at a disadvantage competitively. This is what was told to me by one merchant. Since they will be at a disadvantage vis-à-vis those who were allowed to import without having to pay this commission, they have decided not to import these goods.

In view of this, I have some doubts whether the intention is really to reduce the cost of living or whether it is in fact to stifle trade with socialist countries. That is why I ask what has been the effect. We know that many of the big capitalist countries are having great difficulties in balancing their trade accounts, are suffering from balance of payments difficulties and no doubt they are exerting pressures here and there to curtail trade from the socialist countries. Therefore, I would like to know from the figures, whether this Government is succumbing to that kind of pressure, using the excuse that it wants to help the consumers. I am not concerned with this in any way. My Hon. Friend, the Minister of Agriculture and Natural Resources (Mr. Jordan), sitting in his seat talks about GIMPEX.

[Suspension]

**On resumption of Sitting:**

**Dr. Jagan:** Yes, Sir. As I said, I merely wanted the Minister to give a clear exposition to this House as regards the policies and the practices which are being pursued by this External Trade Bureau so that all and sundry will be quite clear as to the measures which are being taken.

May I also ask if this 10 percent which I understand is being charged is in addition to the customs duties which are charged as an indirect tax on the people of the country? I wish to know whether this 10 percent plus the 3 percent are in addition to the customs duties.

It seems like the Government needs to make a clear pronouncement on this matter so that the people will know exactly where the Government is heading. There is a great deal of confusion and consequently it is leading to a lot of uncertainties. Many business people are leaving the country. This is a fact. Maybe the Government does not want small local capitalists to invest any further in this country. I am not a representative of the capitalist class, my party does not speak for that class, but we have always said that there is a role which small native local patriotic capitalists can play.

The Hon. Minister said before the suspension for tea, that I was referring to this item because of GIMPEX. Many people are of the opinion that the Government has moved in this direction mainly because of GIMPEX, but this is a false premise, because long ago, the Government removed practically all the quotas that GIMPEX had, so that I am not speaking on this because of any selfish motive. The fact of the matter is that generally speaking people are concerned. We see the concern expressed by the Junior Chamber of Commerce. I am not speaking of the Senior Chamber, but the Junior Chamber of Commerce. The Government, therefore, should clarify its position.

My Hon. Friend Mr. Reepu Daman Persaud has already asked certain questions about the legality and otherwise of this Bureau. Perhaps the Minister should tell us what are the other intentions of the Government, whether it is proposed to bring within its ambit external trade of all kinds and not only trade with socialist countries. Why the discrimination? Why has the Government moved only against the socialist countries?

Sir, I am glad that the Hon. Minister has clarified the point about whether there would be one or two charges as regards a commission fee. In view of the objective stated to help reduce the cost of living, do not the Government and the Hon. Minister feel that the 10 percent charge is too high?

We know that commission agencies have functioned here for many years and normally the commission fee of an agency varies from 3 percent to 5 percent and therefore I am rather surprised. If it had been the intention of the Government to pass on the benefit of cheaper prices, for instance, from the socialist countries, to curb this inflationary trend, a 3 percent increase annually, surely the Government on its own, realizing that it already has a 3 percent development levy in addition to normal customs duties, would have taken a small percentage. The Hon. Minister of Trade told us how small the staff is. If that is so, the Government should try to see that the revenues it would be getting from this levy would be just enough to meet the cost of administration but not to impose another tax on the consuming public. This is what it is doing when it says it is imposing a 10 percent charge.

The Minister assured us that this is a national enterprise and is not in any way related to any private concern. I hope there is no such understanding arrangement as we had with the Guyana Marketing Corporation, which is also a national Government concern, and the Greenland Cooperative Society in the case of the distribution of flour. I just want to be sure that this is not the case. Even though the Minister says this is a national institution, there may be subcontracting going on. I hope he will give us double assurance that this is not so because what goes under the name of national is not always national in this country under this administration.

Another question I would like to ask. The Minister read from the Prime Minister's statement and he told us what he said at the Town Hall. We know that. What we want to know is what administrative action the Minis-

ter has taken to control prices? How many months have gone? The Government has the power, what has it done in terms of fixing prices?

The Minister made the point. He read the Prime Minister's statement that one of the main objectives of this exercise was to help to control the rising prices in the country, therefore I am asking him if he would tell us, with this control he has, if the Government has done anything thus far in relation to that part of the exercise which is within the ambit of this bureau.

## Public Business Motion Supplementary Estimates Financial Paper No. 7/1970: 1<sup>st</sup> December, 1970

**Dr. Jagan:** Item 158, we see here, "*Supervision of Weighing of Canes on Sugar Estates*" with the sum of \$5,850 earmarked for this Head. I do not know what is the intention of the Government, whether the Government proposes to continue this exercise indefinitely, but we should have some clear answers to this question because this has been a bone of contention for a long period of time on the sugar estates. The Minister is aware of the fact that many of the scales have been proven to be defective and time and again these scales have led to unnecessary stoppages of work which could have been avoided.

It is felt by the workers and by the union which the workers want, that the workers should select persons from among themselves, elect them, in conjunction with cane farmers, so that they could have representatives to look at these scales at all times. The Minister apparently has decided that the Government should appoint a few persons placed at estates to be ready if something happens, but this is a most unsatisfactory arrangement because these scales, whether by intention or accidentally, go by at a moment's notice as soon as the backs of the officers are turned and it would seem to me that the solution which the Minister has embarked upon is not a satisfactory solution. Besides, it is putting an unnecessary burden on the taxpayers and relieving the sugar planters of what I would consider a legitimate cost of production.

What I am saying is that the workers with the cane farmers should elect representatives to represent them at the scales, to see that the scales are registering correct weights so that the workers and farmers are not cheated and that the payment of those persons should be made through the estates. I see nothing wrong with this. This is a factor of production and should be regarded as a cost of production. Indeed if this were done it would help to prevent a great number of stoppages which the Government and the country are so concerned about.

The Government is going about it in a wrong way. It wants to bring legislation in this House; the Minister is persisting in spite of the T.U.C.'s declaration that it is opposed to such legislation. We oppose it on the basis of principle. I understand that the Minister is going around saying I am in favour of this kind of legislation. This is absolute nonsense. I hope I am not saying something which is wrong and I hope I am correct in saying that the Minister said so. If I am wrong I retract it. Trying to ban strikes is no solution for industrial unrest. The Minister has the example of procedures established elsewhere for the taking of a poll. In this very country on two occasions, the question of polls was suggested. One of the things causing industrial unrest is this question of the scales and I am saying the Minister

is going about it in the wrong way. This should be ended in favour of the procedure which he was in favour of at one time. I notice he has written to the union asking whether the union would be agreeable to a proposal that workers and farmers should elect their representatives and be paid by the sugar planters. I think he has enough persuasion to persuade the employers to meet this legitimate cost and not pass it on to the taxpayers or try to get around it by moving a Bill here to ban strikes.

There is under this Head, item 170, Workmen's Compensation Ordinance in the sum of \$10,000 to meet the payment of outstanding claims. We know that the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance has now been put aside and in its place has come the National Insurance Scheme, but, repeatedly, attempts have been made to get the Government to give to the workers the same benefits they were enjoying under the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance.

On several occasions the Minister promised to bring before this House legislation to amend the National Insurance Scheme but as far as I am aware nothing has yet been done. I should have thought that this Government, which always says it has the interest of the workers at heart, would have done this simple thing long ago. Many things were pointed out to the Members of the Government but they have not taken the trouble to amend the law to bring it into line with the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance. Therefore, I urge the Minister concerned to do this immediately so that the workers will not suffer as they have been suffering over a period of time.

On item 173, we have an expenditure of \$181,000 to provide for an increase in expenditure on conferences, including the Prime Minister's tour of Africa. This is certainly a hefty sum considering that only \$200,000 was the voted provision for the whole year. I should like the Minister of Finance to tell us how much the African tour really cost us, not to lump it together as it is in this Head. What is the exact amount? I raise this not because we object to this tour. What we object to is the extravagant manner in which it was done, the carrying of unnecessary baggage. I refer to one Minister here, Mr. Cammie Ramsaroop. I refer to Mr. Sase Narine. I refer to others.

#### [Intervention by the Chairman.]

**Dr. Jagan:** It seems to me all this was done for the purpose of show and it is not necessary to waste the taxpayers' money in this manner. This is why I ask the Minister to say exactly how much this tour cost.

I wish to support the points made by the last speaker. The creation of all these posts – the continual payment to these people – is a waste of the taxpayers' money. We are aware that, like the Elections Commission, the whole registration apparatus is a hand-picked Government body which is not intended to carry out the functions earmarked in a department like that.



We have seen ballot papers with elastic bands taken out of ballot boxes. When these papers are opened all are marked "P.N.C." and yet in the Report of the Election Officers there was no mention about this.

I recall the conversation with the Head of the Elections Commission when this was brought to my attention. His remark was, "*somebody has to answer for this*". I have not seen either a report about it, or any query by the Chairman of the Elections Commission. We have seen during the recent Local Government Election that ballot boxes were stored in a Rest House at Leguan where P.N.C. activists and organizers were staying, when others were kept away from the Police.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** In Georgetown, we have seen that in several boxes the votes which were cast do not tally with those which were inside the boxes, not by one or two, but by hundreds. The person in charge rightly agreed with the scrutinizers of the other parties to set aside these boxes and the Minister of Home Affairs came along and said, "*add them up*". Why are we wasting time? Why are we wasting the taxpayers' money like this? If the government wants to dispose with elections, let it go ahead. It must not fool the world; and it is not fooling anybody. This country has the worst reputation in the world so far as this question of free and fair elections is concerned. There is corruption!

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** I wish to deal now with Registration Officers, Elections Commissioners. These people are supposed to be impartial; these people are supposed to carry out the letter of the law as well as the spirit of the law on questions of elections. At the last elections proxy lists were supposed to be published four days before voting day. Up to today, they have not been published. Why go through this farce? Why spend this large amount of money, \$156,000, and perhaps several other hundred thousand dollars for the Election Commission? A factory can be built with that amount of money. This can be enough for the down payment for a factory to provide employment for the people. This is dirt; this is filth. And the people in the Government who want to call themselves "*honourable*" are wallowing in this mess and they are taking this country down with it. They go around the world pretending to be great democrats, freedom fighters and socialists. But socialists and freedom fighters do not stoop to this kind of rotteness.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** The Hon. Minister of Education is capable of juggling words but that does not fill bellies. Smooth talk in the long run does not help.

Your predecessors in Trinidad tried it for fourteen years but time has caught up with him; it will certainly catch up with you too.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, I join with my Hon. Colleague in seconding the Motion for inserting after the word "*Elections*", the word "*rigging*"; and also for the deletion of this item from the Estimates.

The Hon. Minister took the opportunity, in replying to what I said, to make several insinuations which are unfounded. If they as Members of the Government have all these facts they talk about, why is it that they do not publish them? Why is it they do not publish them in the *New Nation*? Why do they not come out on the street corners and talk about them? Why does the Minister use the privileges of this House to tell lies, falsehoods and half-truths? Of course, like the cowards they all are they wanted to accuse others of betraying the country, but they themselves have betrayed it.

**[Mr. Hoyte:** Where have you been recently?]

**Dr. Jagan:** Where I have been is known. I do not go around in hiding like you.

Sir, the Hon. Minister is talking rubbish. I am not going to answer all the nonsense the Minister has said. I merely wish to say: "*let him repeat this outside. Let him print it in the dirt sheet.*" Let us come to the next point that the Hon. Minister made, namely, that all the votes tallied in the end. That is not the point. There was a voting book with counterfoils and there were ballot papers one side of which carried numbers. There were checked; so many were given out, but when the box was opened there were 100 additional votes.

I saw this at Queen's College in Georgetown: one man was in charge of nine persons; nine people were sitting counting. It was agreed between the parties concerned and the Chief Officers at Queen's College that each one of these nine persons would separate the ballots according to the respective parties and then the ballot papers would be taken to the head of the table where the scrutinizers from the various parties would be able to examine the papers for each party to see if they were parcelled correctly because the scrutineers could not go around to all nine tables.

This procedure was agreed to by the Chief Officer. The Minister came along and told them "*Forget about that*". I am talking about fraud; how fraud is committed. The Minister hand-picked the Registration Officers. He hand-picked all the election agents, all the people who were separating the ballots. The Minister did not want procedures which would make the whole thing fair and appear to be fair. The Prime Minister talks about two allowances and one car. Travelling allowances are paid to all Ministers. This is the kind of dirt they are always spreading. A Minister is entitled to

an allowance. How does he travel?

They raised it, those rascals, and I have a right to reply. They attacked other people for their own thievery which is going on today. Everybody knows about this. No accounting is done in this country today. The Archbishop of Guyana said that you were thieving. The Director of Audit said that the Government has no accounts to show and therefore the Members of the Government want to push the blame on us.

The Government will stay in power by these methods, but what is happening to the country? I do not sympathise with the Chamber of Commerce man, Mr. Baburam, who is now replying to Mr. Nascimento, who has suddenly become a socialist. I do not defend his position although I do not see that people like Nascimento can become socialists. It is the kind of socialism the Government is practising. I was reading one of the newspapers this week and I saw where he quoted from one of the recent Missions that came here. What they said is that people have lost confidence. How are you going to get this country moving when all these things are going on? Save the money! Cancel the vote! That is all.

Yes, Sir. I was going to speak on item 12. I should like the Hon. Leader of the House to tell us something about the point raised by my colleague with respect to the Government Printery. Because it seems to me that with the new processes installed it should be a very easy matter. I refer to the photo offset method. It is an easy matter to have an additional shift if this becomes necessary to bring out *Hansards* on time; not only *Hansards*, but Government reports which come to Members much too late for them to be of any real help in their work.

With respect to item 12, the notes read: "*to meet additional expenditure on cattle and pig projects*". We do not know exactly what is meant by additional expenses – how it would be done? I should just like to make one general observation here. Basic to the development of the cattle and pig industry we will have to go over the whole question of development of the stockfeed industry. I do not think that the government is looking at this problem very seriously. Because the price of stockfeed in this country is much too high. I note the other day there was a report in one of the daily newspapers. I think it was dealing with the Marketing Division, I am not sure that corn production locally is only 26 percent of the total requirements of the country. I suppose that this is in keeping with stockfeed requirements. I am wondering whether the pricing policy has something to do with it. For I notice last year that the Guyana Marketing Corporation paid 6.8 cents per pound for corn whereas the imported price is 7.8 cents. Is sufficient incentive being given to the producers? I am not going to go into the question of Global-Agri because that was going to produce all the corn in this country, after the banana project fell through in the Demerara River. Then in the Berbice River, we were going to have all this corn produced but that is out of the way too.

What is the Government doing tangibly to stimulate production – basic

raw materials for the stockfeed industry? What is the Government doing to set up a Government stockfeed industry? We saw recently in Trinidad where a mission went to Cuba and it is reported that in Cuba, there have been more progress in the livestock industry in ten years than Trinidad has made in fifty years. The Minister is aware of this. That country has revolutionized the whole question of stockfeed production and therefore the whole livestock industry. What is this country doing about it? Are we going to go along in the same old traditional way? If we do, we are not going to solve either the problems of the farmers whom we are trying to settle on the lands or indeed stimulate production in this vital fields of pig and cattle industries. Obviously, there is great scope for these sectors of production, but we will have to get down to the basics perhaps, (i) a fertilizer factory and (ii) a stockfeed factory which is going to be able to sell stockfeed to the people at cheap, rock bottom prices. This is how scientific agriculture is done all over the world, not only to talk about mechanization; that is one aspect of it which we need not bother about too much. I am talking about the basics. I do not think that the Government is tackling the two basics which are necessary not only to stimulate production but to provide the wherewithal for the dairy and livestock industry.

## **Bills - Second Reading**

### **Corporation Tax Bill: 9<sup>th</sup> December, 1970**

**Dr. Jagan:** I join the last speaker in a rising my voice in protest on the way the business of this House is being conducted. Sir, if you look through the records, you will find that invariably almost all the Bills which have been taken in this House – I mean the important Bills – have been taken by way of Suspension of the Standing Orders.

Parliamentary democracy does not only involve coming and making speeches in the Parliament. The people in the country have the right to know what the Government is doing, especially a Government which was won by fraud. Parliamentary democracy involves an informed public opinion. What opportunity has the public had to voice any opinion on these measures when even, I venture to say, three-quarters of the Members of the Government do not even know what is here? We see the House being reduced to a farce.

Over and over I have requested that we should have meetings regularly so that we can discuss important issues of the day. For days and days, this Parliament does not meet. Wednesday, which is the day reserved for Members' Motions, on that day there is no sitting. When we do meet on Wednesday, we have occasions such as this. What has the Government been doing with this Bill for the past year? It had a whole year in which to frame legislation. Why does the Government not get the Attorney-General to sit in his office and do some work? As I said, why are we wasting time? Questions are not answered. Even Motions and Questions sent to the Clerk are not put on the Notice Paper. What is going on? If the Government wants to rule by decree, it has the numbers; it has the power, let it do so.

Although the Government has given the assurance there is to be no one-party state, it has rigged elections to such a point today that even the people who contest elections cannot get votes equivalent to the number of sponsors of the list. Ask Fielden Singh about Leguan. Some independent people who thought they would come out and opportunistically try to get themselves some seats, put up lists, but there were Ministers who should be doing their work instead of going and threatening people with their jobs and telling them they are going to be transferred to the Rupununi and the Pomeroun. These are the dirty tactics that these people are engaging in. If they want to make laws by decree, let them do so. The only difference between you and Castro is that you are serving your masters who put you there. Castro serves the people.

It is clear that no one can intelligently debate this Bill. Sir, I came to you this afternoon. I said the Speaker has discretion to permit the Government to move the Suspension of the Standing Orders. I asked you what is the reason that the Government has given. You were very hazy about it. You

could not give me any tangible reason. You asked me to go and discuss with the Minister of Finance and you said you went and spoke to him. I went and spoke to him as you asked me to do but they have not given me any reason that would satisfy any reasonable human being.

Why does the Government want to pass this Bill tonight or tomorrow, why could it not wait until Friday? Would there be such a difference between today and Friday that it would affect the whole finances of this country or the administration of the country? I do not know what the Minister of Finance told you, Sir.

[**Mr. Ram Karran:** They threatened him.]

**Dr. Jagan:** Yes. They are so accustomed to threatening everybody, no doubt they threatened you too, Sir.

I also took the opportunity this morning to speak to someone who is versed in matters such as this. I was told that an attempt was made last evening to study it and the thing had to be put aside for further consideration. Therefore, again I ask: What is the reason of urgency that is forcing the Government to rush through this Bill tonight and not to permit the House to take it on Friday, if not on Monday?

According to the Standing Rules and Orders three clear days should have elapsed before debate and seven days from the date of publication. The Minister and yourself have a responsibility to the House and to the nation to tell them why in all this haste this measure is being taken tonight. There is no doubt that the Government deals very autocratically with all concerned, but it is not harming the Opposition in this way. It is harming the country. People do not like to be pushed around. I do not mean only Members of this Parliament, but people. Bring that kind of law; bring it post haste, to stop corruption. Get Tanzania to send you a copy. We will be prepared to show everything. Put all your sleuths to investigate us, but investigate yourselves also.

I say that Members of the Government are doing harm, to this country. I say they are causing the loss of confidence in this country. Even their own friends have reason to doubt their honesty today because of the way they are going about things. What do they have to hide? This perhaps is the question which must be asked: What are they trying to hide? Are they afraid of public opinion? They have swept the polls; they claim that they have won all the local government elections by landslides. They received three-quarters of the votes. Why are they afraid? If they are so strong, why do they have to rig elections? Why are they afraid of public opinion? The public in Guyana has a right to know what is going on.

The Members of the Government are trying to bring forward measures which it has taken the Government itself months to put in legal form, many clauses of which have serious ramifications. I would urge you, Sir, the Minister of Finance having moved the Second Reading of this Bill, to request

the Government to adjourn the debate at this stage until Friday. I cannot see why a request such as this should not be entertained by the Government and by the Speaker. The Opposition would like not only to study the Bill with expert advice and to consult people who may be involved but to suggest amendments, to frame them, to table them in this House. When is this to be done? Or is the Government saying that it does not want amendments or it does not want to hear? Or is this just a formal exercise? The Bill must be presented to Parliament; it must be passed. Is this the approach? If that is so we might as well disband the Parliament. We are wasting taxpayer's money. Hundreds of thousands of dollars of the poor people's money are being spent for this House. To what end?

Sir, I would certainly recommend that if the practices of the House are not changed that you yourself should resign. Resign in honesty, in conscience! Tender your resignation as a matter of protest! Let us all dispense with this farce! Two Bills are presented here. How many people in this country have read these Bills? I ask: *"How many people have had an opportunity to read and study the contents of these measures?"* How are they to give their opinions? In what way?

I cannot see that the request made by the Opposition to adjourn the debate until Friday is unreasonable. This was a reasonable compromise which we were prepared to accept. According to the rules of debate, this matter should have been taken next week. The Minister got up; he did not say why he was asking for the suspension of the Standing Rules and Orders. He did not inform the House; he did not tell the country. He knows, Sir, and the Government knows that if it is a question of dealing with a matter which must be urgently dealt with we would obviously agree.

I have looked through this Bill. I cannot say that I have studied it. Seriously, we do not want to quarrel with the Government, not on these measures, but on procedures which you claim to respect. The rules of the House are made by the Government; it has the majority. And the rules were not made to be suspended every day, otherwise there should not be any rules at all.

Sir, what do we find in this Bill? We have new methods of assessing and demanding payment of income tax. We have provision in respect of –

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** There are provisions dealing with the question of appeals from assessments. We know how the administration is being run in this country today. Not only civil servants, but judges and magistrates are taking orders from the Government. Therefore, one has to be very careful. It is not a principle only, one has to be very careful with the procedures which are inserted in the Bills which will become law.

Mr. Speaker, this method of carrying on tonight is what Guyanese would say, is a lot of r... That is all they will say and you are allowing it.

**Question put and agreed to.**

## Approval of Estimates of Expenditure 1971 – Budget Debate: 14<sup>th</sup> December, 1970

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, the Hon. Minister of Finance has said in his Budget Speech that this is a Year of Consolidation. I would think that a more appropriate slogan would be a Year of Failure. What has the Government done? What has been its record that there is this necessity to consolidate?

Failures, there are many:

1. Failure of a development strategy;
2. Failure to solve the financial problems of the country;
3. Failure to solve the unemployment problem;
4. Failure to curb rising prices, inflation and failure to enhance social wellbeing;
5. Failure to solve the political problems of the country
6. Failure to build confidence;
7. Even an admission of failure of their own idea of a cooperative republic.

I deal first with the No. 1 failure, failure of a development strategy. We were told earlier this year that the Seven Year Plan, the \$300 million Plan, about which there was so much ballyhoo, was scrapped before the termination of the seven year period. We were told that Dr. Wilfred David and a team of economists were working on a new Ten Year Plan. Now we hear that the leader of the team, Dr. Wilfred David, has left Guyana and has gone to the United Kingdom.

What about the financial situation? The Minister made it appear that we are doing well. One of his boasts was that we were, from local resources, providing about 50 per cent for our capital budget, but actually the correct figure is not 50 per cent but 39 per cent. If we take the figures which he gave, \$16.7 million out of a Budget of \$43 million, that is not 50 per cent. If we look at the estimates for the Capital Budget for this year we see that internal resources will provide only \$11 million of a total of \$60 million which is only 18 per cent. Surely the Minister should have taken a little bit more time not only to give us correct figures, but to see that his own figures do not confound the statements which he makes.

How can he boast that we are contributing 50 per cent when the figures for last year was only 39 per cent and when his own figures in the Budget Estimates indicate that for the coming year it will be only 18 per cent? That is not the only problem with our finances. We have a growing balance of payments deficit. In 1968 the deficit was \$2 million. In 1969 it was \$9 million and we understand that it will be \$24 million for 1970.

I have here with me the *Guyana Graphic* which reproduced an article from the *International Commerce*, a United States publication, which talks



about this deficit of \$24 million in the balance of goods and services. So we are not doing too well in this respect. Debt charges have been mounting in the past decade from \$5 million in 1960 to \$18¼ million in 1971. We have a colossal public debt of \$288 million estimated for the end of 1971. This is more than 65 per cent of the gross domestic product. But if we look at the Estimates also we see that there is a debit balance at the end of this year of \$33.8 million. This is going down the drain progressively year after year, and this is what is causing inflation in the country.

Deficit financing is a known technique to stimulate so-called development, but the other side of the story is that it leads to raging inflation, to a lowering of the standard of living, it affects the working class more than anyone else, and indeed, it even robs the small people who we are told we want to help – the small people of credits which they should be getting from different sources. All we have to do is to look and see where this kind of practice has been indulged in and what has been the result.

Brazil is a classic example of development by deficit financing. A few years ago we were told, similarly as we are told in this country today, about the thrust into the interior. In the 1950's we had Kubitschek of Brazil bursting open the jungles and the interior of Brazil; new cities being built like Brasília, new highways have been built; there has been a lot of spending. What is the situation today? Illiteracy, raging inflation, rabid dictatorship, cruelty, torture. These are the consequences of that kind of policy which we seem to want to consolidate in Guyana in the year 1971.

The unemployment problem — mere mention has been made about it in the Budget Speech, but nothing significant has been said — what is to be done to solve it. The Government is going along in the same old way. The development strategy is the same, what is known as the Puerto Rican model; for a while the advocates of this model was taking great credit for all that was being achieved.

I have with me a clipping of the *Barbados Advocate*, 8<sup>th</sup> December, and this is what the Chairman of the Planning Board has to say:

*“Unemployment in Puerto Rico reached a record height of 15.3% in 1955 and has hung stubbornly above the 10% mark ever since despite the average economic growth rate of some 10% annually.”*

Ten percent annual growth rate, yet stubborn, chronic unemployment rate of over 10 percent. Our Government has been boasting about the rate of growth in Guyana. Average figures which it has given hovers between 6 and 7 percent. But when one takes out for inflation which is roughly 3 percent per year, and when one takes out population increase which is around 3 percent per year, what is left of this so-called growth rate?

Secondly, what are we measuring? A lot of ballyhoo has been made in the past about this marvellous growth rate, but experience has shown and we have stated so — I remember in one Budget Speech the Hon. Member

Mr. Chandisingh exploded the point – that a high growth rate or a high per cent per capita national income necessarily does not mean wellbeing. We see now that even those who never shared our views are beginning to say the same thing.

I have here two statements. One is from Professor Galbraith. In a recent article in the London *Observer*, 22<sup>nd</sup> November, this is what Professor Galbraith had to say. I quote:

*“I do not want to seem sacrilegious. The editors of the *Economist* and the *Wall Street Journal*, the Archbishops of our economic faith still hold that St. Peter asks applicants only what they have done to increase the gross national product, but the consequences are no longer theoretical. We can now see what a single-minded preoccupation with growth does to the environment. An expanding consumption is not the guarantee of utter happiness that my friendly critics once held it to be.”*

Then we have Mr. Rene Dumont, a United Nations Agricultural Economist, who recently after visiting Trinidad at the Government's invitation had this to say. This is from the *Trinidad Guardian* of the 10<sup>th</sup> September. I quote:

*“Economic growth measured in terms of G.D.P. and per capita income is not enough. The problem of unemployment and misuse of land should be the first priority.”*

But Sir, a few years ago, we had the conservative paper in London praising this Government, talking about the high economic growth and last year they even had the United Nations peddle the same propaganda which they re-peddled saying, “look, the United Nations has said we have done so well, we have virtually led Latin America.”

Reading the Budget, one gets the impression that even the Minister and the Government have come to realize that they cannot believe their own propaganda about this marvellous rate of growth and so the Minister of Finance talks now about redistributive justice. I would wish to ask: what has the Government done to redistribute income in this country? Have fiscal measures been used to redistribute income? Has the Budget been used as a means of redistributing income?

I think it was two years ago that this House and the people of this country were told that the Government was working on new fiscal measures. Where are they which are going to bring forth this redistributive justice? Instead of redistributive justice, making the small man a real man as they claim, I say they are making the rich richer, creating big elites. The figures show this. General administration has gone up from \$16 million to \$44 million, a 275 percent increase. In the same period, social services went up from \$21.6 million to \$36.5 million only 150 percent; let me repeat those figures. Under this regime which is talking about redistributive justice,

general administration has gone up by 275 percent, but social services which affect the small man have gone up by 150 percent only.

Professor Dumont talks about the non-saving, non-investing middle classes. This is what seems to be happening in this country, creating a bigger bureaucracy, a bigger elite, while the crumbs fall to the people. My Hon. Friend, Mr. Chandisingh gave the figures for health showing how the percentage allocated to health in the Capital Budget has been decreasing; from 12.7 percent in 1959 to 10.2 percent in 1966, to 9.54 percent in 1971. This is how we are redistributing the position in Guyana. Clearly, the Government only talks. There is a lot of criticism, and snide remarks are heard when we speak about Cuba and other places, but what are the realities here? Here is a clipping from the *Guyana Graphic* of November 30 this year, a study done by what is called the Twentieth Century Fund, not something from the socialist communist bloc; what do they say? I quote:

*"The Castro Government has carried out more ambitious and nationally comprehensive programme in education and public health than in the other Latin American countries."*

We do not want to follow Cuba; we do not want to follow the socialist countries, we are going to follow our own road, we are told. We must not be dogmatists, our theoretician the Minister of Home Affairs tells us. They are dogmatists and also revisionists and perhaps the Hon. Minister should try to read something also about revisionists, for clearly what the Government is seeking to do is trying to work out the salvation of Guyana within the framework of the so-called free world. The Members of the Government are seeking to apply in practice the idea of liberation from imperialists with the aid of imperialism itself. This is what they are doing. It is a contradiction in terms. You cannot break away from imperialism by trying to remain within the folds of imperialism.

A great deal has been said about self-help. Self-help, community development. etc., but let me say, nothing will be achieved without self-confidence and today there is no confidence in this regime in this country. I am not talking of the business community. The business community which normally goes along with pro-capitalist policies, even they because of corruption, nepotism, discrimination, even they are dismayed. But I am talking of the small man, who is leaving daily, shedding this country.

One saw the figures which were given about the number of applicants and the amount of money the Government is receiving simply by issuing passports. Lines and lines of people daily, and the Government cannot find enough passports to give to the people; they have to wait four months before they can get passports.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** Is that in general? I am glad to hear there has been some improvement. My friend reminds me that we get \$240,000 from passports.

Mention has been made in the Budget about the failure of the development decade. In this context one must also consider other things which have failed such as the Alliance for Progress, about which there was so much hullabaloo. These have all failed basically because they have not got to the root of the problem. The strategy for economic development, enunciated by those of the United Nations in the development decade, did not get down to the root of the problem because those who formulated programmes such as the Alliance for Progress had a very big influence in the United Nations. That influence is still being wielded and what comes out of the mill? Self-help, community development, cooperative development.

Here again let me read from the Budget Statement, page 12, paragraph 3:

*“National ownership of certain basic and strategic resources as well as control over the major economic decisions is vital to implementing either the policy of self-help and self-reliance, or its corollary, rural development. Further, public sector control over the majority of large scale, modern, economic activity is essential to laying a basis for the construction of Republican Cooperativism.”*

This is precisely what we told the Members of the Government last year when they were blowing their trumpets about how the small man will become a real man under the Cooperative Republic and how coops will be the means of ushering socialism into the country. We said then – and we repeat it – that it is socialism which will help the cooperative movement to develop and to grow. This statement here is virtually a paraphrase of our position. We are glad that the Government is coming around to seeing the light. But seeing the light is one thing; talking is one thing, practice is another. If this is a theoretical formulation what is the practice?

The Minister spoke of *“national ownership of certain basic and strategic resources”*. We call these *“the commanding heights of the economy”*, an all-embracing term. How are we going to do this? Only by self-help and self-reliance? What about our foreign policy? What about trade? The Minister of Home Affairs told us that in Cuba and the Soviet Union self-help and self-reliance play a great role in the development of those countries. True, but what he failed to tell the House was that this was not all. The first stop was to settle with the imperialist exploiters, to get rid of them.

We have not seen any such thing done in Guyana and even if there were attempts to do this how will such attempts be implemented? The Soviet Union developed through the people’s efforts, through self-reliance, but it went in for nationalisation of the foreign enterprises, the mines, the plantations, the factories, the banks.

What about Cuba? Castro does not only out cane and get others to follow him. Castro does not only ask civil servants to go and put one week of

work in the cane fields. Castro nationalised the foreign companies and what have the foreign companies done? We saw the beginning when Castro bought cheaper oil and asked the refining companies to refine the oil. They refused to do so and therefore he nationalised them. Then they retaliated and stopped buying his sugar.

When we talked at the last election about nationalisation, my friends asked, "*where are we going to get the skills to run these industries? Where are we going to get the markets?*" This is what they said. How do you expect to solve the problems? Assuming we are going to do it all with our bare hands, we are going to set up the hydroelectric stations and the smelters, the problem of markets is also very important and we know the power of the imperialists and the economic aggression which they can engage in we have seen it not only in the case of Cuba. When Mossadegh nationalised the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company in 1953, they strangled him and he was destroyed. His government was destroyed. The whole nationalisation process became a fiasco because he refused to trade with the Soviet Union.

It is an example for all to see. The oil companies withdrew the tanker fleet and Mossadegh was left sitting with the oil. Eventually the C.I.A. caused unrest among the very people whom the Government was trying to help and they overthrew him.

Self-help, self-reliance and cooperatives: the Government is right. The socialist countries have these things but we submit that no progressive policy can be enunciated locally and be successfully carried out in the context of Guyana, its size, its population, without a progressive foreign policy. We have seen nothing in the Budget about a change in the foreign policies of the Government.

The last speaker, the Hon. Member Mr. Mingo, talked about aid. We do not need aid. It is a current theory that all the Third World countries can get together and solve their problems among themselves, but we know it is a fact that third World countries basically have an imbalanced economy. Take all the countries in Latin America, one-crop economy, one-mineral economy, all of them want to do the same things.

This was the problem of the Caribbean Federation; all the territories are producers of sugar. What are we going to send in exchange? Our washing? I have an article here in a magazine about Bolivia. This country even in 1952 nationalised the tin mines but because the policy was not an all-embracing policy, eventually it failed.

Even nationalisation is not enough. There must be an overall comprehensive policy which is lacking. The Government is going by fits and starts. No distinction is made between western aid and socialist aid. And as one can see from the smiles and the attitudes of the leaders of the Government they do not intend to have a new approach. If they do not intend to have a new approach, they will not be able to break out of the strangle hold of imperialism.

I think it must be admitted that there is a qualitative difference between

western aid and socialist aid. I am not talking of quantum; I am talking in terms of what kind of aid you get. I have some figures which show that in the socialist countries which are now included in what is called the Council for Mutual Economic Aid there was increased industrial output between 1950 and 1968 by 585 percent as compared with 251 percent in the developed capitalist states. Compare those figures: 585 percent increase in industrial output from 1950 to 1968 as compared with 251 percent for the developed capitalist states; an annual growth rate of 10.5 percent for the socialist countries as against 5.5 percent for the capitalist countries.

If we were to take into consideration the underdeveloped countries, the comparison will be even more glaring. Take the many countries in Eastern Europe which are now socialist. Prior to the War, their status was little better than countries in South America like Brazil, Venezuela, Chile, Uruguay, etc. Snide remarks are made about Soviet imperialism – I heard this across the Floor. Countries in Eastern Europe which were backward take, perhaps, the examples of Poland, Hungary, Romania, today all these countries are supplying over 70 percent of the import requirement of machinery and equipment of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union provides them with the bulk of their raw materials.

When we take the world trends today we note that prices of industrial goods have been going up while prices of raw material exported by the Third World countries have been going down. One sees that the relationship between the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in Eastern Europe has been beneficial to the smaller socialist countries. This is the kind of aid we are talking about. One can go to the U.A.R., to Syria, to other countries and see factories are being given as a form of aid when from the Western countries we cannot get such aid. This Government, of course, does not want to make this distinction.

We heard the general remark that "*aid is raid*". All aid is condemned, all aid is lumped in the same category and, as a consequence, the Government uses this as an excuse not to make any meaningful approaches to the socialist world which alone, we say, can help a country like Guyana to break from the present position in which it is. The present position is clear: there is nothing to consolidate. Traditional problems from the days of colonialism remain with us: foreign manipulation, neo-colonial economic structures, agricultural stagnation, unemployment, inadequate social services. And thus I say, Sir, the real test is social wellbeing and one cannot see this as of now.

The Hon. Member Mr. Reepu Daman Persaud gave us the figures with respect to milk, coffee, corn and cabbage. All these figures show that we are not making the progress for which the Government is claiming credit. In fact, the figures from its own reports indicate a drop in production in several spheres of agriculture. A new strategy is definitely called for, a strategy which will not talk airy fairy language, which will not be based on sloganeering, but which will get down to the meat of the problem, which

will get down to the realities of this country. In this the Government knows that it can get help and support from the Peoples Progressive Party.

Government will, of course, say that it is confronting the big boys and that it intends to make changes. What are the changes? What is the new strategy? Meaningful participation. We do not know what the figure will be ultimately in the Demerara Bauxite Company but we hear outside it is going to be 66 percent or 60 percent or maybe in the end 51 percent. What is intended here? Simply to get a little bit more revenue or to transform this whole industry and the economic structure of the country.

What about the setting up of a smelter and the generation of electricity. At one time we were told by the Hon. Prime Minister after he had paid a visit to Canada and dined and wined with the Alcan boys that a smelter would be erected in Guyana. His then Minister of Economic Development Mr. Henry Thomas contradicted him openly, when he said, not in his lifetime will the aluminium interest, the Alcan interest, set up a smelter in Guyana. For daring to contradict the chief, his head was rolled.

At the last election, one of the biggest balloons during the campaign was the hydroelectric project at Tiboku Falls; it was a multi-million project, beyond \$200 million. Where is it? Is Yugoslavia going to help us to set up this smelter or this hydroelectric project, or are we looking to some other imperialist country to come to help us? Let the Government tell us.

At one time we brought through the United Nations some hydro experts and also some experts to advise the Government on the erection of an aluminium smelter. They have said that an aluminium smelter can be established in Guyana, a small one around 100,000 tons which will pay for itself out of profits in ten years. The Report has been hidden, put away on some shelf. It has not been tabled in this House.

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** The P.P.P. brought these experts not only to table Reports but to implement Reports. They not only do not want to table, they do not want to implement.

We not only brought hydro experts and the experts to advise on the setting up of a smelter; we brought oil geologists who said there was oil here. What did they do? As soon as the P.P.P. was out, a lot of oil companies came as they did in the time of the Interim Government, in 1954, but nothing has come out of it all.

We brought a Yugoslavia team through the United Nations for the purpose of setting up a complex of industries based on wood and timber – 70 percent of our resources. What has the Government done in this field?

So far as fisheries are concerned we were in the beginning stages of discussion for a fishing survey of the whole area, through the United Nations, because we saw a tremendous possibility based on a fishing industry in Guyana. This was not just shrimp. Cuba today has a shipping fleet, fac-

tory ships. Why cannot we do that? We will never do it so long as the Government voices the opinions which it expresses so clearly for all and sundry to hear. All aid is raid. Soviet socialist aid is the same as imperialist aid. We are going to do it on our own. Self-help, self-reliance! This is an illusion. We do not say that the people must not work, there must be self reliance but surely that is not enough.

When we were in the Government, constant criticisms came from the Opposition side: coolie government, rice government, P.P.P. only concentrating on agriculture, what about industry. What about it? Go to the industrial estate in Ruimveldt, see the emptiness there – neither at the private level nor at the public level is there progress. As I read from page 12, Government talks about the public sector development. The Members of the Government talk, but talk is cheap. Slogans, beautiful, but the reality is far from the words. Let me remind the Hon. Members the policies which they are embarking upon; I have already referred to Bolivia and Chile where these policies have failed.

We can make an interesting comparison between that country and our little country. In 1961 when the present President first ran as a candidate for the United Popular Front the people voted for Jorge Alessandri. Five years of him and they changed and put in Eduardo Frei. Again, in that election Salvador Allende lost, but on this occasion he won. The counterpart in our country of Alessandri was Mr. Peter D'Aguiar, the leader of the United Force, a business wizard, who it was felt, if he came into the Government, would bring about economic dynamism and miracles.

We saw what happened after four years of his pilot age in the Ministry of Finance and after pro-imperialist policies were carried out by the Coalition Government as was carried out by Alessandri. Eduardo Frei came along with a new strategy: *"we will have partnership"*, 51 percent ownership. *"The imperialists are taking away our wealth. We will have 51 percent ownership."* And how will it be done? Not under a dictatorship as in Cuba. No, there is revolution in dictatorship, but in Chile Frei said *"We will have revolution in liberty."*

Well, Sir, we have our counterpart here. The Hon. Prime Minister, with the same programme; 51 percent ownership, partnership with imperialism, same sloganeering. There it was *"revolution in liberty"*, here it was *"consultative democracy"*; now it is *"cooperative republic"*. All in time will be found wanting.

But, Sir, the people have learnt from their own experience. Frei's party itself split because people realised that what was being proposed was not only a sellout, it was also very illusory. Before Frei took office the mining companies made \$34 million profit. After Frei took office, with his participation, the mining companies made \$126 million profit. Go to Mexico! The rich have got richer; the local bourgeoisie have got wealthier. Some of them have teamed-up with the foreign capitalists and the Government has teamed up with them too, but half of the people in Mexico today are living



at subsistence level in hovels and shacks.

Ten years ago Harold Macmillan, the then Prime Minister of England, went to South Africa and made what was called the "*wind of change*" speech. He implored the South African Government to give a little on its apartheid policy; he implored the French and the Portuguese to give a little on the question of political independence because the French had been thrown out of Indo-China and they were about to be thrown out of Algeria and there were revolutions, upheavals, elsewhere, including Cuba. So the imperialists said, virtually, "*it is better we concede something rather than lose all.*" Imperialism therefore hastily gave independence to many and in the majority of cases they were puppets.

But this past decade has taught the people that the symbols of independence, flag, coat-of-arms, national anthem, are not enough. There are new cries today.

Sir, before the tea break I said that in 1960 the imperialists had adopted a new strategy in conceding independence quickly rather than face the possibility of upheavals, but the past decade has shown that mere independence was not enough and from several quarters there have come criticisms, even from conservative quarters.

For instance, the Alliance for Progress, which was formulated by imperialism as a counter to the new path which was projected by revolution in Cuba, has failed and now we have even magazines like *Life Magazine* saying that the previous policy has not brought forth any fruit in terms of political solutions to the problems of the people. *Life* last year indicated that every year since 1962 more money flowed out of Latin America than went in and the net outflow after 1967 was over \$1 thousand million per year. When we have magazines like *Life* making these admissions it is a clear indication that the previous policies of the imperialists have failed.

I am speaking of policies like the Alliance for Progress Programme and secondly, the strategy planning based on what is called the crisis of an investment climate. Investors were reaping harvests. Parties like ours – revolutionary parties – in the Third World are demanding nationalisation of these foreign enterprises. In the face of these demands – and not only these demands, but the experience of the people who have themselves learnt that pro-imperialist policies, the halfway policies of the Social and Christian Democrats are not enough – because of this new situation, the imperialists have now changed their tune and advocating the so-called "*crisis*" of an investment climate. They now talk about partnership; they prefer to make local people directors; they prefer to have local capitalists as partners and better still, to have Governments become their partners. In the United Nations, in the Development Decade, instead of narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor countries, we have seen that the gap has now virtually widened. There is now this talk about self-help, community development and cooperative development as the panacea for these ills.

We are told that Guyana has joined with others in the United Nations in

a recent vote calling for the takeover of national resources. This is good. But we know that words mean different things to different people. The takeover of national resources can mean one thing to the Guyanese Government, and can mean another thing to the Soviet Government, and another thing to the Cuban Government. So the fact that on this occasion Guyana is voting with other revolutionary Governments does not necessarily make Guyana revolutionary or its policy anti-imperialist.

Let us get this quite clear. The Resolution is a broad Resolution. We heard similar statements made by the Prime Minister at the heads of Governments Conference in the Caribbean: *"we must own the resources of the area."* How? By what means? This is a vital question. We say that considering all the facts, the fraudulent policies of this Government, it is clear to the Opposition in this country that the Government is not serious in this policy of taking over the national resources of Guyana.

If the Government were so inclined, it would have tried to find a political solution to the political problems in this country. Imperialism not only commits economic aggression against progressive revolutionary governments, but it also comprises the working class and others in these countries with the hope of using these elements to overthrow the Government. That is why it is axiomatic that along with the confrontation of imperialism there should be a basic democratic structure and full participation of the people at all levels. But what do we have in Guyana? The Government rigged the elections to stay in power, but this is certainly not creating the climate in Guyana for what is known as meaningful participation. You cannot have armed coercion over a little strike, with the army moving in as in the strikes in the sugar industry and WIMPEY. Yesterday I read where the Riot Squad bashed up people who are now in the hospital.

Is it this the kind of structure we want to confront imperialism? The cardinal principle of success does not only mean to take over national resources, but to help to build, based on understanding, a democratic structure, to have meaningful participation at all levels.

This is not anywhere in evidence in our country today. We have said it over and over, and we say it again, that the Government can look to the People's Progressive Party for every support in its confrontation with imperialism if there is meaningful participation. We will urge the Government not to take ad hoc steps from time to time as it is doing.

Truly, there is nothing consolidated thus far. Get the people of the country, including the Opposition, to say what is to be done and how it is to be done. Let us have a real national debate. I do not mean the kind of debates we have in this country. The Government should make the radio available; make the newspapers open for discussion. All academics should be involved, not only the University of the West Indies but the University of Guyana. Bring people from overseas who are involved in this whole question if this is possible. I do not share this narrow view that because they are from overseas we must not accept their view. We must learn from experi-

ence.

If people have the experience, especially on this question of economic development, the Third World countries, the developed countries, the socialist countries, can profit from the expertise and experience they have gained. After such discussions it is most likely that not only we will arrive on the right path, but Guyanese people also will know what is to be done, and they will be prepared to back the Government in the programme it is embarking on with the objective the Government claims it has, and that is to take over national resources for the benefit of the people.

## Approval of Estimates of Expenditure 1971: 15<sup>th</sup> December, 1970

### Head 9 - Office of the Prime Minister and Cabinet

**Dr. Jagan:** I notice in Subhead 9, provision is now being made for \$18,000 for Remuneration of Ministerial Private Secretaries. This expenditure is climbing. I suppose it is due to salary increases. Would the Prime Minister say how many ministerial private secretaries there are?

With respect to Subhead 10, the sum of \$46,500 is being sought for Community Development Workers. On the previous page there was provision for a Chief Community Development Officer, Deputy Chief Community Development Officer, Assistant Chief Community Development Officer and 19 District Community Development Officers. We have had grounds to complain in this House about the cost of administration. While it is true that we want a great deal of community development work done, is it necessary to have all these people running around the country and no doubt spending money in other areas as well?

If we look at Subhead 17, School Feeding Scheme, we will see that the provision for salaries is \$33,616, Transportation is \$18,000, Biscuits and Tins is \$96,334 and Miscellaneous is \$15,550. I do not know what the Miscellaneous Vote is for, but it would seem that the provision for salaries and transportation alone is a little over 50 percent of what the children will be getting in food.

I remember in the good old colonial days there was a similar set up where social assistance was being provided for people and the amount that was spent for officers and for travelling was almost equal to the sum provided for social assistance. I think the Government should begin examining these Estimates very carefully to see where savings can be made because it is my feeling that we have a lot of superfluous people drawing salaries all over the place and the time has come in this country where more money needs to be spent for social services like education and health.

We have remarked on the inadequacies in those fields. Money will be found for them only if these Estimates are pruned to see where savings can be made under these various Heads. I would therefore urge the Government to look carefully at these various Heads to see whether we are getting value for money by the employment of all these all over the country. Why are there so many officers? Why are there so many Ministerial Private Secretaries? Surely the time has come for economy in expenditure, and I should like to get from the Prime Minister an explanation on these sub-heads.

## Head 6 – Ombudsman

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, on the recent appointment of the new Ombudsman it was announced that a Committee of this House would be appointed to review the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman. We have always taken the position that this whole Head should be abolished, that it is a waste of the taxpayers' money unless the Ombudsman can act meaningfully under the situation in Guyana. From time to time we have read the Reports of the Ombudsman and repeatedly we see that for the large majority of cases which come to his attention the statement is made that he cannot deal with them.

One would have thought that the Government would have dealt with this matter expeditiously, because we have submitted the names of the people whom we thought could represent the People's Progressive Party. Nothing has not been done and before we know it, another year will pass and a lot of money would have been spent and nothing would have been achieved. Apart from the appointment of the Committee no doubt months and months will pass before the Committee will be sitting. Surely, in view of all the charges and counter charges made today in Guyana – the denial of rights discrimination, racism, nepotism, and corruption, - it is necessary, for the Government in its own interest to deal with this matter expeditiously. I do hope that the Government will immediately announce the personnel of this Committee so that the Committee would get down to work with the object of enlarging the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman.

This is a new year. In fact, I had discussions with the Prime Minister in September even before the Ombudsman took office. Are we going to wait until the Ombudsman gains experience? The Prime Minister knows the man cannot function under the present limited jurisdiction which he has, and he has been telling people who go to him, "*look I cannot deal with you.*" Surely this matter should not wait until the new year. We still have more than half a month to go, why not make the announcement tomorrow? This has nothing to do with consultation, etc., we have already told you. We can do it right now. We must move expeditiously in certain things, not procrastinate, and defer. Let us get on, not wait until next year, and when next year comes, another few months will elapse before the announcement.

## Head 12 - Ministry of External Affairs

**Dr. Jagan:** In the Budget Statement we were told that it may be necessary to increase diplomatic representation by this Government in the field of external affairs. We see under sub-head 1(17), Ambassadors, High Commissioners and Accredited Representatives, an increase of expenditure from roughly \$60,000 to \$82,000 estimated for this year. I wonder if the Minister will tell us whether this increase in expenditure is intended for the estab-

lishment of other diplomatic posts, and if so, where are these posts to be established.

I do not think that it goes well for keeping the public informed, for the Government to do as it has done in the past. The Government comes to the House, a vote is approved, and then subsequently the country hears that a posting has been made somewhere. Surely, the Government has the right to decide but the House and the country have a right to know what the Government contemplates. The Members of the Government cannot come to this House and say: "*we want so much money*", without indicating where it is to be spent.

If we know where the money is to be expended, where the posting is to be, then perhaps Members could make some intelligent comments and criticisms.

I should like, in regard to this same query which I have made, to find out from the Government what is its position with respect – I want a concrete answer – to diplomatic representation with the socialist countries, to wit, the Soviet Union particularly. Is it true that the Government does not intend to exchange Ambassadors with the Soviet Union?

From the statement made by the Minister when, he was in London, I believe, the country was told that representation will be as with Yugoslavia, on a nonresident basis. I wish to know whether this was the wish of the Soviet Union. I wish to know from the Hon. Minister whether the Government has refused the Soviet Union the same kind of representation that has been accorded to India and to West Germany, that is, to have the right to have an Embassy in Guyana even though Guyana may not wish to establish an Embassy in the Soviet Union, or could not afford to establish an Embassy in the Soviet Union.

The next question I would wish to ask, is if the Government has rejected the wish of the Soviet Government to establish an Embassy here as was done in the case of Germany and India. Is it true that the Government has also rejected a request to exchange representation at the level of Chargé d' Affairs? We wish to know this because the Government gives the impression that it is nonaligned. It went along to Lusaka to attend a conference of nonaligned nations and one would think that in keeping with the principle of nonalignment, it would treat both the eastern and western blocs in like manner. This is an important question so far as Guyana is concerned and we would like to know, not in an offhand manner, but concretely, because on many occasions the Government does not answer when the questions are embarrassing.

We would also like to know whether it is true that the Government proposes to recall its Ambassadors in London, in Washington and also in Surinam, or whether they are recalling themselves. Perhaps the House should be given some enlightenment on this.

## Subhead 16, Expenses of Guyana Boundaries Commissions.

**Dr. Jagan:** Speaking on this Subhead, I want to know from the Hon. Minister what is the position as regards the Venezuela Border Mixed Commission since the Port-of-Spain Protocol which was rushed through this House has not yet been presented, as far as I am aware, to the Venezuelan Congress. Presumably, if the Protocol is not ratified it means that the previous agreement has come to an end – the Geneva Agreement – and until ratification does take place by both Governments then the Commission cannot meet. At least this is the way I see it, perhaps I may be wrong. The Hon. Minister would tell us what the position is.

I should like to know also, if this Protocol is not ratified by the Venezuelan Congress, as appears will be the case, what will be the position of this country? What will be the position of this Mixed Commission? Are we going to continue to pay the Chairman that amount of money? This holder, Sir, is holding two sinecures as far as we can see; one the Chairman of this Commission, and the other the Chairman of the Elections Commission; two Commissions which do not function in this country. No doubt the salary must be in the range of \$1,500 a month. The Government cannot find \$1,500 a month, not even \$1,000 to finance the Office of the Leader of the Opposition, but it can find over \$1,500 a month, or there about, to provide a salary, not to speak of travelling allowance, etc., for an individual who does not function. What is the position?

It is a disgrace for this country when people are starving to continue expenditure such as this, expenditure on things like the Elections Commission and the Boundaries Commission. It is the Boundaries Commission I am talking about now because it is the same individual sitting on both, that is why I mentioned it. I want to know from the Hon. Minister, Sir, how many meetings have been held of this Commission, the Venezuela Border Mixed Commission. Is it still in existence? How many meetings have been held since the Geneva Agreement came to an end? Is it proposed that this Commission should meet during the time when the Port-of-Spain Protocol is not ratified by the Venezuela Congress? What is the anticipation of the Government in this regard? Surely, it must know from its Embassy in Caracas, from its intelligence, what is the position.

Sir, my information is – I am not there all the time, I do not have an intelligence service at my disposal – but my information is that there is so much opposition to this Protocol that the Government is unlikely to bring it before the Congress for ratification. This is why I ask, Sir, whether we intend to continue spending money on this Head when, virtually, the Commission will not be sitting.

## Head 13 - Ministry of Economic Development

**Dr. Jagan:** In the past the Government produced a very useful publication called "*the Economic Survey of Guyana*". With all the staff that we see under this Head, Development Secretariat, supported by a big Statistical Bureau, I am wondering why it is that we cannot have this publication annually. Is it that the Government is afraid to bring out the facts and statistics?

I would urge the Government to let us have these publications regularly. Do not bring them out, as in the case of the *Hansards*, three or four years late when they are of no use to anyone. These statistics are useful only if they are available promptly so that one can make a proper assessment of what is going on. But knowing how the Government juggles figures these days, realizing that its own statistics sometimes do not bear out the point which it makes, it is perhaps understandable why the Government does not wish to bring out these publications regularly.

My colleague the Hon. Member Mr. Ramkarran mentioned the fact this afternoon that many publications issued by the Government are not tabled in this House. I would suggest to the Government that all relevant statistical material, not only should be published, but should be laid in this House so that Members of this House can have the benefit of this kind of information for their work in this Assembly.

Sir, the Government has told us that it is placing a great deal of emphasis on cooperatives and community development and today we were discussing the Community Development Head. Now, we have before us a large staff for the Cooperative Department. Much has been said also about contributions made by these two sectors. I wonder if the Government would be able to give us some statistics as to the contribution in terms of gross domestic product, national income of these two sectors.

We see from the press that there is to be an investigation – I hope I am correct – of the Guyana Cooperative Union Limited. It is very difficult to get any information about what is going on in this so-called very important field. Not too long ago, I remember a person who had some shares in some cooperative society at Mackenzie or Wismar wanted to know what happened to this society and what had happened to his shares. He went to this Union he could not get information; he went to the Department he could not get information. What are we running? All this emphasis and now we hear suggestions of fraud in this big parent body.

This afternoon, we were told it is the Government's prerogative to transfer people as it deems best, when we were discussing the item, Secretary to the President of the Republic. The gentleman concerned was specially trained in cooperatives but I understand, because he did not agree to orders being given to do a lot of irregular things that he was moved out of the way and now the thing is bearing fruit; corruption and fraud are now being investigated.

The Cooperative Department and the Cooperative Union are different



Departments, but they are tied up. The Guyana Cooperative Union Limited is the one where the investigation is being carried on. Rene Dumont, the Professor who was called to investigate cooperatives in Trinidad, recently said the organisation of cooperatives has been taken until now in the wrong way, mainly from the top and with too much spoon feeding. A really good cooperative must come from the people. It seems that what Dumont is saying about the coop movement in Trinidad is true also of the cooperative movement in this country. There is all this talk about Cooperative Republic. We must be able now, with all the emphasis, to have a proper evaluation; do not give us only numbers, so many hundreds of cooperatives. What real contribution is the cooperative movement making in the economy of the country? I hope that we will get from the Government not only an investigation of this Cooperative Union Limited but all the other so-called "*cooperatives*", which are not cooperatives, which are merely vehicles for some people becoming very rich.

### **Subhead 17, Subsidy, Guyana Development Corporation**

**Dr. Jagan:** The amount to be spent is a significant sum - \$370,000. I wish to say that for the very little that is being done in this country in industrial development; this is a lot of money to be spent. There is Development Expenditure, first of all, in a secretariat in the Prime Minister's Office, then in this separate bureaucracy of the Guyana Development Corporation. We have another bureaucracy in the Bank of Guyana where we have these studies being done, and money being expended, but when you add it all up what is the result? Where is the industrial development, where is the Guyana development? Where are the factories? With all the feasibility studies that were done by the Guyana Development Corporation, where are the factories to give the people employment?

I would suggest if the Government cannot get down to putting some of these plans on the ground, that it should dispense with all this heavy expenditure, constantly examining things, piling up reports upon reports. People in Guyana today want results and I am afraid that all we are doing is spending a lot of money especially under the Prime Minister's Head. Soon we may have to investigate not only fraud in the Guyana Cooperative Union Limited but perhaps fraud in many other Departments of this Ministry, and the time has come when there should be not just constant investigations but implementation of Schemes, some of which have been investigated by the Guyana Development Corporation many years ago.

Why has the Prime Minister not used the industrial estate which belongs to the Government? It does not have to nationalise or take majority participation. We have the land. Money was expended to build roads. Why cannot the Government embark on the erection of some factories to provide employment for the people of Guyana? There are Schemes which this body, the Guyana Development Corporation, has investigated, for

which it has produced feasibility studies and which it has tried to sell to private capitalists.

When are we going to get a move on? If we cannot, I suggest that we delete this whole Head and scrap this Department. It is a waste of taxpayers' money. The Government might as well carry on all the investigations under the Development Secretariat because it is a waste of time. They are making plans and scrapping them, then making others which we are hearing about.

The Prime Minister told us just now that this is not something made forever, that the Plan made by Professor Arthur Lewis was merely to be something of a guide. Guides are not "*guesstimates*". Development Plans are not supposed to be "*guesstimates*".

### **[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** When the P.P.P. was in office there was not even one economist. When we wanted Charles Bettelheim we could not get him. The Government now gets all the economists it wants. Whomever it wants it can get – Arthur Lewis, Wilfred David – and what do we get out of it? Nothing! And listen to the slander of the Prime Minister about Dhar, that Dhar came – he quoted from some magazine.

# Public Business Motion - Approval of Estimates of Expenditure 1971: 17<sup>th</sup> December, 1970

## Head 23 - Ministry of Home Affairs - Registration and Elections

**Dr. Jagan:** I should also like to speak on the same items. I respectfully submit that the Government should strike out this whole Head as this is a total waste of the taxpayer's money. Elections have become a farce. We see where individuals and groups, even parties, which must have at least 50 signatures in the sponsoring of a list, cannot get even 50 votes at an election. Apart from this, it is a known fact that the lists are padded. The original registration list was compiled with Shoup International, no doubt, a C.I.A. front organization, which compiled similar lists in Trinidad and Vietnam. In Guyana, this organization conveniently disappeared when an investigation was to be made concerning it immediately after the last General Elections.

In the present voter's list, there are people who are dead; there are persons who do not exist. It is the duty of a proper Registration Officer to revise these lists annually so that automatically those who died would be struck off, and those who come of age would be put on the list. It is his duty to ensure that the lists reflect what is the reality, that is, to see that all living persons, 21 years and above, appear on the lists.

During the course of the debate in this House, it was pointed out that the P.P.P. did not take up its appointment on the Elections Commission and that was because, when the P.P.P. had a member on the Commission, that member was powerless to examine these fraudulent lists compiled by the Government bureaucracy which was hand-picked and which now supervises these elections.

We have provision for a Commissioner of Registration and Chief Elections Officer. How can the people of this country have confidence in such an officer when he does not even comply with the law of the land, the law which this same Government makes, the law with respect to proxy lists? The law says that proxy lists for the General Elections must be published four days before voting day. Attempts to secure those lists have brought nothing. Up to today, those lists have not been published. Even the Chairman of the Elections Commission, to whom a request was made to supply those lists failed to do so.

All we read in the report of the Commissioner is that over 19,000 proxy votes were exercised in the last elections.

If the Government wants to annul elections, then it must dispense with the farce of both the Elections Commission and this whole registration apparatus because it is a hand-picked body from top to bottom. These are people who work on orders from the Government.

During the Municipal Elections in Georgetown, we saw where a certain

procedure was agreed to by the officer in charge and this was changed when the Minister appeared on the scene. There was Ministerial direction. Of course, the Minister and the Government have a power to direct, but it is a question of how these directions are given and made.

As of now, I submit that the taxpayers can do much better with an expenditure of \$342,000. Whom are we trying to fool? Everyone both here and abroad, knows that the whole electoral apparatus is corrupt from top to bottom. If the Government wants to remain in power forever, do so, but do not waste the taxpayer's money when this same money can be used for many other purposes more beneficial to Guyana today. Many things are short – schools, drugs, hospitals, dispensaries, dispensers, nurses – and the country can ill afford to waste this huge sum of money.

If the Government is sincere and interested in free and fair elections, then it must make up its mind to have a completely new voter's list. Have these lists revised annually, not by the Government, not by P.N.C. hacks but by independent people. If independent people cannot be found, then the Government and the Opposition should be involved in this exercise jointly to see that the thing is done squarely and fairly.

The conduct of elections, because of the bureaucracy which is in control today, is a complete farce. Ballot boxes are taken in the opposite direction from which they are supposed to go. During the elections, we saw this happen in Essequibo. Instead of a jeep with a ballot box going towards the East, it was going towards the West. When scrutineers of the P.P.P. attempted to follow it, the police stopped the P.P.P.'s vehicle and searched it. This is the kind of administration we have. It was found that four wads of ballot papers, wrapped with elastic bands came out of one box and we now see an attempt being made to lay the blame at the feet of the United Force. Poor United Force!

In the United Nations recently, many countries moved to expel South Africa on the ground that it was not a representative Government. Those same countries will do well, using that as an example, to move that this Government, which represents the Guyanese, should also be expelled from the United Nations. It has no mandate to sit there.

I move that this whole Head be deleted from the Estimates. Dispense with the farce and save the taxpayer's money so that it could be spent more usefully for the benefit of the people.

### **Head 33 - Ministry of Communications - Post Office**

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, I note that a new appointment has been made to the post of Postmaster-General. I do hope that this will result in better administration, as we have had over the past year or years, all these scandalous disclosures in the press of mail disappearing and mail being found on the seashore. We also heard that mail was tampered with not only in this country, but also, it

appears, in the United States from which some mail originated. I wonder if the Government is in a position to tell us at this time whether steps have been taken, and if so, what steps, to correct these malpractices. It is a disgrace for this country to know that people, in many cases poor people, have to exist on the little pittance they get from relatives and friends abroad or, perhaps, in this country, that donations are sent to them through the mail and these are pilfered; mail is thrown away. We would like to have some assurances that steps have been taken.

I should also like to know whether the Government has stopped prying into people's mail. I understand that even the ex-Postmaster-General had reason to complain about spying on his mail. As a result of this and other things, he became so fed up that he packed up and resigned the post.

I understand that a committee was appointed to go into this matter. We have not seen the report of this committee about the general administration of the Post Office. But I understand that this report was very damaging in respect of what was being done - spying on the Postmaster-General, putting people there, through the security, over whom the administration had no control. All this came out in the report. Unfortunately the papers did not even want to publish these disclosures, no doubt on instructions from the Government.

It is a disgraceful situation. We hope that not only these petty malpractices, like stealing, have been stopped but that the special committee reported these spying activities and that the tampering of people's mail have come to an end. That was, as I recall, the recommendations of this special committee. I hope that the Government simply will not brush this aside. It knows it is a fact. The Government has the report. Let the Minister doubt what I am saying and if he cannot doubt it, then perhaps he would let us know whether these malpractices have stopped.

If these malpractices are there, there will be no proper administration, and that is why, as I said, the last Postmaster-General resigned; he could not properly administer with this kind of interference into something of which he should be solely in charge and which should not be subject to ministerial overruling and political direction. We feel this should not be hovering over the heads of people who are supposed to run these semi-commercial operations. If they are to be made to pay their way, then the politicians should remove their dirty fingers from the heads of the administrators.

### **Head 35 - Ministry of Communications - Civil Aviation**

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, I wonder if the Hon. Minister could give us some information as to the operations of the Guyana Airways Corporation. At one time we had heard that the service would be extended to the Caribbean and would extend as far as Miami, and that some arrangement had been worked

out by B.W.I.A. whereby the Guyana Airways Corporation would have freight concession for this route. I wonder if the Hon. Minister will indicate to this House what is the present position and how successful has been this operation.

A few days ago, I heard that the airstrip which was indicated to be built somewhere at the back of Mocha/Arcadia will no longer be built. The reason being that the soil is not satisfactory. At least, that is what the press indicated. It seems to me that some serious effort must be made to find a solution to this problem because it is rather ridiculous to fly to New Amsterdam or Bartica, or wherever it takes a few minutes to go by aeroplane and one has to spend nearly an hour to go to Timehri.

What about the Ogle Airstrip? I understood that at one time the Government was contemplating using this airstrip – extending it so that it can provide the internal service to facilitate passengers so that they do not have to waste all this time going and coming from Georgetown to Timehri. Perhaps the Hon. Minister would like to enlighten us on the position as far as these two queries are concerned.

My Hon. Friend raised this question of \$7,000 being spent for bush clearing. Surely, the Government could consider bush clearance in the full sense of the word, that is uprooting all these trees from the approaches to the airport, or it can go to its American friends and get some of the weedicides they are using in Vietnam. After all, the Americans can give technical assistance of that kind and so save the taxpayers this huge expenditure every year. The Ministers of the Government seem to think wasting taxpayer's money is just an exercise.

## Head 31 – Ministry of Trade

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, I should like to ask the Hon. Minister a question as regards the trading policy of the Government pertaining to the recent announcements made as regards the External Trade Bureau. The Minister met, I believe, the businessmen, but my perusal of the newspapers did not indicate whether Government proposes to levy a similar 10 percent commission on all goods as has been done in the case of goods coming from the socialist countries. I should like to get clear from the Hon. Minister whether it is intended to institute a similar commission or service charge.

If this is so, I should like to know whether the Hon. Minister does not consider that this is really an exorbitant sum and can be considered in this so-called "tax free" year as, indeed, a tax on the people. And I wish to I know, if this commission is not to be levied, whether the Government does not consider that it is carrying out a discriminatory policy operating against the socialist countries and, indeed, operating against the interest of the people of this country because the Hon. Minister again admitted that goods originating from the socialist countries are generally cheaper in price.

Another question which I should like to put to the Hon. Minister is one dealing with the question of our exports. The last figures published by CARIFTA indicated that Jamaica had increased her exports within the area by over 60 percent; Trinidad, by over 30 percent, and Guyana by a mere 5 or 6 percent. I should like to know from the Hon. Minister whether there has been any improvement in the situation as regards our external trade to CARIFTA countries, since those figures were published.

It would seem that the Government is going ahead with the plan which was formulated some years ago to make Guyana possibly into the agricultural appendage of an industrialized Caribbean. I would have no quarrel with such an arrangement if there were real ownership of resources of this area by the people of this area and not as we have at the moment, namely, the branch plant dependent type of industrialization which has been established and is being established in Jamaica and Trinidad and which has caused such havoc in Latin American countries, which has caused restrictions of the real development of those countries, which has led to a great deal of unemployment, poverty and misery.

The statistics which we heard prove the fact that there is no real industrialization programme in the country – the Industrial Estate is empty as I remarked some time ago. Are these indicative of the Government's trade policy fitting in with an overall plan which does not materialize for the benefit of the people of this country?

We have said over and over that we are not opposed, to indeed, we are in favour of Caribbean unity and integration. But, we cannot see eye to eye with the Government on a trading policy that is tied up with an overall policy which will reduce Guyana to an agricultural appendage because the smaller islands are complaining about the tendencies of CARIFTA.

The Hon. Minister can put this House and the country at the point where we can clearly see where the Government is going or otherwise Guyanese will be reduced to further serfdom in the near future.

## Bill - Second Reading Capital Gains Tax (Amendment) Bill

**Dr. Jagan:** It is rather amusing to hear the last speaker say that the United Force is at least consistent in its opposition to the measure before us, in keeping with its stand on the Gift Tax and the Capital Gains Tax, so far as the P.P.P. Budget was concerned.

At that time, the P.N.C. marched with the United Force. From what we see now, it was not the issue that was involved. As the Prime Minister once told me, it was not the *causa belli* but the *casus belli*. Those were the days when the P.N.C. joined with imperialism at whatever cost to the country.

The Hon. Prime Minister, the other day, treated us to a great deal of historical debate and some jocularity, but the fact of the matter is, that while we would agree that those who can afford must pay their way, at the same time, we must ensure that we are not going to penalize the just. Many of these measures which come before this House really need much deeper consideration.

I am not going to take the position taken by the previous speaker to say that the matter should be thrown out because it is not consistent with what was said at the time of the Budget, although one would have expected the Government to implement what it said. Of course, if the Government, after a lapse of nearly a year, has some second thoughts, we see nothing wrong with the Government coming forward with perhaps some modifications in its proposals. But I should like to raise a different point.

From time to time, we hear that what should be adopted in Parliaments such as this is what is called "*the committee system*". In the United States, measures such as this one and the one which was passed in our absence, very complicated measures, are passed to a committee for consideration. While a few members, particularly Ministers of the Government, may be aware of what is proposed, they rely on their technical advisers. Many of the backbenchers and others are not aware of the implications of these measures. Even if they are, some of the things which others might see are perhaps not seen by them.

We have no quarrel with the principle which was enunciated but we do not want, in embracing a principle, to cause the just and the unjust to be penalized at the same time.

Thus, I would urge the Government that all very technical matters, such as this Bill, should be referred to a Select Committee of the House before they are taken through Parliament as this is now being done, so that the matters can be examined in minute detail, not in a formal debate such as we have now, or even in the Committee Stage of the Second Reading. If this were done then when Hon. Members made some points, as the last speaker attempted to do, we could have, not heckling but intelligent coun-



ter proposals or answers so that, at the end, all Members would be quite clear as to what was being proposed, whom it was proposed to tax, and in what manner.

I know that the Government would like to get these measures passed before this year ends. We do not want to obstruct the Government, therefore, I would suggest that the Minister embrace the same method which was applied last year, that is, we agree in principle to this measure subject to the Bill being referred to a Select Committee of the House for further detailed consideration and ratification, subject to a Motion of the House at a subsequent stage. I understand that this was done previously in the earlier part of this year but I was not here at the time. The Minister of Finance himself suggested the method in the case of the two Tax Bills which were rushed through the House on the last occasion.

We want to be certain that the House is not pressing those who should not be pressed, for instance, in cases of legitimate transfers to members of families in what may be regarded as inheritance of property. We do not want people to pay for those things. I do not think this was ever the intention of the P.P.P. when it introduced these measures in 1962. As I said, at that time the P.N.C. opposed these measures. It may be that it did not oppose them in principle.

I would therefore suggest to the Hon. Minister of Finance the proposal which I have made for his acceptance and I hope that he will agree to it so that we can have more meaningful discussions on this measure at some later stage.

## Public Business - Approval of Estimates and Expenditure, 1971: 18<sup>th</sup> December, 1970

### Head 31 – Ministry of Trade

**Dr. Jagan:** I am grateful to the Hon. Minister for his explanation, but, I am sorry to say that the House is still somewhat in the dark in some respects on matters which we attempted to elucidate.

The Minister said that there would be no discrimination as to the granting of quotas. By this I assume that anyone or any business house can get a quota. I presume quotas are restricted either to hard currency areas, like dollar areas - I do not know if this is so at the present time- or to Sino-Soviet countries that is all well and good. In fact, that is merely restoring the position as it was during the P.P.P. regime because all quotas were abolished. It was the Coalition Government that reinstated the quota system. We are glad to hear that there will be no quotas.

I should like to ask the Minister if he does not consider that this is discrimination and, indeed, may be a violation of G.A.T.T. In other words, it is discriminatory treatment as it regards imports and exports with respect to certain countries. The Minister said that there will be a 10 percent service charge for goods originating from Sino-Soviet countries, but that there will not be a similar charge for goods coming from, let us say, capitalist Western countries. Is this not violation of the G.A.T.T.? Is this not discrimination in terms of virtually putting an imposition on goods coming from certain countries?

Let me explain by using example. Let us say the categories to which the Minister referred were drugs and food; he made the House to understand that there will be no service charge. I should like him to also explain what is the difference between service charge and commission, which the Government has in mind, because, this is confusing me at the moment. It seems to me that there are the same, but, he seems to make a distinction between the two.

The Hon. Minister says that there will be no service charge for drugs and food, but that the Government will levy a Commission. Now, let us say the commission is 3 percent or 2 percent. In any case he said it will be lower than what the commission agents are now charging. What about drugs and food which may be coming from the Sino-Soviet countries? Is the Minister saying that for these categories of goods the commission will be 2 or 3 percent, but, for the similar goods originating from the Sino-Soviet countries there will be a 10 percent charge?

This is what I meant by discriminatory treatment. I do not think that G.A.T.T permits this kind of treatment. In other words, if you have a service charge, a commission, or call it what you will, it must be identical; it must be nondiscriminatory. This is the point I would like to raise for the

Minister to clear up. First of all, what is the difference in conception between "commission" and "service" as the Government sees it? Secondly, I would like to ask if in truth and in fact there is no discrimination in the way the Government is going about this business of putting a 10 percent service charge on goods originating from the socialist countries, which will include also foods and drugs, but there will be lower charge for goods coming from the western countries.

It seems to me also, on this question of the policies with regards to industrialisation, that the Minister either totally misunderstood or misconstrued what I said. He seemed to say that on the one hand I had always objected to what is called the Puerto Rican model of industrial development or economic development, but, on the other hand I was advocating it. This is not so. It is said that the Government's trading policy, particularly in relation to the Caribbean, is resulting in the non-industrial development of Guyana.

I do not know if the Minister is aware of it, but professor Arthur Lewis some years ago wrote a paper called "*The Industrialisation of the West Indies*" in which he said that the policies which should be adumbrated for the area must be industrial development for the Caribbean islands, intensive development by mechanization of agriculture, the removal of the surplus population from the Caribbean to the land mass areas of British Honduras and Guyana which have large areas of land and which can concentrate on the production of food.

I was saying that it seems that the CARIFTA plan is carrying out this policy. We have seen from the trade figures given by CARIFTA, that there was a 60 percent increase in trade in Jamaica, 30 percent in Trinidad and only 5 percent in Guyana. There is also the fact that there is no industry to speak of in Guyana. There has been no industrial development in the last six years.

It seems, therefore, that we are conforming to this overall strategy which was formulated by Professor Arthur Lewis and others in an earlier period and is now carried out by CARIFTA. The point I made was that what is so harmful about this relationship, this CARIFTA embrace in which we find ourselves is industrialization in the West Indies is not going along according to what the Minister says is his desire.

The Minister said, for instance, "*We want to change the model on the Puerto Rican type of economic and industrial development.*" To whom is he referring when he uses the word "We"? The Prime Minister of Jamaica, Mr. Shearer, and Mr. Lightbourne – I am not sure if he is the Minister of Industries or Trade, made a special trip to New York to assure the investors over there that the thinking of the Jamaican Government was not synonymous with what seems to be the declaration of one leader, to wit, the Prime Minister of Guyana when a statement was made that the West Indians should control their natural resources.

It is clear that there is no thinking *ad idem* throughout the area on this so-

called strategy either of economic development or industrialisation.

I should like the Hon. Minister to understand clearly what we are trying to say. For us, trade is a matter which is inextricably linked up with development, economic growth and industrialisation. You cannot separate them. I would say that today, the overall policy of trade and its integration policy in the West Indies so far, will not result in the development of Guyana, more so, in the industrial development of Guyana. I should like the Hon. Minister to reserve his comments on those points and not divert as he did-misconstrue what I said.

I am criticizing the Government's trading policy if it really means to carry out a meaningful development and industrial development for Guyana. Again, I should like the Hon. Minister to explain some of these things. I do crave his indulgence and your indulgence in this matter because these matters really should have been brought to Parliament for discussion, and we would not have to spend time on them when we are dealing with estimates, but unfortunately, the Minister and the Government dealt with these matters by way of a little statement and then went to the Town Hall and addressed the Chamber of Commerce. We should have had a formal debate on these matters, then all this confusion would not have arisen and there would be no need for all these questions back and forth, because they would have come out in the normal course of debate.

I would therefore urge the Minister to take this occasion to reply to some of the queries which I have made.

The Government is trying to defend its position by abuse of a personal nature. We are not here to go into this, because if we are to do this we would tell the Minister to go back to the Dharma Sala and run it, but the Minister argues about the sharks and that it is necessary to protect the consumers. If it was necessary to protect the consumers from the sharks, we agree with that; we will support the Government - we have said so over and over - put your price contribution and determine what margin you want and the c.i.f. landed cost. Is the Government becoming a shark on its own by levying a 10 percent on the c.i.f.? If the Government is so interested in protecting the consumers, why not pass on the cheap goods coming from the Sino-Soviet countries to the consumers? These are hypocrites trying to fool the people. This is a form of taxation in this so-called "Tax Free" year, but the Government does not want to say so, and secondly, it is clear that -

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, all we are trying to do is to get some clarity about the Government's policy, but no doubt, because the Government is not clear in its own mind and is confused, it cannot give any coherent answer, and it just resorts to abuse.

We are not defending the mercantile community.

## Subhead 52, Glasgow/Teperu Quarry

**Dr. Jagan:** I wish the Hon. Minister would stick to the question. He has on several occasions this evening charged that we are defending these so-called "*exploiters*". He made an allegation that we are or were in receipt of funds from them. He does not answer all the charges made by my friend about the corruption that is going on. Questions which he has the power to answer he does not answer, but he makes all these vague charges. This is why I asked from my seat, "*Why is it that the Government does not fix a decent wage?*"

The Hon. Minister knows that the union with which I was associated - the Sawmills and Forest Workers Union; I am no longer the President - is challenging the Prime Minister's Union, the Guyana Labour union, to represent these same quarry workers. How can he say that we are defending the quarry owners and that we are in receipt of money from them when the union is challenging them and also fighting the stooge union of the Government at the moment?

Let the Hon. Minister speak on things which he knows about and not make false insinuations in this House. The things which he should know of and the questions which he should answer concern the misuse of funds, personnel and materials for the Prime Minister's private home on the East Coast.

## Supplementary Estimates: 21<sup>st</sup> December, 1970

### Subhead 1, Item (2)

**Dr. Jagan:** The answer which the Hon. Minister gave is very unsatisfactory. It is true that the Government as it is claimed, cannot intervene in the affairs of the Public Service Commission, but, surely, if the work of the Ministry and the Government is held up because of shortages and non-fulfilment of vacancies, then the Ministry has the right and the duty to consult with the P.S.C. about matters pertaining to employment; not who should be employed, but, the general question of filling vacancies.

Only a few days ago, the Prime Minister referred to the loyalty of Guyanese who graduated from socialist countries, when he tried to gibe at those who are leaving this country and going abroad for bigger salaries.

This is a real disgrace. I spoke to the Minister personally in the case of the individual. This is not a question of trying to push someone for political reasons. This is a person who has a professional qualification which is recognized by the Government. The question of providing employment for Guyanese in his position must be faced realistically. There are few employment opportunities outside the Government services. There is only the Catholic Hospital as a recognized institution. What are these people to do?

I read somewhere that in Surinam they brought anaesthetists from Romania. The Government claims that it has no bias and prejudice against persons who qualify in socialist countries. Why is it refusing jobs to Guyanese who are qualified?

The Minister knew that this person was seeking employment. The present specialist in this field, one Dr. Holder, is leaving the country and I understand there is only one specialist remaining. He cannot cope with all the work - I may be mistaken - including attending clinics in Georgetown. Let the Minister not just give a facile answer to the effect that we cannot interfere with the Public Service Commission. It is not a question of interference. We know that orders are given. Do not let us act like children; do not tell us; "*we cannot interfere.*" The Government has the right to question them.

Why is this Guyanese allowed to leave the country? The Government must give an explanation with regards to these persons seeking employment. The Government has the intention to enact legislation. The Prime Minister told me since last April that there would be legislation; the present legislation does not permit them to practice privately; it only permits them to work in a recognized institution.

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** The Minister is saying that as soon as these people have a registration certificate from the Medical Board they can practice. The Min-

ister obviously is not well informed about what is happening. U.W.I. graduates, graduates from the United Kingdom and certain Commonwealth countries, graduates from the United States of America, as soon as they register here can practice either privately or in medical institutions, but, if persons graduate from a recognized institution of comparable standard in Western Germany or France or the Soviet Union, they are given a temporary registration which permits them to practice only in recognized institutions. As far as I am aware there are only two such institutions. I do not think that even McKenzie Hospital is registered as a recognized institution. Thus, these people cannot practice privately. This is the point I made: the Government does not want to give them employment.

I was told that provision would have been made since last April to allow these persons to practice privately.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** The Minister says they can practice privately. This is not so. The Minister can look up the record. One person has been registered for a year and a half, nearly two years. That person will willingly practice tomorrow and she cannot. I have advised such persons to go ahead and practice. Let the Government sue them because the Government is playing the fool on the matter. If I were a doctor with the necessary qualifications I would go ahead and practice as long as people were willing to come to me and let the Government dare to prosecute.

The Government is in a very dishonest position so far as these people are concerned. This is not only doing harm to Guyanese and others, but, it is depriving a large number of Guyanese of services which we in Guyana need.

## Public Business Motion - Approval of Estimates: 23rd December, 1970

### Head 27 - Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources

**Dr. Jagan:** I should like to raise a point, because I think that this is a very important Ministry and the direction in which we think the Government is going can have very serious consequences. I do not know whether the Minister has read the paper on the sugar industry by Dr. Clive Thomas. I would commend this paper to him. He said that the farmers at Cane Grove want to go into farming. Cane Grove was closed down because it could not pay.

#### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** The Minister does not seem to understand. Port Mourant factory was closed down because the sugar planters wanted to maximize their profits, to concentrate and reduce their overhead costs. They do not care what happens to workers who are dismissed.

The point I want to make – and Clive Thomas made this point – is that the sugar industry is in a favoured position because it has a guaranteed minimum price in Britain and in Canada. Consequently, it is still a more profitable crop to grow than food crops. But take away this subsidy, and we are drowning and then what happens? People are now worried as to what will happen if Britain goes into the Common Market. Go to North-East Brazil where they have converted all their agriculture to sugar. There is mass starvation. The Minister wants all the farmers here to convert now.

I do not want to quarrel with that because the policies in the other sectors of agriculture are failing and the Government is not coming forward with a sound agriculture policy, which means stimulants, subsidization and so forth, for other sectors. If necessary, tax the sugar industry by special levies so as to be able to subsidise the other sectors. Then you will have the farmers going into the production of food in this country.

All the experts, Dumont and every agronomist, are saying that we should grow local food to meet our local consumption. This is basic and axiomatic for the development of the country, but this is not being done. The Minister said, "*Look at the farmers! See how wealthy they are! Look at how much money they make!*", but does he know that cane farmers have been robbed from time immemorial?

Let me make this point for the benefit of the Minister. The Minister did not want to recognize the cane farmers. He has the power; he says he will do what he likes. Let him do something to help the cane farmers. He tells us the amount of money the cane farmers got, but he does not tell us the



cost of production and what is the net profit. The cane farmers are given two-thirds after making certain deductions. Let us say, that the price of a ton of sugar is so many dollars. Certain deductions are made. They then take what is left, divide it into three. A third is taken for milling costs.

This formula I submit, is robbing the farmers. One-third is very high considering that in the rice industry only about one-fifth to one-sixth is taken as milling fees. Therefore, one would think that in the sugar industry the amount would be more or less the same.

There is no competition in the sugar industry because Bookers and Sandbach Parker, through the Sugar Producers Association, own practically all the factories and they have a common agreements with other sugar planters throughout the West Indies. I tried to get Mr. McKenzie, who was at one time Director of Agriculture and adviser to C.D.W., but he was applying the same formula that would apply in the West Indies. I tried at one time to get the Cubans, because they nationalised their sugar industry, to give us the cost for the grinding of cane. Unfortunately, we have not got this figure.

If the Minister is really interested in the farmers he will look into this aspect of the question. Let us not talk about recognition and so on because we know the Minister says he will not do so, but if he has so much power let him carry out an investigation on this point, because this is a moot and sore point. Farmers are being robbed of a whole lot of money. If they are making money at the moment they would make much more. I commend to the Government that the only way they would get this advice is if they go where the industry has been nationalised: Peru or Cuba. If they go to the West Indies, Fiji or Mauritius, they are meeting the same big boys. They have a common interest and you will not get anywhere. They apply the same formula all over. I should like to hear the Minister on this point.

## **Subhead 8 – Wages, Government Housing Estates**

**Dr. Jagan:** The Hon. Minister, as I said before and I repeat, is making a great play on the ground of its humanitarianism in removing these people from rental slavery to private ownership, but the fact of the matter is that the Government has found itself in a vortex. The people are not paying rent! Most of them cannot afford to pay and most of them are supporters of the Government. The people are paying only a part of the maintenance charges, \$3, but clearly, it is costing the Government much more. The Position is: the Government is not getting rent and it has to pay maintenance costs because of the financial difficulty in which it finds itself. It comes along with this aura of humanitarianism, saying, "*We are so generous.*"

Indeed, the Minister had the gall to say it is so much better than in socialist countries. I remember the last time he spoke on this matter he quoted the difference between what this Government is doing, and what is being

done in the Soviet Union. The Minister studied law and he certainly must know that he cannot deal with an argument by taking sections of it. He must take the whole picture in the Soviet Union. He must have one phrase to cover the whole thing: rent, electricity, gas, and water. Everything in the apartment costs 8 percent of wages and salary. I am telling you what is a fact and this covers a vast number of the population.

The Minister is dealing with the exceptions to show what the benefits of private ownership are. The Government says, "*You want to own your own little house and have your own garden, OK, you will pay*", but the Minister is not putting the picture clear. He tried to compare the little fleabite the Government is doing to help to solve the housing problem here and to make it appear so generous, when indeed its generosity is merely intended to save money. He has not fooled anybody. The housing problem in Guyana is very acute and what the Government has done so far has not solved the problem.

The Government cannot tackle the problem. What have the Members of the Government done but talk? What has been done on the question of house lots and the acquisition of properties from all the sugar estates in order to make them available to the small man? I repeat, the Government says it is being generous, but it is charging a purchase price on the basis of the old value - the value of many years ago. We do not disagree that the rent which people have paid should be converted towards payments, but do not come and tell us falsely that it is better than the socialist countries.

I repeat! Housing problems in a socialist country are tackled on the basis of subsidized rentals. Private ownership of houses is the exception. What is the Government doing about cheap rentals? The Members of the Government criticize the P.P.P, but it was the P.P.P who put in houses and rented them at \$17 a month. What are they doing today? How many people can afford to build houses? We saw what happened when they went into the T.U.C. housing Scheme. When the time came to pay, they could not enter the houses. They had to go and beg, and use influence to get back the money because the houses cost too much.

This is a fact. Therefore, if the Members of the Government are serious, do not let them try to fool the people. Try to solve the housing problem by building large numbers of houses and renting them to the people of the country on the basis of their ability to pay.

This is what Collymore said, "*The Hon. Minister uses the word 'Socialist';, but 'Socialist' does not mean owning houses. 'Socialist' means freeness, free telephones, free houses, free food, free water, free electricity, and free gas - that is what 'Socialist' means.*" The Minister spent a lot of time attacking a person who could not reply. The man talked about full employment. He talked about free medicine, free education and a lot of other free things.

The Hon. Minister does not put it in a proper context. The Minister has an opportunity to reply, but he does not want to listen.

The housing problem in this country is very acute. Everybody knows it

and it is not going to be solved by making propaganda points. We are not interested only in propaganda. It is not that we are opposed to cooperatives. We are opposed to the fact that in the end the people have to pay more. Even if they own the houses, they will have to pay more. That is the objective of the Government: to let the people foot the bill, whereas, today they are subsidised because they pay rental. All this talk about house ownership is a lot of nonsense. I do not care whether I own a house or not as long as I can live within my salary.

## **Item 2 – Housing Development Bill**

**Dr. Jagan:** As my colleague, Mr. Chandisingh, a moment ago said, we are not in principle opposed to this measure. In fact, we welcome any measure which will solve the grave problem of housing which exists in this country. One would have thought, however, that at this stage the Government would have come to the House with something much more specific and definite. The Government has already had many years in office. The P.N.C. has had many years in office. It has had the benefit of a development plan fathered by Sir Arthur Lewis and experts from inside of this country and outside of this country.

Now we hear that a new plan is to be formulated, but so far we have not been given any figures. What will be the allocation in planning terms? Planning does not involve just coming every now and then and saying we want to do this and that, and so we want some money for this and for that. There must be an overall plan. There must be proportional spending depending on the priorities of the needs of the country. Government, of course, will decide its own priorities but at least the people and the country must know how much of the financial resources of the country the Government is prepared to allocate. I am not thinking only of Government money but of private money. How much in all is being allocated?

We have a disgraceful situation. I read in one of the reports of the Bank of Guyana that, a big institution like the Credit Corporation was re-lending money from the pool which was made up of payment coming back to it. That is not good enough because the amount was very small for a country like this where agriculture must be rated very highly. Surely in that case we need a better credit policy, a more specific policy.

We know the housing problem is acute but the Government is not telling us how much money it intends to spend from the Government sector, from the private sector, from the banking system. I do not know how much money there is to borrow from the banking system because the Government is heavily in debt. Every year the money is going, deficit spending and the drawing out of money from the banking system.

If you are not allocating very much what will be the possibility of the banking system doing it? If not the present bank, which Finance Corpora-

tion or enterprise is coming here? How much are they going to put? Let us hear something more specific, something tangible. That is what the people want now. We had a Minister for Housing for four years. And we now have another Minister of Housing and still everything is rather vague. This, I am sorry to say, does not get at the root of the problem of housing in this country because, even if you provide loans, large numbers of people cannot afford to build houses because the factors of house construction are such that they eat up a lot of money. It is costly, first of all, to get land and, secondly, to get materials. This is a country with large assets of wood and timber, which is the biggest asset in the country. For years we have been hearing about the utilization of secondary species. What is being done about it? Let the Minister of Housing and the Minister in charge of Forestry answer. We should be in a position to sell lumber to the ordinary man at 10 cents per square foot so that he does not have to buy expensive cement which comes from outside this country.

The Prime Minister says we are going to make clay blocks. If you want cured lumber at a reasonable price you cannot get it. They talk about Cuba and the buying of the sleepers and things. The sawmills are ceasing operation.

What I am saying is this - Government is not tackling this problem in a manner which will bring about confidence in the Government, that is going about this thing diligently and in seriousness. Why cannot the Government negotiate to tackle sawmills? Take many of the people who are unemployed, the youths all over this country. How much forest land do you have? Saw them, bring the lumber down, cure it, and season it. This is what is needed in Guyana if you want in truth to tackle the housing problem. All the land on the East Coast, East Bank, West Coast, West Bank, is tied up by Bookers planters. If you want to solve the problem in Georgetown where is the cheap land?

The Minister made a statement the other day concerning what has been done. You are therefore telling us that the Government is going to guarantee 20 percent of the loan. This is not going to solve the problem of housing. First of all you have to get the person who is going to give the loan. Secondly, the purchaser has to meet high prices - too high for the ordinary man today. The Minister knows it. The ordinary man in Georgetown has to pay sometimes as high as one-third, if not higher, of his wage as rental. This is why I feel that a more concerted and comprehensive approach has to be taken to get the root of this problem.

Let us consider our resources - land resources and timber resources. The Prime Minister now talks of clay bricks. With all these resources there is idle manpower. You do not have labour shortage problems in Guyana. We have unemployed, underemployed. Why do we not have a concerted action to combine these, in order to solve this problem, more expeditiously to the satisfaction of all the very hard-pressed people? The Prime Minister does not have to worry. He has two big houses. He is drinking cognac. I

should like to hear from the Minister how soon he expects to tackle the number one problem in this country, that is, the housing and land problem.

Take the land held under D.H.M.P. leases, it is there.

We would like the Hon. Minister in his reply to give us a detailed and concrete proposal as to how he intends to tackle the number one problem, including the problem of subsidized houses. What are the plans of the Government, outside the plans for private house-building when houses are going to be costly? What are the plans of the Government with respect to either subsidized or council – built houses?

## Christmas and New Year Greetings

**Dr. Jagan:** Mr. Speaker, I too, should like to join the Hon. Prime Minister in expressing our sentiment this time of the year. During the Budget Debate I had listed in my speech the failures of the Government. One thing which I failed to mention was that the Government did not succeed in de-emphasizing Christmas. I think it is good that the Government has failed because this is something traditional to the people of Guyana. Regardless of how we argue, quarrel and debate, the time comes, at least once a year, when we all can forget past differences and not only celebrate but be friends. Christmas time and the New Year always brings for the Guyanese people not only relaxation but friendship, hospitality and all the good things in the Guyanese character. I think this is something which we must always not only be proud of but cherish.

I hope Sir, that since the Government has failed in its effort to de-emphasize Christmas that it will also relax, perhaps for next Christmas, and permit this entry of that little something which also offered some pleasure. I refer to the grapes. I am one of those who cherish mangoes and sapodillas and all the nice things we have here. We will look forward in the New Year, not only for changes like that, but for many more meaningful changes which will not have us always protesting about the way the Government conducts its business.

Let us hope that the New Year will bring better relations and that more and more Guyanese will be proud of the contributions which we make in this House when we debate seriously, when we discuss the important questions of the day with all the seriousness that they deserve and also when we are able to do so after the people themselves have been fully apprised of what we are debating and discussing. I think the Guyanese people deserve this.

I do hope that the New Year will be one full of hope and will be one which will meet the aspirations, if not of all the Guyanese people, at least of the vast majority of the Guyanese people.

I wish you, Sir, your family, all the Members of this House and the staff who have worked so diligently and hard, not only a Merry Christmas but all the best for the New Year.

## Housing Development Bill: March 25<sup>th</sup>, 1971

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

Clause 9.

**Dr. Jagan:** The Government proposes to insert a new section or paragraph to this Clause. Now this question has been engaging the attention of those who have been concerned with this matter for some time and I feel that the Government will be opening the floodgates to the disposition of the tenant if it proceeds with this Amendment by the addition of 9 (c). I know that it has been argued that in some cases small proprietors wish the land for members of the family who may have grown up. The same can be said of tenants; those tenants who have been occupying lands for a long time, they themselves have families. Their families may have grown in the interval and thus the families of tenants also are hard pressed to find lands for themselves.

One would think therefore, Sir, that the answer to the problem is not to take lands away from tenants and give them to the landlords, even though they may be small. The answer lies in making more lands available. Now we know, Sir, that Guyana is a large country with a very low population density per square mile, but in spite of this fact there is great land hunger in this country. The answer to this problem, therefore, is to open up the lands, provide more drainage and irrigation so that both landlords and tenants and their families can have not only the limited holdings that they have at the moment, but more lands, adequate holdings, so that they can earn a living.

While one may think about the welfare of small landlords, at the same time, one must think of the tenants, who have been occupying these lands for a long period of time. We know that tenants are worse off than proprietors, generally speaking, so that I would have thought that the Government would be well advised to let the situation remain as it is and not to open what I would consider to be the floodgates. Once these are opened and magistrates, landlords and committees are entitled to go into this whole question, one would find interminable difficulties experienced by tenants and, in many cases, tenants will be ejected from their holdings.

As I said, the answer to the problem of land shortage is not to be found in the direction in which the Government is trying to resolve this problem. The answer is to be found, as I said and I repeat, in making more lands available. There is no shortage of lands in Guyana, but the problem is one of water control. This is in the power of the Government to do and that is the way to tackle the problem. I urge the Government to withdraw this

section of the Bill and not to proceed with it because if it is the intention of the Government to protect farmers – and it was the whole basis of this Ordinance, to protect the rice farmers, to protect tenants – what we seem to be doing now is to be going the other way and removing whatever protection they may be enjoying. Therefore Sir, I urge the Minister to agree that this section should be deleted from the Bill.



## Debate on President's Address: May 21<sup>st</sup>, 1971

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, I regret to say that the Government has not done very well for his Excellency the President. They have given him a very generalized statement to read to this House and to the country and when attempting to fill out some details, one finds that nothing has emerged which is new. One would have expected, in view of all the growing pains, all the new problems confronting the country, the Government would have by this time come forward with some new departure, But it is the same old beaten track and, added to this, there is a great deal of confusion. I see that we now have a theoretician in the person of the Minister of Finance. Unfortunately, he seems to have read a lot but did not have time to digest much of what he has read or the theory which he wants us to believe as the correct way forward.

The Hon. Minister of Finance says that economics is not a political ideology. I was taking notes when he was speaking. Ownership and control, he said have gone past the question of ideology.

We are told again – I am glad the Minister is taking his seat – that Allende and Caldera are on the same platform so far as ownership and control are concerned. This is where the confusion lies and that is why I say the Minister has not properly digested his reading of economics and political science and even finance and monetary questions. At one stage, Sir, he told us that the Government has arrived at its present course, from its personal, practical experience and not from any doctrinaire approach and then at a certain stage he led us off into an excursion of the deals which the Russians are making with Fiat, and attempted to make with Ford, or with Japan.

As with the Minister of Housing, when we had an excursion the other day about how much better the Government was doing than the Soviet Union in housing, we had a lot of half-truths pedalled, we always have a lot of distortion. However, the point is that we have been saying for many years that the model which this Government started out with is bankrupt, and we are always told *"When you get into the Government, when you come over to the other side, then you can do what you want"*. It seems now from what the Minister of Finance said, that they have found a new path, but clearly when he says that Allende and Caldera are following the same path, it shows the depth of confusion. They are doing the same thing. It is a paraphrase of their following the same path. They are dealing in the realm of economics. We have been talking of an anti-imperialist economic programme different from the Puerto Rican model. We had Frei in Chile, a counterpart of Caldera, Christian Democracy, pursuing a certain line. Now that the Puerto Rican model has become patently bankrupt, I see where Professor, now Sir Arthur Lewis in his latest speech says that the West Indies have been embarking too much on this infrastructure business, and more

emphasis should be put into the productive sector. He refers to agriculture and industry which will be associated with its development.

I said there is confusion. At a certain stage, because the Puerto Rican model has become patently bankrupt, the imperialists and even the United Nations, where the imperialists have a lot of say, are propagating some new ideas, the idea of partnership which my Hon. Friend the Prime Minister was at one time embracing.

What is the difference between Allende and Frei, or Allende and Caldera? Caldera is the ideological brother of Frei and of Burnham. What they want to tell us, Sir, is that they are finding a new path, but in truth and in fact, it is no new path; it is a path which is working within the embrace of imperialism, which imperialism is forced to adopt in this era. It is no use giving us excursions into the Soviet Union. That is another tactic of imperialism to say that the Soviet Union is becoming capitalist and to say, "*Look at the capitalist deals they are making.*"

Sir, in Allende's programme, the popular front as in a socialist country like the Soviet Union, the public sector plays the dominant role in the economy, and the private sector will be marginal. But nowhere either in Caldera's or Frie's or the P.N.C.'s programme do we find any such thing. This is a fundamental difference. If the Soviet Union is making deals with Fiat, it is not to set up capitalist enterprises, but for capitalists to help to build socialism. What is wrong with that? What is wrong with Lenin, when he did not have scientists and technicians, hiring them from capitalist countries? It was right. It was so right that today the Soviet Union can produce more scientists and technicians than the United States, the United Kingdom and Germany put together. There is nothing wrong in that.

But this is not what we are talking about here. I am not going to go any further with this because the Ministers and the Government are trying to confuse the people of Guyana. There is ideological confusion to make them feel that they are really on to something new. In order to help themselves in their attacks against us who propose an integrated, all-embracing programme, they try to make it appear that the models which we propose are similar to the ones which their imperialist friends are now advocating.

The Minister give us a lot of figures to show growth, but I will remind him of the words of the past economic adviser to the Government, that we had growth, but not development. This is a known fact because what you measure is what development means in terms of the ordinary people. This is what you have to measure and by any yardstick, Sir; you will see what is happening today, despite all these talks and these glorious figures. Three to four years ago, the *Daily Telegraph*, in London was saying that Guyana and Pakistan were going to be the model for Africa and Asia respectively. These were the two shining examples. Pakistan is now facing mass starvation.

[Mr. Hoyte: Like Poland.]

**Dr. Jagan:** Poland is not facing mass starvation. That is not true, you have it wrong. At any level, unemployment, cost of living, education, health: go around and find out.

I was in the Rupununi not too long ago. Everywhere I went, in every school, every village, there were no drugs, no doctors, no dispensers. Drugs used to be there in the P.P.P.'s time. We were told there was no growth during the time of the P.P.P. The Minister compared \$1 million surplus in the last year of the P.P.P. regime and \$15 million this year, yet the people cannot get the basic items like drugs.

At one place in the Rupununi, one village, a medical ranger showed me a letter a man wrote to him, the man said – I am sorry I did not bring it, I would have read it here; it was a brief letter. The man said they used to get drugs once a month. Now, the ranger came to the village, and when the people lined up to get treatment and medicine, he told them that medicine was only for children, and for old people, parakari is the medicine. Ask the Hon. Member (Mr. Duncan). Parakari is a light alcoholic drink of the Amerindians.

We have not been told very much about the health problems. In the field of education we always get the charming Minister telling the House, the country, all the nice things about education – wonderful talk, but come down to the basics. The Guyana Teachers Association said the other day –

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** I went there to find out. I think somebody referred to the percentages of free places that are won in the city, and the person made the point that there was a difference between rural and urban performance. It is not only rural versus urban, but urban itself versus urban, in that the poor families cannot afford to send their children to the private kindergarten schools or even primary schools where there are not only good teachers but the exhibits and demonstrations. They have the advantage of growing in homes where they have better opportunities for learning. How are we going to build this so-called "*egalitarian society*"? How are we going to arrive at socialism, when the whole education system is geared to creating an elite from an elite? Are these the people who are going to build socialism? Find out what happened in the G.D.R., Germany or in Cuba. The people, who run when socialism has to be built, generally come from this group. The Minister knows about this, but what is done about it? Standardization of school books, what is done about it? There is only talk. Put two or three experts to work on it full-time.

I was in the Interior recently. Hon. Members should see the conditions under which teachers live, and they should hear what allowances they get. Government has agreed to give them certain incentives but they are not given. Representatives of the Guyana teachers Association told me the other day that a memorandum regarding subsistence allowance has been ap-

proved some two years ago, but they have not yet received the allowances.

If the country was well off financially, as the Hon. Minister of Finance is making the country believe, then surely we would have been able to give drugs, an essential item, to the sick and we should have been able to give education to children beginning at five plus. Primary education is a basic thing.

The Minister of Finance told us about the huge circle. What he did not speak about is the heavy taxation which has been heaped on the people of Guyana. Take the defence levy. Did the previous Minister of Finance not say that this was to be an imposition only for one year?

[An Hon. Member: Not the defence levy.]

**Dr. Jagan:** But the point is, the Seven-Year Plan had in the introduction a statement which said that only \$10 million dollars will have to be found from taxation to finance that plan.

[An Hon. Member: A minimum of \$10 million.]

**Dr. Jagan:** It did not say minimum. You go and read it again. Some things you do not read; I read those things. You understand what you are told to understand. Taxation has gone up by 500 percent, so much so that they have had to scrap the plan. This is why there are surpluses but, in spite of all the surpluses, you cannot give the basic things to the people. You are going around in vicious circles.

Take the simple question of coconut oil, fry-oil: the subsidy given in our time was abolished. If you go to the coconut producers for increased wages they say *"We cannot raise wages because the price of copra has not been raised"*. The Minister of Labour does not want to prescribe minimum wages for the coconut workers; the Government does not want to raise the copra prices because it feels that that will have an effect on the oil price, as the subsidy has been removed. Therefore, there is a vicious circle, and the poor people, the so-called *"real men"*, the small men who will become real men, are becoming smaller men. This is a reality. I am giving facts now which anybody can verify.

Nothing has been said about the vexed question of unemployment, except that we are going to absorb more people in agriculture. I do not want to repeat what has been said already about agriculture by my colleague, but I wish to say that one of the things which have led to the increase in production in practically all countries is the question of prices. Nothing sweetens the farmer more than to have an adequate price for what he is producing, and despite what the Government may say its intentions are, unless there is a realistic price system, it is not going to increase the agricultural production of this country. We will continue to depend on sugar and bauxite.

So far as rice is concerned the Minister of Agriculture was talking about markets. We recognize that one has to produce what the market wants but at the same time we have to take all the factors into consideration. At one time we were doing our own experimentation here. The man who was doing the rice breeding work was removed. Then were told big experts were coming from the United Nations. Once they invited us, we went. When Blue Belle was being propagated, we saw what was being done. We saw Blue Belle, we saw Star-Bonnet, we saw different things, but from the discussions going on then - this was about a year and a half ago - there was no indication at all that Star Bonnet was the variety which this man who was highly praised by the Government was going to propose for the future. He showed the disadvantages of this particular variety. Surely, the Minister of Agriculture knows this? Why does he not tell us about that too? Why are we doing all this research? Why are we continuing with it? I remember that when I went there, they showed us many varieties. There was some rice as small as this, bearing heavy pods and I said, "*Why don't you put it out right now?*" I was told not enough work was done with it and it is not yet right to put it out. But from my personal experience there, I was told that Star-Bonnet was not one of the types selected. In fact, they were making hybrids from that. We are justifying this compulsion on the farmers now on the grounds of what has happened in Jamaica.

Let the Minister of Trade, Minister of Agriculture and the Prime Minister tell us about Cuba. The Minister read a letter this afternoon. Someone was talking about Mooneer Khan and was referring to what the Board could do, what was the problem facing the Board. What he did not say was that there was a new Government which is in charge of foreign affairs and foreign trade. Why is it that the Government did not then go to Cuba? Why is it that up to today, the Government is not exploring the Cuban markets?

I understand - perhaps the Prime Minister in his reply will tell us if this is so or not - that the Russians have to feed the Cubans by buying rice from Brazil, take it all the way to Russia and send it back to Cuba. You are helping Uncle Sam to blockade them and to starve them. During the 1964 elections, Sir, when we charged that the P.N.C. party would not sell to Cuba, that it would break off the trade with Cuba, when the P.N.C. Members were telling the people they would get \$10 a bag for paddy and \$30 a bag for rice, the American Ambassador to Guyana came out and said that they have no objections to selling any agricultural product to Cuba. Yet the reality of it is that the Cubans have to buy rice from Brazil. They cannot go directly because the Brazilians will not sell them, nor will boats, even Russian boats I presume, be allowed to go to Brazil if they go to Cuba, because the Brazilians like the Americans, have decided to blacklist all ships which trade with Cuba.

This is the rascality which these people are involved in, and now they are forcing to the farmers to grow Star-Bonnet when the Star-Bonnet expert has not recommended this. Let the Prime Minister tell us, because he is

going to speak next, whether that was the recommendation. They say I am begging teachers. I go anywhere; I want to know. I remember – and this can be verified – when the controversy was on Blue Belle, Star- Bonnet was not one of the varieties which was advocated. The Government is drifting as usual. To listen to the speeches here, the Government can call an election tomorrow and win three-quarters or 90 percent of the votes, so wonderful are their policies and so popular they are among the masses.

The Minister of Trade read from my speech a year ago and said that we advocated nationalism of this, that and the other, including trade. Of course we did, and then he said we also advocated control of drugs and foods. How long have we been doing that? But like bauxite, it is a question of what kind of nationalisation. We talked about workers' control; we talked about integrated, all-embracing policies, not just "*tokenism*". I see Wallace has asked Joe Louis to become his adviser. That is the kind of "*tokenism*" the Government is going in for.

From what I can see, contrary to what the Government is advocating, the small man is not becoming the real man but the small man is becoming smaller. Take the question of drugs. The Minister said that previously there were two variables, C.I.F. prices plus profit margins and all the other margins. Now they have controlled one of these variables by fixing prices and margins and therefore the small man will benefit. But, Sir, control is one thing, nationalisation is one thing, but it is how it is done. This question must be investigated. When the Government is bulk purchasing, whom is it bulk purchasing from? It is the same thing on the question of drugs. The Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Trade, who was at one time a junior Minister in the P.P.P., indicated that if goods, drugs and other medical supplies were bought from the socialist countries, the Government would make a saving of half a million dollars a year on that alone.

I ask the Minister what sources has the Government tried? Where is it booking its orders? Where are Government supplies being bought? Is it that the Government has removed one set of sharks and put in another set of sharks in the driver's seat? I hope not! But we hear a lot of funny things happening so much so that some Minister is even saying, "*I am so sorry that I have recommend so and so to go in there*". Be careful!

It is not only a question of control; it is how it is done. If you put a lot of round pegs in square holes, they can bind you and you can lose. Secondly, the poor man will pay for it.

On the question of drugs, let me cite an example. Small men have come to me. They told me that previously they used to get their supplies from the agent paying a 5 percent commission. The Minister said that he does not want commission agents any more. The commission agent has now become the wholesaler. What about the problem of competition? Where there is a situation as in Guyana where there are no monopolies in the field of trade, there can be competition which can help to reduce prices. The Government is eliminating that factor of competition today, so that even

though the Minister may say that he reduced the overall margin for the commission agent, subcommission agent and what not, plus the wholesale profit from thirty-five to twenty percent, still the small man may be paying more.

These are the practical considerations plus the factor of where the goods are imported from. These factors have to be gone into, and I hope the Government will not only put a representative of the Chamber of Commerce on an advisory body; the Opposition should be there already to see what is going on, to know, to give suggestions, because the whole aim of control was to help the people. Unfortunately, it has not done so. I do not feel that this is mainly a question of external factors, as the Minister is making it to appear, or even a question of sabotage. I am not doubting that these may be factors, but these are not the only factors which today are leading to this ever-rising cost of living which is affecting the small man.

Last but not least: The Prime Minister did not speak here, but a few days ago, at an open air meeting, he said – no doubt he is getting very worried – that the people seem to be going to the same party which said “*Not a cent more*”. It seems, Sir that the Prime Minister is not averse to distorting facts and so for the nth time I wish to state exactly what this has turned into – a vicious slogan.

At the time of the Guillebaud Commission Report in 1958, salary scales were divided into two levels, super scales and the ordinary scales for civil servants. For daily paid workers an increase from \$2.52 to \$2.70 was recommended. The P.P.P. Government raised the \$2.70 recommendation to \$2.75, and so far as the big increase was concerned for the super scale salaries, I said at a meeting at Windsor Forest, “*Not a cent more*”. This has been turned upside-down. As I asked, “*How could those at the top who were getting very big salaries get bigger increases when the middle brackets were to get nothing*” Such is the purpose of propaganda that even the Prime Minister, to make some political gain, is not averse to using these distorted slogans.

What is the Government doing? We did not want to pay more, so they say they are the generous people. What about the civil servants? What about teachers? The Prime Minister had a conference yesterday; perhaps he will tell us the outcome. Let us hear what he is doing about this demand. The associations have produced statistics to show that the cost of living went up by about 26 percent, but all they have received are two increases which amount to about 10 percent. What is the Government doing about this? Are we going to wait until we have another strike or until they come to the P.P.P. again, for the P.N.C. Government to give them something? What has happened to the \$10 a day minimum wage which you promised the people? Now you are saying that you are giving them more than they are entitled to.

The teachers want some assurances in writing. Apparently, they do not trust the Government any more. But the Ministers refuse to allay the fears and apprehensions of a responsible body. Many of these people are their

own supporters. The Government refuses to give them assurance in writing. If the Minister says to the people 'You are going to get so and so; that is what is intended', can it not be put in writing? I hope the Minister of Education will take some time out. Just being pretty and being nice is not enough in politics; agreement must be put in writing.



## Debate on President's Address (Cont.)

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, in all seriousness, I do not think we should just come to this House and merely make speeches. The House will lose the respect it deserves if it is not run properly or if we just come here and make speeches. The Government must be aware that there is a growing feeling of dissatisfaction in this country. A lot of it is due to the fact that the Government seems to be incapable of coming to quick decisions. The purpose of governing is to be able to make decisions.

Why should teachers have to say to the Opposition that things which they agreed two years ago have not been implemented? What has happened to the Report of the Watchmen's Advisory Committee, and the many other exercises which have been investigated and not acted upon?

The question of the cost of living is really a serious matter today facing Guyanese people as a whole. The Minister of Finance was saying a little while ago, "*We have not been able to stabilize things and we do not have a runaway inflation*". A lot of this is due to outside factors, outside costs. I do not think I am telling anything out of place in that sense. If the cost of living goes up for the small farmer, the huckster, if his cost of production goes up, naturally the prices of the commodities which he is producing will go up too. It is shameful today to go into the market and find the cost of items there. You can buy bananas in Canada cheaper than you can buy them in Georgetown. We were told that we must buy local things, not grapes and apples; but mangoes are five for fifty cents. What are we doing? Are we creating a situation where the working class cannot eat fruit any more? This is what it is coming to. Even I cannot afford it.

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** The Hon. Member thinks that I am joking; I am very serious about this matter.

The prices are high in the markets. I am talking now about local food-stuff. The Government puts on a ten percent surtax on goods from socialist countries. If the Members of the Government say that it is not discriminatory, as we charge, then in good faith they must remove it to help to reduce the cost of living, so that people can buy, and buy cheaply, not only clothing, but many other things which are available. I think it was the Minister of Finance who told us yesterday that some of the merchants are engaging in sharp practices, by importing some of these goods, processing them and sending them back to Carifta countries as if they were coming from Guyana. Why should the Guyanese people not have the advantage of cheap foods? I am not saying they must have everything from the socialist countries. In our time, there were large tins of sardines being sold for twenty-

five cents.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** When we had trade with Cuba you said it was blood money. The Government created a baby called Carifta. Now it is sabotaging Carifta; it is buying cement from Venezuela. I understand that you will have to waive the duty and the defence levy on cement coming from Venezuela which means you will lose forty-one cents.

**[Mr. Clarke:** He spoke to John Fernandes]

**Dr. Jagan:** You are not going to convince anybody that we went to make an Alliance with John Fernandes. You do not like us to have the nails to nail your coffin. How else are we to know facts like these? We made the appointment. We do not hide; we have nothing to be ashamed about; we are making no alliances. The *Guyana Graphic* says we made a peace plan with you. There is no peace plan

**[Prime Minister:** I said so already.]

**Dr. Jagan:** We will support anything that you do. Here is an example. The Government will have to buy cement at a far higher price from Venezuela. Has the Minister spoken to the Yugoslavs or to the Russians who were here about supplying cement and bartering it for something from Guyana? Has he done that? No, he has not.

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** If you had done it you would not buy from Venezuela. In the process of buying it you are sabotaging the imperialist baby you created called Carifta and you are going to lose revenue.

We repeat: the situation in this country is grave and there is going to be more and more dissatisfaction. The use of troops, the use of police, the closing down of schools and this arrogance are not going to solve the problem. Imagine the so-called "enlightened" Minister talking about teachers having the right to flog, in this day and age! The Minister is living in an isolated world. She must know that all over the world today, students want to have a say, not only in what they are taught, but also in the selection of teachers. I am not saying that everything they say is right, but surely, you cannot stick to the antiquated methods.

**[Miss Field –Ridley:** Stop mis-advising them]

**Dr. Jagan:** So far the Minister has misinformed the House. The P.P.P

only came into this picture when the people came to the P.P.P

**[Interruption]**

**Dr. Jagan:** The Minister is saying something else. The Prime Minister must clear with her right away so that she speaks the right thing in here.

The Government must either embark, especially in trading, on a new policy which can help to reduce the cost of living, or it must subsidise the cost of living. The Government told us that it had \$15 million surplus this year. It is now going to be running the bauxite industry. We were telling you that the bauxite industry had a windfall from devaluation in 1967. You did not want to tax sugar, bauxite, timber, the \$10 million windfall which they were to get. The Government will now have that windfall. Help to subsidise the cost of living! Or is that also against the philosophy of the P.N.C. leadership? As they say, we must not increase the price to farmers, we must not subsidise. This was in their Paper. In 1966, the Government produced a White Paper saying that subsidization is costing the Government \$14½ million a year, and the Government cannot afford this. This is how you got your surplus my friend.

**[Prime Minister:** It has just occurred to you.]

**Dr. Jagan:** Yes, but it is a telling point. Your \$15 million came from that \$14 million.

Sir, I speak very seriously on this question of the cost of living because this is going to create more and more dissatisfaction, more crime and all kinds of other things.

When the people are becoming united, the Members of the Government go and talk to them about race; they go and talk to them about all kinds of things. We want unity; we want cooperation; we want self-reliance; we want self-help. How are you going to get self-help and self-reliance from compulsion? All the local authorities are fraudulently established by bogus elections. How are you going to get self-reliance? Let us have new elections. The people must be involved not only at the trade union level. That is one level of course – but they must be involved at the grassroots level, and there is no better way than to have representative institutions.

The Government must make up its mind. It cannot have it both ways. Either adopt domestic and foreign policies which will really keep down the cost of living and help the small man, or if it is acting as it is doing now, then take some money and subsidise the cost of living. Have a policy of subsidization. Even in colonial times, after the war, there was subsidization of essential commodities in this country, and this is in keeping with socialist principles to help the man at the bottom. We are to create an egalitarian society, there are new slogans every year but the man's belly is hurting more and more every year. This year's slogan, "*We must clothe everybody, we*

*must feed everybody, we must house everybody"*, is going to come to nought too. We had free milk and free cassava. Now we are going to have free clothes and free milk.

I wish now, Sir, to close on this note that the Government must seriously consider this question of subsidising the cost of living. All Guyanese will applaud the Government, if it embarks on this course which will really make the small man into a real man.

**Sitting Suspended.**

## **Public Business Motion - Guarantee of Loan to the Guyana Development Corporation: June 1<sup>st</sup>, 1971**

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, my colleague raised the point about this strange coincidence of the Government of Guyana nationalizing an imperialist enterprise and getting assistance from an imperialist enterprise to run it. The Hon. Prime Minister from his seat made the point that this is business. But we know that big businessmen like the Rockefeller interest who own the Chase Manhattan Bank put politics before business, in fact politics is business. Therefore, it is strange to hear from the Hon. Prime Minister —

**[Interruption by the Hon. Prime Minister]**

**Dr. Jagan:** He knows that the industrial, the financial and the military are all intertwined and interlinked. Even President Eisenhower at one time criticized the Rockefellers who have helped to overthrow Governments which have dared to nationalise, to move in the direction of socialism. It is difficult to understand how these people would be coming to the assistance of this Government when the Government says that it is moving towards socialism.

Mr. Nelson Rockefeller in 1953 was appointed by then President, Dwight Eisenhower, to make a tour of Latin America. More recently, when he was given a welcome in Guyana, he came not only to Guyana but to Latin America, as the representative of the next President of the same Party, the Republican Party of President Nixon. What did Mr. Rockefeller say? He said that the United States must give help to the dictators, to the fascists, including Papa Doc Duvalier and all the others in Latin America who have destroyed democracy, who are selling out the national interest of these countries, like Brazil, where partly-owned state enterprises are now being denationalised. This is the kind of influence which is coming through people like Mr. Nelson Rockefeller. My colleague referred to the brother in the quotation which he read — Mr. David Rockefeller who is the President of the Chase Manhattan Bank. He and others representing big business, made it quite clear that they will do everything to sabotage so far as aid is concerned, so far as loans are concerned and even investments, to Governments which are moving towards socialism.

We have said during the debate on the nationalisation that it was rather strange that the Government was not moving against Reynolds Metals Company. We saw at the time that a powerful figure in U.S. politics, a one-time Secretary of Labour, a one-time U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, came here but representing Reynolds Metals Company. Can it be, as we had said, that what we are seeing in the nationalisation of DEMBA is the move against imperialists in the interest of big imperialism in the United

States of America?

The Prime Minister only a few days ago, gave me a copy of a book by Carrie Levitt. The name of the book: *Silent Surrender*. Now, the Prime Minister has read what I have been talking about in this House for several years. I told him about the book, *The Choice for Canada* written by Walter Gordon, a former Finance Minister. The same point was made about U.S. takeover of Canadian industry, and we said that in time it is likely that ALCAN will become a fully-owned Canadian enterprise and not an American subsidiary operating in Canada. Are we merely nationalising an American subsidiary because we are in cahoots with American imperialism which is afraid that ALCAN may become Canadian property, with its resources like DEMBA which it controls abroad? Are we by nationalisation, ensuring that the United States will continue to manipulate and to get the bauxite resources from Guyana?

Those were some of the doubts we expressed since Reynolds was not being nationalised, especially since the big representative of Reynolds came here to talk silently. Was this the "*Silent surrender*"? Is this loan not indicative that something is wrong somewhere? Maybe we are over-suspicious, but if we are, we are over suspicious in the national interest. Are we over-suspicious when we see Chase Manhattan coming to the rescue of a Government which says it is moving against its very philosophy, against all the things that it believes in, against a background where it has moved to overthrow Governments like Mossadegh's Government which nationalised the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company in 1953? The same Rockefeller said that they were able through the C.I.A. not only to overthrow Mossadegh's Government but to muscle in and get 40 percent of the oil in Iran, what was formerly a wholly-owned British preserve. This is why we now ask; what about Reynolds? What about these negotiations?

We were told negotiations would start immediately after. Why is it we have not seen any negotiations starting with Reynolds, or is it that what we are surmising is really true, that all this deal – especially considered in the context of Guyana's foreign affairs, its trade policies, etc. – is done with the blessing of the United States of America, while the Government poses and makes its supporters believe that it is proceeding in an anti-imperialist direction, that it is virtually carrying out what the P.P.P. is advocating? It has cast doubts and we would like the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance to tell us how soon the discussions with Reynolds will start. We want to know this. The public wants to know so that it can be assured there will be no underhand deal to sell out the national interests of this country to United States imperialism.

## Assistance to East Pakistan Refugees

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, it is sometimes said that tragedy arrives in double doses and this is certainly true for the unfortunate people of East Pakistan. It was not too long ago that these people suffered a great deal from a natural calamity. By that I refer to the tidal wave and cyclone which swept East Pakistan and did a tremendous amount of damage. There was loss of life and I am told that numbers of people were made homeless and so on. During the recent elections conducted in that country the area affected was left out of the electoral process as the havoc from that period was so great that it was felt there was not enough time to make the necessary arrangements tabulating people, putting them on the roll and so on.

We have all read now where recently millions of people have been moving across from East Pakistan into India. We have been told what a tremendous problem this has been, not only for the Indian Government but also for the people themselves. The figure which has been released indicates that the total number of persons who have been displaced is in the vicinity of over 4 million.

We who live in this country, when we talk of the Guyanese nation are thinking of a little over half a million people. When we think of a bigger entity like the West Indies Federation or the West Indies we are thinking in terms of 2 or 3 million people and we see the enormity of this problem when we realize that this is virtually a small nation we are talking about in terms of the number of people who have been displaced and who are suffering today.

The Prime Minister and I were in India in 1953 and I recall – he will recall it too – that even as late as that time the conditions in the refugee camps were horrible in Delhi and in different parts of the country which we visited. In Calcutta we saw thousands and thousands of people who were living in these camps for displaced persons without proper sanitation, without work, without enough food to eat and so on. That was as a result of the upheavals following the partition of India. In other words, those problems persisted as late as 1953 from 1947. Thus we can imagine what the scope of the problem is like today. We have read and heard that cholera has killed thousands of people. We understand also that the monsoons are now coming and this is likely to pose a very big problem because it is difficult to live in those countries even under normal conditions during the monsoon period. One can imagine, therefore, what it will be for these millions of refugees who are living under makeshift conditions.

So colossal, apparently, is this problem that the Minister for External Affairs in India has gone on a mission abroad to alert Governments all over the world about the enormity of this problem which has been thrown into the lap of India, no doubt with the objective of seeking assistance. The Prime

Minister herself – I refer to the Prime Minister of India – has asked for international aid referring to this as not an Indian problem but an international problem.

The other day I heard over the BBC where the Foreign Secretary in Great Britain had said that Britain had given more than her share to help with this problem that is confronting India. That Minister went on to say that such problems in the future should be dealt with internationally through an international organization, and he suggested the creation of a disaster fund by the United Nations.

We recall that when the earthquake disaster struck Peru – I think it was some time last year – a move was made by Cuba for the United Nations to establish such a fund. Unfortunately at that time there was not much support for that proposal. We were critical of the fact that the Guyana Government did not support this measure. The United States had opposed it also, but now we find that Britain is calling for the creation of such a fund.

I would think that even though we did not support this proposal when it first was made by Cuba we should certainly at this stage make a clear statement that the time has come when such a fund not only should be set up through the United Nations but that Guyana should support it.

I understand that a Committee has been set up in this country to collect money for this cause and that the Government of Guyana has contributed \$10,000 worth of rice. No doubt anything that is given is welcome today, but I feel that we can do much more. I do not think on such a grave occasion we should depend only on what individuals or organizations will be able to contribute because we know from past experience generally not much support is forthcoming and since this is a rather urgent matter we should like to appeal to the Government to consider increasing the amount which has been given as a donation towards this cause.

I am sure, Sir, that in doing so the Government will be contributing funds from Guyana to a very worthy cause and I hope that early consideration will be given to this, and sympathetic consideration, so that a much larger contribution can be made. We all appreciate the fact that we are going through difficult times but in keeping with our generosity, in keeping with our stand of international solidarity, we should make a very generous contribution on this occasion. I therefore commend to the Government further support for this humanitarian cause.



## Supplementary Estimates

**Dr. Jagan:** We note an item here, item 58 for \$468,800, Subsidy on oil, Guyana Marketing Corporation. This sum represents the utter bankruptcy of the Government's policies. Only yesterday we read in the newspapers that the Minister acting on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture was lecturing the people and telling them we must get away from a one-crop or two-crop economy. Not even in the days of the P.P.P., when farmers and consumers were subsidized, did it cost the Government this sum of money for oil. What do we find now? Go and ask any consumer! He has to be subjected to shortage of oil and black market all the time. Where are we going?

This is a land which can produce coconuts; there is no doubt about that. Yet we are spending nearly half a million dollars a year for subsidy. What does this mean? As far as I can read here, it probably means that we are paying for oil or copra imported from the West Indies which should be produced here. Now, note the bankruptcy of the Government's policy. During the P.P.P. regime there was a crop bonus for coconut producers, this Government has cut that out with the result that coconut farmers are not producing. Secondly, they are buying copra from the West Indies at a price of 19.2 cents per pound; but the price in Guyana is 14½ cents. What kind of policy is this? Are we not going to have a shortage if we pay the farmers about 5 cents less than they are getting in the West Indies if we cut out the crop bonuses? And when we have the shortage we have to pay a higher price for the oil or the copra from the West Indies.

What kind of logic is this? Yet we are saying that we have a policy to help the farmers, that we have a sound agricultural policy. Where is the soundness of the policy? This is madness. This is why I say this is utter bankruptcy of a policy where this country is wasting half a million dollars over two years, a quarter million a year roughly, when, with an intelligent policy, I am sure it did not cost the P.P.P. that amount of money a year to subsidize farmers and the consumers. I was Minister of Trade at one time. When there were shortages we imported soya bean oil and copra from the West Indies. The Government made a small profit on the soya bean oil which balanced the loss from oil from the West Indies. And realizing that situation I remember telling officers once in my Ministry then that if there was any shortage again somebody's head would be rolled; that we must always have a sufficient quantity of oil in stock – buy it, keep it, so that there would be no black-marketing. Why can that not be done now? We said that we must have a sound policy which will stimulate coconut production in the country and thus the policy came of giving a crop bonus to coconut producers.

This Government comes to this House and tell us that it has a sound policy for agriculture when we are neither subsidizing the farmers nor the

consumers and the taxpayers have to meet a loss of quarter million dollars and yet suffer from shortage of oil all the time and have to pay black market prices. Only last night some small traders were telling me that people are willing to go into the market and pay black market prices rather than have to wait in a line for a whole day at the Guyana Marketing Corporation so as to get oil. Surely the Government should review its policy.

When the union which bargains for coconut workers goes to the employers they say, "*We cannot pay*". Then they throw the figures at your face, they say, "*In the West Indies they are paying 19.2 cents, we are getting 14½ cents*". The union took the matter to the Minister and requested that legislation should be made with respect to fixing minimum wages for these unfortunate workers. The Government does not do that, because it is in a dilemma. If it fixes the minimum wage, then the employers would say we want more money for the copra. So it does nothing and the workers, the farmers and the consumers suffer, and the country goes to the dogs. This is precisely what is happening out of this bankrupt policy. Surely the country deserves better than this.

A loss of a quarter million dollars a year in a country which is supposed to be the agricultural base for the whole Caribbean is not good enough. We are importing copra from the West Indies; we should be producing today not only sufficient oil in this country for our own consumption but all the other products so that we could really be supplying the West Indies. We would get duty-free concessions from CARIFTA - it was alleged we would benefit from this and thereby expand our oils and fats industry. But it does not look as if we are going to get anywhere. This is very bad and I hope that the Government is not going to come back to this House to ask the people of this country to subsidize; any subsidy we will vote for the next time is subsidy to the consumers. This is not subsidy to consumers. The Hon. Minister of Finance says that without this, the price of oil will be higher. Of course we understand that. What we are saying is that there was a subsidy on oil which was cheaper than what you were paying the producers for in the P.P.P. time. In other words, the Government bought from the Maharajah and Wieting and Richter Oil Mills at a certain price and sold it to the consumers at a lower price. That is what happened in our times. If the coconut industry was prospering in Guyana, if the Government had an intelligent policy, one could say that this expenditure is justified, one could say that it is a subsidy to the farmers and to the consumers. But the coconut industry is going down. This is being paid not to our producers but to the West Indian producers. If we are subsidizing the consumers, as the Minister claims — I am speaking of the subsidy in relation to what was given in the P.P.P. time. I am talking about a policy of keeping the cost of living low, and at the same time helping the national economy. That is what I am talking about. The Hon. Minister like a clever lawyer takes a little point. Anyway I hope the point which I have made has been taken and the Minister of Finance is not going to try to score lawyer's tricks

or split hairs. There is no common sense in this. Are you satisfied with this policy which involves our subsidizing West Indian oil or coconut production to the tune of a quarter million dollars a year? If you are satisfied, well then that is all right.

I do not want to be long on the subject; my colleague has amused our comrades on the opposite side. I wish to raise this matter on a more serious note with respect to the recent conference in London and the so-called "*assurances*" given to the Caribbean Commonwealth producers of sugar. We have not been able, reading in the press, to see that there has been any difference in the position that existed before the Ministers and the delegations went to London. We have not been able to see that there were more specific assurances given.

I am told outside that it was said at the meeting with Mr. Rippon that Britain will be going into the E.C.C. with the existing quotas. But nowhere was this mentioned in any communiqué, no one has read this in any newspapers. If that is so then the Government must tell this House. I think a statement should be issued to the country on what specifically was told to them so that all will know what is the position. My Hon. Colleague is quite right - there is a great deal of apprehension about this. If certain assurances were given that Britain will be going into the Common Market with the existing quotas we want to know for how long? Is it only for the period up to 1974 which is the tenure of the existing Commonwealth Agreement? Or is it for a longer period? If not, what is the Government going to do about it? We would like to know all these things. I believe the Government has a duty to this House and to the country, having gone to this International Conference, to come back and initiate a debate so that the House and the country can know what is happening on this very important subject and so that the views of the Opposition can be expressed so far as this commodity is concerned. The future of this country would be assumed so far as it concerns this important item which looms so large in the economy of the country and the welfare of the lives of so many.

May I say, since we are not likely to have a debate on this subject that we cannot depend on the British with their moral commitments? Secondly, Britain today is under pressure, not only from West Indian peoples and Governments but also from the sugar planters in these areas who are British. By 1974 it is quite possible that Tate and Lyle and the other big producers will scuttle their interests in the Caribbean. They are doing so in Jamaica. They have done so in Trinidad where Caroni Ltd. has been sold out to the Government, and by that time the country will find itself not with the allies it has at the moment, the British capitalists, and thus its bargaining position then will be very negligible, not as strong as it is today.

It is a question of what the Government is planning to do in this interval. This is what the Government must come to us with, something concrete to meet this sell out which is bound to come because the British by that time would have been in the Common Market, they would have

achieved what they want, and the British sugar planters would have made other arrangements, buying beet sugar interests in Europe.

I heard one person say that by then we may be in a better position because we will get all the quotas in the West Indies because all the West Indian territories are dropping in sugar production. Let me point out that if that is so and we are beginning to put all our eggs in this basket, including getting farmers to drop out from food production and going into cane, we may find then that we are really a one-crop economy and we have neither the British capitalists, the sugar planters, to bargain for us nor the West Indian Governments. Our political position then will be even more desperate than it is at the moment, because we will then be one voice, so to speak, arguing in the wilderness. This requires intelligent planning for the future, and the Government is in the commanding position to plan. We are merely sounding a warning so it will take heed.

Item 73, Grant, University of Guyana. We note that an additional sum of \$800,000 is to be allocated to the University of Guyana. The Government did not say here what is the necessity for this extra amount, whether this is in keeping with the decision announced some time ago that the university will be converted from a night institution to a day institution, from the coming school year beginning September. I wonder if this is what this amount is for, or is it for some other purpose.

Perhaps the Minister will tell us precisely why this amount is listed here or whether it is not for the conversion from night to a day university, whether it is due to the added cost of running the university in terms perhaps of more staff, more students. I should like to hear from the Minister what this is all about and whether the Government intends to continue in what it has stated, to convert the university, as we have said already, from a night institution to a day institution.

We note, too, from the press that a team of advisers came here and was having consultations with the university about the setting up of a medical faculty. I know the Minister of Health is very keen on this question and we are glad to see that some steps are being taken in this direction. I wonder whether she can tell us how soon it is intended to move in this direction and if this is going to be done very soon.

The Hon. Minister has not replied to my question as to whether the Government intends to continue with what was proposed some time ago, that is, the conversion from night to day.

## Motion - Write Off of Losses of Cash

**Dr. Jagan:** The amount stipulated here is not a great deal but I would like to ask the Government to be more careful in the procedures which it has set up to see that we do not have recurrences of events such as these. While we may be now writing off losses, one reads in the press almost every week of similar issues here and there, and it seems to me that some total reconstruction is probably necessary. I do not know what needs to be done but certainly it seems, from the scale of thefts and the frauds which are taking place, that something radical needs to be done.

I have been wondering whether the Government has strengthened the Audit Department. I recall that some time ago the Director of Audit, in one of his Reports, indicated that public corporations were not included within his ambit. I hope that the Minister of Finance will make a careful note of this recommendation of the Director of Audit and bring public corporations within the ambit.

Another useful exercise would be to involve the citizens of this country in a more meaningful way so that officers of the Government who have to deal with cash and the spending of money will be more careful especially if they realize that people are always checking and double checking on what is taking place.

There is need for this in the present state of the country's political situation where, for instance, in the area of local government the P.N.C. has control of all the local authorities and, in the case of public corporations and ministries where many officers are a law unto themselves.

We read not too long ago a statement made by Mr. Semple. I think he is a Vice-President of the Public Service Association. He said that there is a crisis of authority in many Government departments in that there are some officers whom one may call "*career officers*" and juxtaposed with them are political appointees and those who are career officers can have no authority over those who are politically appointed. This leads not only to inefficiency – what Mr. Semple called the "*crisis of authority*" – but no doubt it also leads to fraud and losses such as those we are now asked to write off.

It has been brought to my attention, for instance, that there are people in the public works department who obey no one, who do as they like, who do not carry out certain procedures laid down by the Ministry or by the Government, who are dismissed, transferred to another Ministry and then subsequently brought back to the same Ministry. They cannot be told anything because they have entrée to the Minister. If such things are going on, not only will there be a breakdown of authority but fraud will be taking place perpetually and this House will be called upon from time to time to write off losses.

I think this must not be looked at merely as a financial exercise but as a

deeper malaise which must be treated and I hope the Minister who is concerned with husbanding the financial resources of the country will look at this broader aspect of the question to see that we are getting value for money spent for the Public Services and also to see that there are no losses in the future.

The public is becoming unduly alarmed about these daily, weekly occurrences of fraud. If the Government cannot, through its own procedures, its own machinery, curb these tendencies, perhaps the time has come when it should do what was done in the Soviet Union after the revolution in 1918. It should appoint watchdog committees, involve the Members of the Opposition so that they can go and check at any time at a national level and at the local level because there is a lot of corruption in the country today apart from just simple thefts.

It would be good to set up wider machinery. The framework of our political situation is such at the moment that it will not be possible to eliminate these things in future: the People's National Congress having control of the Central Government, having control of the local authorities, having control of the appointment machinery, having subverted the institutions of the country such as the Public Service Commissions and so on. These are mainly the reasons. Therefore, it may be well for the Government, if it is seriously concerned about this question, to go outside of the ambit of what has been established, which may have been good for normal times. We are not now living in normal times. Surely the Government itself must be quite concerned about this sickness which has crept into the society not only in the Government but the general society of Guyana; and the quicker we can take steps to so eradicate this evil it will be better for the Government and the country as a whole.

## Withdrawal of Defence Levy

**Dr. Jagan:** The Hon. Minister replying on behalf of the Government, said that this Motion was brought for the purpose of political posturing and that it was misconceived. The Government is in the habit of splitting hairs and not getting to the substance of the problem. It is clear that not only the Opposition but the whole country, including rank and file supporters of the Government – Government Ministers are callous, they do not care – are today experiencing grave difficulties in balancing their day to day budgets.

The Hon. Minister of Trade (Mr. Ramsaroop), in attempting to hold down the cost of living, fixes prices in some cases which are unrealistic, thus many people do not import items. The result is black marketing. A few nights ago, I was told that corned beef coming from the United States is pure bones. Because of the prices that are fixed, a certain quality has to be brought.

What we are talking about here is the whole question of the load of taxation on the people of the country. What we are talking about here is the sum total of taxation in the country, which is affecting the small man, and we are saying the time has come to remove one of these burdens on the people. Now, the Minister in his own insulting manner began to lecture us as to what is the concept of defence in the Budget statement. The Minister and the Government cannot deny that the Defence Levy is adding to the burden of the increase in the cost of living today, which is high.

Let me cite this. I have been told by a former Financial Secretary in the colonial days that putting on a blanket 3 percent or 4 percent, or whatever it is, on all imports is not a good tax measure because you are taxing –

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** What is their argument? Because the Defence Levy has to do with defence, buying arms and equipment, populating the Interior for purposes of defence, and building our diplomatic representation, it cannot be removed.

The Defence Levy was estimated in this 1969 Budget to bring in \$7 million for that year. My Hon. Friend has said it has not brought in that much, but if you call it "*Defence Levy*" or anything else it is expected to bring a sum of money for the Government for certain purposes. The Government claims these purposes are good; we are not questioning whether they are good or not because one can go into a long question and say "*Cut down on some of the farcical diplomatic representation there is at the moment in Surinam, in Jamaica and so on.*" One can say that. I am not going to argue on that premise.

Let us argue on the premise that those things are necessary, that arms

and equipment are necessary for the soldiers, that Interior settlement is necessary, that diplomatic representation is necessary. The question is: Are we to find the money via the Defence Levy or in some other way? We are saying that the sum total of the Government's taxation, including the Defence Levy and devaluation, has added a tremendous burden on the working class.

It is for the Government to decide priorities. We can only advise. How the Members of the Government will spend the money, whether it will be spent on Interior development, for the purpose of defence, as they call it, or in other ways we cannot direct; we can only advise. They are there to decide how the money must be spent but we say that if the Government needs the sum of money that is accruing to it from the Defence Levy it has other measures that it can adopt to do it.

Long ago we had a blanket 3 percent on imports. It was called Bill of Entry Tax, but it was removed. Why? One reason for the removal was that a 3 percent tax was considered inequitable because it taxes the rich and the poor at the same rate. For instance, a 3 percent Bill of Entry Tax on food means an increase in price at a certain level which does not mean anything to the man who is a Minister or a millionaire, but it certainly means a lot to the ordinary man who is receiving a wage which is low or to a man who is unemployed.

The Minister of Labour seems not to comprehend the point I am making. He says if it is too low, let us raise it. The Government is talking about creating an egalitarian society. This is what it says. We challenge the Members of the Government to do it. Do not use a tax device which penalizes the poor more than the rich.

Let me come to a few examples now. All their measures – for example, devaluation – have put pressures on the working class by raising prices for goods which the people have to buy but have created \$8 to \$10 million extra profits for the rich whom they have failed to tax. Why have they not done that?

The Government wants money. We are not saying it should not have it. We are not at the moment questioning what it wants to spend it on. According to the Minister it will come from the Defence Levy. What we are asking is, "*How do you get your money?*" We say, "*Squash the Defence Levy*" and if the Government feels that it cannot cut down its cost, it cannot cut down its big bureaucracy, the waste, the squandermania and the fraud, to meet the expenditure for these purposes which are enumerated under "*defence*", if it cannot get the money by prudence, then I suggest, "*Cut down the bureaucracy.*" The cost of running the bureaucracy has increased from 44 percent of the Budget to nearly 50 percent of the Budget.

Logic is really missing when it comes to some comrades who are even qualified as lawyers. Raising salaries has nothing to do with the size of the bureaucracy. You can raise salaries and still decrease the expenditure. That is also logic. The Hon. Minister does not understand.



The point I want to make is that a blanket 3 percent tax is an inequitable form of taxation. It is an unjust form of taxation, especially for a Government which claims that it wants to make the small man into a real man and wants to create an egalitarian society.

I have here with me a Venezuelan magazine called "*Venezuela up to Date.*" I should like to read from page 2. I quote:

*"The changes made by the Congress last December in Venezuela's income tax law mainly affect mining and petroleum companies operating in the country. The tax rate on their net earnings has been raised from a maximum of 52 percent to a flat 60 percent."*

If the Minister is saying we have to have the money, we need it, we cannot cut down expenses and we must have this money, we are saying remove the Defence Levy which is a general tax on all goods coming into the country affecting the poor man, and put on an increase, if necessary, in income tax as Venezuela has done – 60 percent company tax on mineral companies. How many have we got? Okay, you have taken over DEMBA. What about Reynolds? I have here the *Thunder* of June 1952, and an article by then Chairman of the People's Progressive Party now Prime Minister. This is what he had to say:

*"Education, where is the money to come from?"*

We can ask the same question today: Where is the money to come from? Listen to Comrade Burnham then:

*"Now there is bauxite of which we produced 1,583,417 tons in 1950 and which now pays an export tax of 30 ¢ per ton yielding about \$475,025. At the same time the bauxite was worth \$13,832,442. Taxing bauxite was worth \$1 per ton which will yield \$1,108,391 more, even assuming that our bauxite production does not go up."*

Reynolds has been given a "give away" tax. The Prime Minister said since 1952 to tax them \$1 a ton; they are still paying 30 cents. These companies are paying 45 percent income tax; Venezuela is taxing them 60 percent. All right, the Minister asks which bauxite? Which mining? Devaluation caused the mining companies and sugar to get an extra windfall of nearly 8 to 10 million dollars a year. Government will now nationalise the other bauxite company – it has nationalised one of them – therefore, it will get not only what it was getting before as income tax, but it will get the profits, plus the windfall which DEMBA got from devaluation. Therefore we say, Sir, in the changed circumstances of today the Government has other possibilities (1) of getting enhanced income (2) possibilities of getting more income by revising the price structure. This is what we say. This

is your trouble you do not listen. Hon. Members of the Government like to argue like lawyers splitting hairs. But we are not concerned with splitting hairs.

I recall some time ago at one of my press conference I called for subsidization. Some people said, "Why ask for subsidization?" One pressman asked me, "Why not call for removal of the Defence Levy?" I said it is the same thing, it does not matter whether you knock off the Defence Levy or you ask the Government to subsidise because it is the same. We are talking in terms of so many millions of dollars. That is why we brought this Motion. But the Government has evaded the whole problem, that is, the question of the cost of living today. It seems therefore that if the Government is determined to vote against this Motion we will have to come with another Motion to ask the Government to subsidise the cost of living. Fry oil, salted fish, pickled meat, flour, split peas, and these things were subsidized even in colonial days. Colonial administrators were even more solicitous of the working class than you who claim to be pro-working class and socialist. That is the point I am making.

We fail to see how this Government can go on like this. We have seen where many measures have been taken by this Government which has contributed to the high cost of living, it is not only devaluation. In 1966, the Government brought out a White Paper which stated that it will have to cut down on subsidies. It has cut down on \$14 million worth of subsidies which consumers and other were getting in the good old days. Again, my friend talks about colonialism. The Coalition Government of which the P.N.C. was the major partner decided as a matter of policy to cut out the subsidies of the working class. On top of that in 1967, we had devaluation. Now the Minister of Trade with the E.T.B. has put on a 10 percent tax on goods coming from socialist countries and 5 percent on other goods.

Sir, I referred to the measures which the Government has taken that have contributed to the high cost of living. In the same White Paper I referred to in 1966 there was mentioned the fact that Guyana is taking over 20 percent of the G.D.P. in the form of taxation, higher than Jamaica, Trinidad and higher than most underdeveloped countries in the world; in Africa and Asia it is around 12 percent. This is what the Government's statistics disclosed. It has been mentioned in the Seven Year Development Plan that there was to be a gap of only \$10 million for taxation. That was what Professor Arthur Lewis, Economic Adviser to the Government, the framer of the Government's Seven Year Development Plan cited. This is why everyone is having such a difficult time today.

It is in this spirit that this Motion has been brought, to help to reduce the cost of living. As we said, if the Government finds that it cannot afford, then there are other avenues open to it to raise more money for the money which would be lost if this measure was abolished. This measure is certainly acting in a way which is creating a hardship on those who can afford to pay the high prices, which they are paying at the present time. Since the

Government has indicated its position, we will be forced, if this Motion is defeated, to bring another Motion calling on the Government to subsidise the cost of living.

## Financial Paper No. 3 of 1971

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, in the press and over the radio we have been reading and hearing that in the United States of America the sins of the Johnson administration are now catching up with them. It seems that in Guyana too the sins of the P.N.C. are now catching up with them.

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

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

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

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

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

Since you continue to repeat, I will explain, just to put the record straight. When my colleague was speaking, you said, "*Give us the facts; give us the figures*". Now when I want to give the figures, you say, "*Stick to the Motion.*" The Gorsuch Commission recommended fantastic salary increases

for what are called super-scale salaries. No increases for middle-bracket civil servants and a minimum wage of \$2.70 per day for unskilled workers. What did the P.P.P. do? The P.P.P. increased the minimum wage from \$2.70 to \$2.75. That is the record.

The minimum wage went up from \$2.52 to \$2.70 by Gorsuch and we raised it by an additional 5 cents. This is how you all try to fool the people, but they will catch up with you. Where the slogan of "*not a cent more*" came in, it was in respect of the super-scale salaries, where we took the view that we could not grant increases to the very top civil servants when nothing was recommended for the middle bracket. Let me inform these ignoramuses why they struck. They are dealing with a different historical period. They are confusing Guillebaud with Gorsuch. They struck on the Guillebaud recommendation, which came out in the latter part of 1961. That is why they struck.

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

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

There is one other thing, and that is, with respect to the pensioners. The Government should realize that those who are living on pensions have small pensions which were calculated when the dollar had a different value. I should like to know from the Hon. Minister whether it is proposed to increase the pensioners' allowances, and if so, what is to be the percentage for that category.

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

## Guarantee of Loan to Guyana Bauxite Company, Limited

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

We put our cards very clearly on the table. We said it was strange that the biggest bank in Guyana, the Chase Manhattan Bank, would come to the rescue of a Government which claims to be anti-imperialist. We see something sinister about this. If we are wrong and the Government says that this is simply good business, I am asking whether the Government has dealt with all the banks on a nondiscriminatory basis. I remember when they were nationalizing DEMBA the Canadian Government said, "*We have no fundamental objection to any Government wanting to get control of its natural resources because Canada is doing it.*" But they said, "*We want nondiscriminatory treatment.*" If this is good business and we are told 7½ percent, what is the maximum? If this is such good business we would like to know if the Government had approached all the other banks because as I understand it, Governments, like business, have a floating overdraft with all the banks. The Prime Minister says that it is not the banks. In the P.P.P.'s time the overdraft was with the two imperialist banks in the country, Barclays and Royal; now there are five. Do we understand that the Government of Guyana is discriminating against the small fry and going to the mother of imperialism and giving favours? I should like the Government to state clearly whether it offered or approached the other banks in this country to help in this difficulty as we understand it, which now confronts the Government as we understand it.

If so, what was the response of the other banks operating in Guyana? I read an editorial in the *Evening Post*, last week I think it was, where it was reported that the points raised by the P.P.P. Opposition seemed to have some merit, but the editorial justifies it on this ground, that the Government has been saying that the banks are not cooperative, they are anti-national and therefore Chase Manhattan in the goodness of its heart has come along to show its generosity. If Chase Manhattan is now trying to

ingratiate itself with the Government, does it follow that we are going to leave them all the financial transactions of this country.

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

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

## Debate on Foreign Policy

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

*"...the P.N.C. and the U.F. were 'at one' on foreign policy, but disagreed on domestic issues, particularly economics."*

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

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

The Prime Minister goes to Lusaka. He cannot help but follow the lead of the progressives, if not to take the lead being the most progressive. This is his personality. I know the old comrade. But the question of performance is another matter. When we come to the objective realities of the situation, this is a different story. This is where the pulls and the pressures begin to exert themselves and thus we have the P.N.C. saying one thing at the foreign level at Lusaka, but at the domestic level, in Guyana, the policy does not match out within the pronouncement. Thus, the United Force Leader rightly can say, as his previous leader did, that on foreign policy there is no disagreement, "*we are at one*" as the Prime Minister would say, "*ad idem*".

In order to make it appear that they are pursuing something new the Members of the Government have to use phraseology such as "*nonaligned*" and, in order not to forge a new path, they have to rationalize on the basis of what they know to be incorrect. In these days we find imperialism not only making new manoeuvres on the economic front, such as the theory of partnership but also, on the ideological front, tremendous forces are at work. I can understand my Hon. friend the Minister of State being caught up in



these ideological confusions but I cannot forgive my ex-comrade the Prime Minister. He had real fundamental understanding but as he rightly said some time ago, "*politics is the science of deals*" and having made a deal with the United States of America to get him into power he has to go along with this policy which is dictated by the United States of America.

Now, Sir, let us face the realities. My friend Mr. Chandisingh tried to put the thing in proper perspective.

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

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

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

I am sorry to use that word. All I can say is my Hon. Colleague the Leader of the United Force is even more confused than my friends over there.

My friend was critical of Cuba, critical of Chile. Understanding his philosophy we can understand why he says so. We understand this, but surely he must realize that Latin America and the Third World countries are powder kegs today because of these factors that *Life* magazine enumerated. As I was saying before the intervention by the Prime Minister, the net outflow from countries such as Latin America is nearly \$2 billion (U.S.) a year and this is what is contributing to the explosion. The only difference between my friends over there and over here is that they realize these facts; they say

they want to make a change, but in deed and in fact they do nothing to change the situation. How are you going to change it? How are you going to change the realities of economic domination, cultural domination, ideological domination when you remain within the orbit of the imperialist world.

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

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

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

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

Let me just read this one quotation, not from a source which can be questioned, but a statement by someone who cannot be regarded as a fellow traveller or a communist. I refer to James Muir who was the Chairman and President of the Royal Bank of Canada. In the *Canadian Newsletter* in 1968 this is what he wrote:

*"I shall give but one example, an exceptional one, perhaps, of the inexorable effect of human effort in terms of human labour. I saw the new irrigation and flood-control dam in the Ming Tombs Valley. It was practically finished, and had taken only 140 days to complete. It is over 2,000 feet long, about 95 feet high, 555 feet wide at the base, and about 25 feet wide at the top. It has a concrete core, upstream side is clay and the other is earth, gravel and stone. One hundred thousand were working in three shifts around the clock. All work was described as voluntary; certainly, it was unpaid. About half of the work force was provided by the army, the rest by citizens from every walk of life who go, and live and work at the site for days or weeks, as circumstances, age, health and physique permit. With little else than their bare hands, picks and shovels this colossal task has been accomplished. I stood on high ground and looked down upon this vast human ant hill. I took photographs of the scene, a shift of thirty thousand toiling people, and hoped when developed these pictures would have caught something of the atmosphere of the drama."*

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

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

That is on the domestic side. My friend says, "*group cooperation at the international level*". What group? The Third World? We are not opposed to cooperation with other Third World countries. By all means have it. But, Sir, the Government is aware that Third World countries are, by and large, in the same relationship to each other, that is, most of them are primary producers, most of them have had a socioeconomic structure which made them the producers of raw materials and the markets for the manufactured goods which came from outside. Where are they going to get the capital goods? Where are they going to get the military help? Egypt did not go to

the Soviet Union because of ideology; but because she realized that if she had to transform her economy she had to have someone to help her and then she looked to the socialist world. This is how that relationship was established.

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

Your friends Colonel Nimeiry and Kadhafi have just recognized the People's Republic of China. What have you done? People like you will become anti-communist because it suits your opportunistic tendencies.

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

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

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

It says:

*"The U.S. still clung, under the earlier aid agreements, to the formula under which about 20 percent of all local currency payments for aid deliveries have eventually to be repaid in convertible rupees or dollars, 61 percent remain earmarked for long-term investment inside India, mostly in the form of 40 year loans, 6.5 percent are reserved for short-term credit to private business dealing with American partners, and the remainder is put at the disposal of the U.S. Government and*

*its embassy on an ad hoc basis”.*

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

*“The U.S. embassy in Delhi has invited American tourists in India to change their travellers’ cheques not at the local banks but in the embassy.”*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If we are nonaligned why can we not even go and see? Williams does not pretend to be nonaligned; he does not go to the nonaligned conference like our Prime Minister and make big speeches. What are you doing to justify this pretension of being nonaligned? My friend says about China, "We can go to Taiwan; we can send experts and technicians but we cannot go to the People's Republic of China". I was rather surprised that he said that apparently China for some time did not even want to get into the United Nations. For the benefit of the Hon. Member, perhaps to enlighten him, I should like to read from this pamphlet called *The American System* by John Graham – it was produced in Canada:

*"In 1951 Dean Rusk told U.S. and World Report: The Chinese communists must be overthrown and their Government far from being recognized must be destroyed".*

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

Further on it states:

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

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

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

I am reading about American policy because this Government is misinforming this House and the country when it says that the People's Republic of China did not want to take a position at the United Nations. The Government is doing so because it is following the United States policy on China and is trying to rationalize its own behaviour – a behaviour which is not consistent with its nonaligned policy.

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

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

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

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

The point is that the balance of forces are shifting towards socialism, and the reality of this is thus demonstrated in the fact that the ruling class of the United States today is having to change its policy. We are not in the same position as the United States. As I pointed out, even countries which do not call themselves so, pretend to be nonaligned. Britain, France, Canada, they are in practice following more of a nonaligned policy than you are practising. This is the reality of the situation.

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

America wants this position. Therefore, the puppets have to begin changing their position.

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

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

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

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

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

We are not saying abandon all relationships with the western countries. But we start out from the major premise that you cannot break from imperialism by staying completely within the folds of imperialism. There is no



aspect of your policy which can give the credence in the world that you are nonaligned.

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

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

The Taiwan regime has a seat in the United Nations on the grounds that it represents China proper. It has been recognized in international affairs that the People's Republic of China, headed by the Communist Party, is the representative of the people of China. This is the question. The Members of the Government, versed in logic as they are, must see this point. The question of the representation of Taiwan at the United Nations is a separate issue which must be taken in the same way as their other unresolved questions, such as the placing of these other countries, which I have referred to, in the United Nations.

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

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

Here it is that many of those who are regarded as nonaligned have supported the seating of China and the expulsion of Taiwan, but the Guyana Government has seen fit to abstain on this important resolution. Let us hope instructions will come in time this year to change the position from abstention to aye. And let us hope, Sir, in this very important group which the Minister of State referred to, the Latin American group, that Guyana,

even though not a member of the O.A.S., will use its influence to see that the blockade and isolation of Cuba imposed by American imperialism is removed.

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

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

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

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

I have here a petition which was signed by a whole lot of M.P.'s in the British Parliament. Parliamentarians all over the world are now engaged in a move of solidarity with the Vietnamese people. The petition is signed by Brockway and Mikardo. Brockway is your friend. He used to defend you. I am talking about political defence. Sir, here is a petition calling for the withdrawal from Indo-China of all American military forces and materials including air and naval forces and a cessation of all bombing attacks from bases either within or outside Indo-China. Would these people in the P.N.C. sign it? You do not have to pay any money. Call on them to sign it. They would refuse. It is not English people. These people always see things in terms of colour or nationality!

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

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

And, the commentator said today that the C.I.A. advised the Johnson administration. Firstly, that there was no threat from North Vietnam. It is coming out of the confidential papers. The BBC is relating what is happening in the *New York Times*. The C.I.A. advised the Johnson administration that the liberation movement in South Vietnam was an indigenous force not as they made the world to believe that it was an invasion from the north, secondly, the so-called "*Domino*" theory that if South Vietnam fell to communism the whole of South-East Asia would become communist. The C.I.A. should know better because they are all over the place like fleas. They advised Johnson that this was not going to be so. But, Sir, Johnson, the ex-President of the United States, and even his predecessor Kennedy, put all of this in the background and went ahead because their main objective was to forestall the growth of socialism in any part of the world. All right now you have more information. Why do you not change your policy? Why do you not say a word now that the whole world is calling for an end to this war? The whole world is adding its voice. Why is it that the Guyana Government is silent on this fundamental issue? The Vietnam issue is not just an issue of the people of Vietnam. The Vietnam issue is an issue of whether a small country has a right to transform from a neo-colonial status, to go on. This is the position.

One thing we can say, at least in the United Force there is consistency and honesty in that they stand for capitalism, they stand for imperialism, yesterday, today, tomorrow and the day after tomorrow. But, Sir, with this breed it is far more dangerous. Yes, because it is affecting the people of Guyana and not only the people of Guyana, But outside of Guyana.

The time has come really and truly in this country for a break to be made. Only yesterday we were talking about removing some of the burdens of the people and you are not going to do it. I predict and many of the predictions we made have come to pass, like the failure of the \$300 million Seven Year Development Plan. We predicted it would fail and it has failed. It is like your nonaligned policy. We call on the Government to follow a genuine policy of nonalignment, like Tanzania. We refer to Tanzania. Tanzania is carrying out a domestic policy based on taking over the command-

ing heights of the economy controlled by foreigners and the local parasites, consistent with a foreign policy which goes along with that. They were able to mobilise the masses; we saw it in the building of the Tanzania railway where the western countries wanted about five times as much and which used delaying tactics. Here is an example, a practical example of what socialist relations can do to take a country from imperialist domination, racist apartheid domination. It was done through the help of socialist countries.

Our friends in the Government want to split hairs between China and Russia. We are not here for that. We are talking about the socialist world, we are saying, *"Do not tell us about nonalignment when you are aligned hand and foot with the United States of America; when you use words but performance is something entirely different."* We would urge the Government sincerely to practice what it preaches, to follow the example of Tanzania in this regard. And I can assure the Hon. Members that so long as they pursue these forward-looking domestic and foreign policies they can be assured of the co-operation which is necessary to build as they have built in China, as they have built in the Soviet Union; that is how those countries were built, by the people, not by dependence on imperialism. They were able to get hold of capital, which was going out before by nationalisation and by mobilization of the human resources. But we are only talking about *"aid is raid"* as an excuse not to go to the socialist countries. Now that the money has stopped we are getting it in the form of food handouts but this will not lead to deliverance, as we have seen in India.

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

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

interested in Guyana and principles and we call on the Government to stop filibustering and putting on this air of freedom fighter and get Guyana moving forward, in a direction where it will be respected, not only in the short term but in the long term. Let Guyana be a place which will lead the Caribbean and the Third World countries.

## Provision of Central Electricity Services

**Dr. Jagan:** The presumption behind this Bill is that it is unlikely that there will be any change in the *status quo*, so far as we can see, in the future.

I should like to ask the Minister if he can tell the House what are the plans of the Government – my colleagues have raised the question and I should like to put it a little bit more specifically – as regards not only rural electrification but the expansion and development of the central electricity services. I refer to those in Georgetown.

As far as I remember, when the nationalisation of the Demerara Electricity Company took place, the consultants, Preece, Cardew and Rider, recommended that the new corporation should purchase two 10 megawatts plants and subsequent to that go over to hydroelectricity because this would have been the cheapest method of providing further power to the plants.

At that time the proposal was that the hydroelectricity should be developed at Malali in the Demerara River. We know that the Government did not pursue this and at one time it was talking of developing Tiboku with a multi-million, over \$200 million, dollar project. We know that bubble has burst. You have told me us that bubble has burst.

What we have learnt is that the World Bank has apparently turned down an application which the Government made for the development of that project. We should like to know what are the plans of the Government. Is it feeding the Electricity Corporation works with new steam generation? If that is so, it is most uneconomic.

We read only last week where the President of the Berbice Chamber of Commerce was making some suggestion about approaching the Surinam Government which, we understand, has surplus hydroelectricity to see whether that surplus could be used for electrification of the whole of the Corentyne. I am not saying that this is a desirable course. We know also that Venezuela has a great deal of surplus electricity because of the huge hydro works which it has put in at Caroni. I am not here suggesting that we should tie up with Venezuela.

The main point I am making is that two of our neighbours on our borders have surplus hydroelectricity, cheap electricity. According to the consultants who had advised the Government previously this is the direction in which we should have gone quite a few years ago, but we have not done so; we have not done so in the past six years.

We should like to know what the specific plans of the Government are. Is it planning to go in for hydroelectricity development or is it purchasing further uneconomic steam units? What are the plans for rural electrification for the whole country? How long will it take before the whole country is electrified? When we speak of the whole country we are speaking of the settled areas, the populated areas, the coast predominantly. Of course, one

would think that if we had cheap hydroelectricity many other areas would come into this Scheme.

We know that because of the present haphazard manner in which electricity is generated, for instance in New Amsterdam, consumers have to pay very high rates. We read recently where the works in Bartica had to be handed over to the Government. If the Government has taken the outfit over, it has taken over "*a dead*" and not only a dead, but it is helping its capitalist friends because, as I understand it, that undertaking was run by Bookers and it was losing money because the charges were fixed by the Government for the Bartica area. It had to meet the cost of running it from profits earned elsewhere.

If the Government has taken it over, it has taken over a loss. If it had developed cheap hydroelectricity one can understand the logic of such a takeover. Because then it would not cost you anything. But now, having taken it over, the Government is merely subsidizing Bookers. That is how we see it. We would like to know from the Government how much it has paid for it, or whether it has got it for nothing. And even if you have got it for nothing it is still a loss because the running cost of it will be a subsidy to Bookers as they were bearing that before.

Sir, I think that this should be one of the priorities of the Government because we know that cheap electricity is not only a facility to people to light and brighten their homes, or to help children, for instance, who have to study at night, but it is a means of generating power for industrial purposes. I am not talking of the big industries. I am thinking of small scale work whether it is woodwork, or poultry rearing, or shoemaking, or metal working and so on. This is a *sine qua non* for development. It is for this reason I think the Government should give major priority to its development.

Thus, Sir, we would like to know from the Government what its proposals are. We know that the Minister is very clever at making evasions. We are not talking about reports. There are thousands of reports for Guyana. This country is over reported as everybody will tell you. The answer to this is the decision, the plans. You are the Government; you have a responsibility to the country to tell the people when you propose to have hydroelectricity. Or, if you are not going to provide hydroelectricity are you going for atomic energy which is equally as cheap? If not, do you intend to continue with expensive steam generators?

The question is this: how soon will we have rural electrification throughout the country? By this I mean the settled areas, plans for which were laid out since the Interim Government by Preece Cardo and Rider. We would also like to ask the Government whether it has also taken into consideration the bringing in, as was recommended, all the Schemes, not only Schemes like Bartica and New Amsterdam which they have taken over, but even the estates. Because we know the estates are operating their own Schemes and in many cases they do not provide services to the people which can be

provided if it was all linked up with the national grid run by the Government. These are fundamental questions we would like to have answered.

So far as cost is concerned if the Electricity Corporation is making the profits as projected by Preece, Cardew and Rider – and I fail to see why it should not be making those profits if it was run efficiently – \$20 million net profit in the first ten years, \$40 million in the second ten years, it would have been in a position to pay its way, and this includes the cost for additional plants and rural electrification. We would like to know if the Corporation is making the profits as projected by Preece, Cardew and Rider and on the basis of those profits, if it is able to finance a development which was projected, that is, rural electrification and if it is to provide the charges for further generators etc. for the plant.

I say this because Hon. Members will recall that when the Government nationalised the Demerara Electricity Company it was able to get \$18 million worth of credits for two steam generators, buildings etc. This was on the basis of the Report by Preece, Cardew and Rider on the projection of net profits which will be earned by the company in other words; so to speak, self finances for both rural development and Plant expansion. We would like to know whether those projections have materialized or whether we have to find money from elsewhere, maybe Chase Manhattan Bank, to do the job which was supposed to have been done by the Corporation itself.



## Confirmation of Customs Duties (Exemption from Import Duties) Order, 1971 (No. 31)

**Dr. Jagan:** I should like to support this measure but in doing so, like my colleague, the last speaker, to draw to the attention of the Government to another category of people who need the sympathetic consideration of the Government. I refer to the many people who live in the Interior and who have to travel by outboard motors. As you know, Sir, many cannot afford outboard motors. They have to paddle long distances, not only for the purposes of agriculture, to transport their crops, and to go to and fro to their work, but also for school children to move from their place of residence to the school, which sometimes may be quite a few miles away.

Recently, in the Waini, I was talking to a Captain who told me he had to paddle over 20 miles, I think it is much further than that, from the Waini all the way to Morawhanna to see the District Commissioner and paddle back.

I recall so far as school children are concerned, one person concerned with education was saying in a Report that it was a wonder children go to school at all in view of the difficulties which they have to undergo in order to reach the school place. In view of this I suggest that the Government should give sympathetic consideration to the removal of duty on outboard engines and on parts.

I was told by my colleague who is not here today, the Hon. Member Mr. Stoby that a 6 horsepower outboard engine has been increased in price by nearly 100 percent in the last four or five years from \$300 to \$600. We know that on the Coast we have roads; these are passable. But in the Interior, in many cases there are no roads at all; water transportation becomes the road of the people in the Interior. Therefore this category of people who have to earn their livelihood and whose children have to go long distances to school must be given the same kind of sympathetic consideration which is now being given to those who are now considered for the purposes of sport.

As I said, we have no objection to this category being given a lower rate of duty for the purpose of encouraging motor racing. But surely the Government cannot say that if those who are in the category of sport are to be given duty concessions, that those who have to earn a livelihood, who have to send their children to school in the Interior, do not deserve the same kind of consideration. I therefore ask the Hon. Minister to keep this in mind and to come forward to this House before too long with a similar proposal for the remission of duties altogether, if the Government feels that would be making too much of a concession for a reduction in duties for those who use outboard engines and parts for those outboard engines.

## Public Business Motion - Increase in the Prices of Paddy and Rice: 22<sup>nd</sup> September, 1971

**Dr. Jagan:** We have listened to a great deal of heat but very little sense. Clearly the Minister has got himself into a whole heap of contradictions. He said, "*We must not increase prices because the yield is low, what is the purpose of increasing prices when the yield is so small.*" Price is that greatest incentive in all countries of the world so far as farmers are concerned. The first point that a farmer looks at: What is the relation to his cost of production? What is his input? What is his output? Clearly in terms of output – income I am talking about – price is a factor and an important factor but he disregards this. He says that production is the factor, but he does not see the dialectics of this.

Sir, to come to production. What are the factors of production? Land, water control, variety, fertilizers and mechanization. Land and water control – what has the Government done about this? Where are its drainage and irrigation programmes? It has scrapped them all. Where is the Tapacuma Extension Scheme? Where is the Mahaicony/Mahaica/Abary Scheme? Where are all the follow-up Schemes for Boerasiri? What nonsense are the Members of the Government talking about wanting to increase production?

Variety? We had a plant breeder before Pawar come here; he spent many years trying to breed new varieties. What did they do? Scrap everything that was done because the Yankees said, "*Blue Belle.*" Pawar went along with them in the early period. They themselves had to, although they tried to ram Blue Belle down the throats of the people; they gave it up. Next, Star Bonnet. You do not have to have a plant breeder. You just take it from the United States. That is Star Bonnet and Blue Belle. Let us hear a debate between the expert, Pawar, who has done a lot of research here, and all their experts. But they would curse the man behind his back – a scientist.

The United States – you have the statistics here – produced in 1970, 49 percent in long grain, 40 percent in medium grain, and 10 percent in short grain. Yet we are going to divert our whole production to long grain variety. For what purpose? Most of our export crop is to the West Indies. We produce a negligible quantity for export outside the West Indies today. One-third or more of our crop is eaten in Guyana. Do they want long grain variety? Do the Trinidadians want it? First, the Minister's emphasis was yield. Now it has gone from yield to variety. Long grain.

This so-called Jamaica market is 20,000 tons which is equivalent to 40,000 tons of paddy. Roughly that is equivalent to 20,000 acres. Why then are we in this unholy haste to tell all the farmers all over the country, regardless of conditions, water control, price of fertilizer, economics of that operation, to grow Star Bonnet? All we need for the Jamaican market is 40,000 tons of

paddy, equivalent to 20,000 acres of rice, but we are going to, like a dragline, bulldoze the people. That is why they cannot get results. That is why rice production is going down. Let them go and find out yields.

I am sorry I did not bring the rice. Blast has taken it over in Wakenaam. Blast was controlled here. It was only on the East Bank and in the new varieties which are being bred to become blast resistant. You do not experiment. You bring Star Bonnet. For what purpose? We are told that the Government has now before it five varieties recommended – hybrids. Do you mean to say that this man is going to stake his international reputation? If so, has his opinion been tested in the light of other people's opinions, people who are world experts in rice?

Are we taking the cush-cush people that they are padding up in all the Ministries, to say "yes" if the Minister says "grow Star Bonnet", all of them bow and say, "yes"? That is what we have been reduced to in this country. Let the legislators go to the Experimental Station to see how these people are misinforming this House and this country. Five varieties of hybrids have been given to them. Yields are far higher than Star Bonnet. The input factors of production are not as great. They do not require so much fertilizers. They can grow in conditions under which two-thirds of our crops are grown in this country.

We have water control at Mahaicony-Abary. The experts are there. The Government started with Blue Belle. It has gone to Star Bonnet. Tell us what the figures are not only for those with proper water control, but also their own varieties. They have a protected price and market outside. They do not sell through the Board. They ship to the Board and without grading at the Board are awarded their own grades and export prices at the Board, while the farmers have to be cheated in grades and prices at the Board. And yet the Rice Corporation at Mahaicony-Abary is losing money every year.

These people are totally illogical. There are the facts. Can they deny it that at Mahaicony-Abary, which is a Government station, where they have all the factors, all the scientists, all the brains and protected prices and markets, they are losing money? That is why rice production is going down. Two-thirds of the country has no water control, yet they are forcing people to grow Star Bonnet. Look at the price incentive they are giving: \$1.50 for Extra Super Star Bonnet, \$1 for Super Star Bonnet, another \$1 for the ordinary varieties, and 50 cents for Super. Let them give us the statistics, how many people are awarded Extra No. 1 and Super.

The Government must make up its mind. The facts are here. The United States farmer receives a figure of \$11.64 a bag whilst Guyana farmers are receiving \$6.30 a bag for the same Star Bonnet. Not only that, the American Government buys from the farmers at subsidized prices, pays them to keep land idle, what is called the soil bank, and then in turn sends it out at a subsidized price or gives it away under PL 480 to countries like Jamaica. What are we going to do? The Hon. Minister is ignorant of economics; he

knows about animals. He does not understand.

I withdraw the word, "*ignorant*", Sir. Obviously, the Hon. Minister does not understand that wage factor alone is not the main factor in production, that cheap labour is not always the most efficient labour, that in the United States, they deal with large cultivations, they use tremendous mechanization, they use aeroplanes to cultivate and spray fields.

Look at the Government's policy! We are going to deal with Global-Agri in a little while. Look at rice! These are the products of the United States and we hear about soya beans behind the scene too. There is a surplus in these products in the United States of America. We know that the United States today has a deficit for the first time in 50 years, perhaps in 100 years. There is a deficit in trade. They forced their puppets to put a 10 percent tax on cheaper goods from socialist countries. They are not puppets, yet we see it in practice.

The United States experiences difficulties in selling goods abroad, yet we are going to produce not only the same product but the same varieties. There was the previous example which probably still operates, where Connell and Company were marketing Guyana rice, not the Guyana variety, but what is called "*Rooster Brand*", in its own bags under its brand name.

In these days of gluts and difficulties of finding markets in the world, how do you expect to compete against the United States, which subsidizes its exports, which gives them away for political reasons, when you are going to allow them to sell your rice under their brand name? Today people do not buy rice; they buy brands. People do not buy soap; they buy brands; they buy a name. We have no name. Are we going to grow the same variety that the United States has? What does this mean? It means in this world situation of growing difficulties to find markets we will come more and more under the political domination of the United States. Then she can say "*Unless you do so and so you are not going to have markets.*" How are you going to sell when you are selling the same thing the United States has a surplus in and the same brand names?

Perhaps my friends do not see imperialism operating with all its sinister manoeuvres as clearly as we do but we warn them. We give them free advice. This is dangerous. What is the position with corn? We are importing corn today but we hope to replace it later on by production internally. That is a never never land. We are importing millions of pounds of corn. The five varieties of hybrids which we have could produce what we need in terms of food production for more people. Hungry people in the city and elsewhere could get cheap food, as cheap as it was in the P.P.P. time.

Where are vegetables and ground provisions now? The Members of the Government have accused the Rice Producers Association of sabotaging. Who has sabotaged the ground provisions but the Government with its policy? Why is it that ground provisions are today selling at a minimum price of 12 cents per lb? The policy of the Government is all wrong and the

Government must be concerned about this because this is not only a matter of concern to the P.N.C. This is national interest.

The trend in Latin America is there to see. Countries which exported agricultural produce, which were self-sufficient, are today big importers of food and this is the direction in which we are heading. This is a serious matter. Their masters will not allow them to industrialize the country. They are to fall back on agriculture and say, "Agriculture is the backbone of the country." Yet they are killing it. Look at the figures in any field of production and you will see! Look at the prices in the markets. That alone will tell what is happening. The consumers can tell you through their bellies that the policy is wrong.

We cannot go on like this. Favouritism is there; the use of the profits of the Board to subsidize their friends for political purposes. This will pay political dividends in the short run but not in the long run. It cannot. Go and see some of the friends who have been helped with loans. Do not go to the big industry alone where you said you cannot collect the loans, but go to the rice industry also. The Government takes the money from all the farmers generally who should have received increases of \$2 million, \$3 million, \$4 million, and gives it to its friends who eat it up. They sell the fertilizer; they sell things. This is the Government's dilemma. It wants to make farmers of people who are not farmers because it fails to give them industrial jobs. Your masters tell you that you cannot industrialize the country.

To come back to prices, I have sat in West Indian conferences negotiating prices on behalf of the farmers. Three factors have always been used: world price; factors in the cost of production locally; the necessity to give the farmers a fair return. These are the three factors that are used.

I heard the Hon. Minister say that world prices are down but the West Indians have learned through their taste buds that cheaper external rice is not always the best rice. They got used to Guyana rice and its odour and they have learned to take it. Thus the two other factors have always been the main factors in determining price – cost of production and a reasonable return for the farmers.

Can we truly say that what is being done today is reasonable? The Government is dishonest. It used these factors to get an increase in prices but did not pass the increase on to the farmers. The Members of the Government will not deny this. This is dishonesty; it is cheating. They take the money instead and give it to their friends.

Not only would I say that West Indians, by and large, have dealt fairly with us in rice, but they have also a moral obligation because we give them a *quid pro quo*. We buy Carifta goods, industrial goods, coming from Jamaica and from Trinidad and Tobago. Even though prices are cheaper outside, even though quality may be better in many cases, in the interest of this so-called "regionalism" which they have fostered – the Yankee-dominated, the imperialist-dominated, regionalism – we give them a *quid pro*

*quo.* The Guyana Government has surrendered industrialization of Guyana in favour of industrialization of the West Indies.

Be that as it may, what has happened is that we have to pay more. Therefore, they should give us more and they have been giving us. But this Government, dishonestly I say – I use this word advisedly and deliberately because it is in the record. Their delegates to the Conference dominated the Board. We have the record. They put up a case for increased prices. They got them and when they got them they did not give them to the farmers. That is dishonestly.

I say, Sir, that what the Government has done is nothing. It cannot satisfy the basic problems confronting the farmers today. It is not only discriminatory against political opponents but it is also anti-national, it is against the long-term interest of this country. As long as this Government continues, agriculture will be the backbone of the country, there will be no industrialization. But according to its policies, its discrimination, agriculture is bound to go down as it has been going down. The Government must seriously take stock of this and not come here and try to score debating points. Why does not this Government debate? So when one talks, one can talk from this side. The Government does not do that because the Members are afraid to be exposed.

I repeat, the hybrids offer the possibility of forty to sixty bags per acre. The hybrids offer the possibility of three to four crops per year. In New Zealand, India and other places what was called the Green Revolution took place because they have used new varieties and so on, it has changed the production problem so far as food is concerned. Some of these countries which were net importers of food, are now beginning to look for markets outside but we do not want to take advantage of this because this Government has it deep down in its mind that certain sections of the community must not go ahead and it is out to destroy its political opponents by any means, put pressure on them so that they would come to its knees and beg it for jobs, land and loans.

Look at these; they cannot win an R.P.A. election run free and fair. They cannot win one seat in the sugar belt. We saw that recently in the election for cane weighers, yet they won all the seats for the local government election. This is dishonesty. This is why this country cannot make a headway.

They talk one thing about coops. I thought the Rice Marketing Board was a cooperative. I was a member when in colonial days they had eight Rice Producers Association and eight for the Government and in those days we fought hard because the Chairman belonged to the Government eight, and always give the farmers the bird. We fought hard when we got into Government and we changed that. We gave the farmers 11 out of 16. They had the majority, they were running the show. This is what you call cooperative. Cooperative means basically people running the show. How can Hon. Members of the Government talk about cooperatives and the main one, the Guyana Rice Marketing Board they are destroying? The Guyana

Marketing Corporation is being run bureaucratically with hacks. How does this Government expect things to progress when all over the local areas it is hand-picking people because it controls local authorities? It does not even trust its supporters like Llewelyn John. It does not even trust the ballot box; the Government says, "*Show hand*". What a disgraceful situation.

Any reasonable man looking at the political situation whether in Uganda, in Ghana, whether in Indonesia where there was also talk about going to socialism, where there was also rule by virtual dictatorship – which we have here – will see that those people lost out and they lost out fundamentally because the people were not really involved. This is going to happen here too; it is just a matter of time. But I hope that they are over there not only some political climbers and bureaucratic capitalists who want to become capitalists tomorrow; I would hope that there are also some truly national patriotic people on that side who see the interest of the nation before the interest of a few who want to ride rich, to ride rough shod over the masses of the people. I close by warning the Government that these shallow tricks and these manoeuvres will serve only for a short while; they cannot succeed for long.

## Dismissal Notices – Employee of Messrs Sandbach Parker and Co. Ltd.: November 1<sup>st</sup>, 1971

**Dr. Jagan:** Mr. Speaker, we have read with a great deal of concern about the impending closure of six departments of Sandbach Parker and Company Ltd., which belongs to the Demerara Group of Companies. It is estimated that over 250 workers will be dismissed and thrown in the streets. Something seems very strange and funny in this whole operation. Not too long ago, I think it was July or August of this year, the union which bargains for the employees in this enterprise signed an agreement retroactive to January of this year and with a life extending to December, 1973. We understand, also, that in this agreement, provision is made for ninety days' notice to the workers in the event of termination or amendment of the agreement.

In what appears to be a rather strange incident, although, as disclosed in the press, the company has decided to close down after consultation with the Government, no intimation was given to the workers or to the union despite the agreement signed, and like a bolt from the blue, they were suddenly told that these workers will be dismissed. We are at a loss to understand this kind of behaviour. Perhaps we should not be, because it would seem that Oliver Jessel and company belong to the new breed of robber barons, we do not seem to care either about agreements or about the welfare of the working class. How is it, all of a sudden, when only a few months ago an agreement was signed, the company has decided to shut down six departments?

We were told that this company, Sandbach Parker, had an encouraging record and was doing, in fact, better than a corresponding firm operating in Trinidad. How then, Sir, that all of a sudden this company has decided to shut down? We are not in a position to know exactly whether the company has closed down because it is losing money. If about a year ago this company had an encouraging record and the business of this company has expanded by about \$3 million, one would assume that it was making profits. If it was making profits, the question which arises is: what is the scale of profits? Perhaps the scale of profits which may be considered reasonable by other undertakings is regarded as unreasonable by Jessel and Company. We do not know. One can only speculate on the actions of these financial wizards, who seem to get rich quickly by utilizing other people's money in their financial gimmicks, such as, unit trusts, with their high interest rates that they have to recoup by making high profits at the expense of the working class.

Last year when Jessel took over we saw that over 200 sugar workers were retrenched; at that time, unfortunately, nothing was done about it. It seems that either the Trade Union Movement is impotent or that some of



their affiliates – the affiliates of the T.U.C., are so closely connected with the company, that they dare not take strong action when these ruthless capitalists willy-nilly throw out workers in the streets in order to make fat profits at their expense. Since we do not have the figures of the profitability or loss of the company we would like to have the Government tell us what the position is.

The company says that it was in consultation with the Government over six months ago. If this is so then surly the Government should have enquired why it they are closing down – what were the profits or the loss of the whole enterprise or sections of that enterprise? Did the Government threaten this company with some strong action? Or is it that the Government only threatens those who are powerless? There are great deals of missing links with this very situation. We want to know from the Government categorically what these consultations were. What are the investigations? The Prime Minister has said there were no consultations. Does it follow that Jessel is lying? If the Government has not been consulted and Jessel and company are fooling the public then we would like to know what has the Government done since Jessel has intimated that he will throw the workers on the streets. Has the Government undertaken any surveys to ascertain whether or not this company or its branches which are to be closed down are losing money or making profits? If the latter, what is the extent of the profitability? Unless we have these figures and facts we cannot know exactly whether the retrenchment had any justification, whether any action should be forthcoming either by the trade union movement or the working class as a whole in cooperation with the Government.

This leads also to the next point, and that is, are we, in this country, going to allow these sharks to close down what may be marginal operations and continue to run enterprises like the sugar estates, like Diamond Liquors, where fabulous profits are made? Is this the way this country will be run in the future? Are we going to resort to the kind of nationalisation that we have seen in some counties like the United Kingdom where unprofitable, or the least profitable industries are taken over by the Government and those highly profitable ones are left to the capitalist class?

These questions are germane to an understanding of how the Government intends to tackle these vexed questions of the rising rate of unemployment. Already in our cities, one-third of the youth are unemployed, another one-third underemployed. Jessel and Company have thrown out workers in the sugar estates before and now they are adding to the list of unemployed by throwing out another set in Georgetown. Soon we will hear that because of their experiments and so forth which have been permitted by the Ministry of Labour and the Government that they have to retrench other workers, that unless they employ advanced technology, they will not be able to compete and will go under.

I think a time has come when the Government must take a stand on these issues. It must tell the nation and the workers what it proposes to do

the solve the grave unemployment crisis which today has so much on toward effects; - crime, prostitution, the sentencing of people to life imprisonment for petty crimes. We do not know, we hope it is not true – whether there may be certain factors which prevent the Government from speaking out strongly on this occasion. It is rumoured that Sandbach Parker and company has provided a lot of heavy equipment – draglines etc. to Greenland Cooperative Society. Perhaps we will be told if this rumour is true or not; for there are a lot of rackets and behind the scene activities going on in this country, as a result of which we find that the Government moves in very devious ways. The time has come when something tangible must be told to the nation. What does the Government propose to do positively on this whole question of unemployment and specifically about the throwing out of nearly 300 workers in the streets at this very crucial time in the history of our country?

## Public Business Motion - Financial Paper No. 5 of 1971: November 22<sup>nd</sup>, 1971

**Dr. Jagan:** We have seen even one of their Members yesterday in the *Graphic*, Mr. Archie Codrington, issue a statement that it is disgraceful for the Government to pressurize the Library Committee to withdraw their subscription to the *Graphic*. Such mean dodges they are using to destroy their opponents. No doubt, Mr. Codrington, belongs to the Library Committee. Does it mean that only the *Chronicle* will be read in the Library? I wish to ask whether it is necessary, in view of the grave unemployment situation in this country, the need for industrialization, the need to have industries and factories, whether this Government can consider expenditure of nearly \$2 million dollars as being in the public interest, as distinct from the P.N.C. interest.

If the Government wanted printing machinery, there is printing machinery in the country. Lithographic has a lot of machinery. Surely, any sensible Government will try to maximize the use of equipment which is available in the country, whether by nationalisation, whether by private arrangements etc. The Minister of Finance must tell us why the Government is trying to bring in new equipment. The Hon. Member must know, he has knowledge of everything that is going on, of the state of the equipment. He must also know that in times past, it was almost impossible to get the other presses to print for other people, but that is by the way. The main point I want to make is that this expenditure was not in the public interest and this House should be given the facts – what is the feasibility – because the Government does not go into any proposition unless studies are carried out.

Cement, glass, bicycle tyres, which one factory has the Government established to give people work in Guyana? No, it is going to spend \$2 million on capital equipment. But, apart from this, this House will be called from time to time to vote supplementary sums as subsidies for this newspaper. I am asking whether the Government explored the possibility of nationalizing, because if the Government goes into competition with the existing printeries, *Graphic*, Lithographic etc., it is likely that some of these presses will have to be closed and there will be retrenchment. Is this the Government's way of solving this problem?

I know when the *Chronicle* closed down, that the workers set up a cooperative. They came to the Government to ask for assistance. I do not know what assistance was given, but we do know as a fact that the *Chronicle* did not continue as a daily paper; it was only a Sunday paper, which means it was not an economic proposition. The previous owner would not have stopped publishing it if it had been an economic proposition, and the workers too would not have stopped continuing it as a daily paper. Therefore, I ask the Government whether, like so many things in Guyana, this is an

other exercise in which the public is to subsidize another arm of the P.N.C. These facts must be given to this House. We see a lot of rackets being run in other directions. One so-called cooperative gets a lot of contracts. And on this occasion, something which is a party press is going to be run at the taxpayers' expense. What will lose money will be run at the taxpayers' expense as the propaganda machinery of the P.N.C.

Nobody is saying the Government must have no voice, but look at the methods. Coercion. No wonder all over the Caribbean today there is fear expressed about people like those who now run the Government. This can by no stretch of the imagination be called economic development. It should be put under the Head of propaganda for the P.N.C.

## Hospitals Bill: December 23, 1971

**Dr. Jagan:** I wonder whether we could make one observation on the Subhead 20, travelling facilities for relatives and visitors, Best Hospital. I do not wish to raise a question on travelling, but I just heard what the Minister said about food and I would like him to check to see whether what he said is correct or not so far as the Best Hospital is concerned.

Clearly, the food there is inadequate. T.B. is partly a nutritional disease and the food is not only inadequate but patients have their last meal at 3 o'clock in the afternoon and there is nothing provided until breakfast the next morning. The time gap is too great. As far as I understand it the patients get a cup of tea with some milk and a piece of bread for breakfast in the morning and for so - called "dinner" at 3 o'clock. This is a prison diet and not a diet for Best Hospital. I would like the Hon. Minister to make a check on this. Other patients can starve or get food from outside, but is not so easy for patients at this institution.

The other point I should like to raise is in relation to subhead 24, Renewal for Bedsteads at Public Hospitals. I hope that the Hon. Minister will look into this question. One can argue about quality and quantity so far as food is concerned, but so far as beds are concerned, we saw in the *Guyana Graphic* about three weeks ago where two maternity cases were in one bed. Here is the photograph. It was stated that this ward had thirty two beds and there was over sixty patients. Surely you cannot have gymnastics about this. The Government should tell us what it proposes to do about this situation, whether it has already been corrected or not.

I should like to ask the Minister of Trade if he knows of a study, which was done about purchasing hospital requirements only, which would make a saving of \$1/2 million per year, a study conducted by the now Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, who was then Junior Minister, and the Hospital Administrator, that if all hospital requirements were purchased from socialist countries instead of from the Crown Agents, the Government would save \$1/2 million a year. Will the Government, in view of this information, channel its purchases of hospital requirements to the socialist countries, thereby saving the taxpayers money so that the Minister of Health will be able to give more beds to the mothers in the Hospital and to give more food to the patients at the Best Hospital?

**Head 59, Ministry of Housing and Reconstruction - \$1, 438, 809 agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.**

## Head 33 - Ministry of Trade: December 23<sup>rd</sup>, 1971

**Dr. Jagan:** Subhead 9, Contribution to General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. I speak on this Subhead because I have made this observation before and I would like the Minister to state whether this is so or not, that is, that the Government has placed a ten percent service charge on goods coming from socialist countries, the Sino-Soviet bloc, as against a 5 percent service charge for goods coming from other countries. On one occasion I said that this was equivalent to a surcharge. The Minister said, No "*that this was mainly a service charge.*"

I reminded the House on another occasion that the previous Minister had said that the previous service charge would be imposed on textiles from the Sino-Soviet bloc countries but now I understand that it is imposed on all goods coming in from other countries.

If the information is correct that it is imposed on all goods, then there is clear case of discrimination. My information is that this would not be within the terms of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The Government must therefore say why it is having this differential charge. The Government must say in truth and the fact whether it is not a 10 percent surcharge levy on cheaper goods coming from socialist countries in order to discourage the purchase of these goods so as to help and to work in cooperation with the kind of thing which we saw recently in the United States, that is, a 10 percent surcharge for goods coming from other countries. In view of the fact that the Guyana Dollar has now been devalued in relation to the imports from non-dollar countries I should like to know whether the Government would give consideration at this stage to the withdrawal of these service charges.

We notice here is a sum of \$200,000, put here as expenditure. I wonder if the Minister would tell us how much revenue the External Trade Bureau has collected so far. What is the average monthly amount for the last period for which it has been operating? On one occasion, the Minister said that the P.P.P.'s position on the External Trade Bureau seems to be wobbling in the sense that it says that it is in agreement with such an institution but at the same time, it is doing everything to subvert it. I should like to say that that is not a correct view of our position. While in principle the P.P.P. is in favour of Government control of foreign trade, in the other hand, what we are opposed to is the way it is being done. I referred a moment ago to the discriminatory levy on goods coming from socialist countries even though it is an a known fact that those goods are cheaper in price and this was admitted by the Minister of Finance in his Budget Statement as regards imports from China.

I should also like to refer to the fact that because of the method of operating this Bureau we find that the price of cement has been increased from

\$2. 10, before the Bureau took over less than a year ago, to nearly \$3, as I understand it, for a sack of cement at the present time.

My Hon. Friend mentioned a few days ago or perhaps more than a few days ago in this House that the Government did not seem to know what it was doing and this was accounting for the tremendous amount of dislocation, and not only dislocation for we saw recently where many persons were retrenched, they could not continue with their operations because there was no cement in the country. Another point which I should like to raise is the whole method by which the Government goes about making its purchases. There are many allegations of corruption. I should like to see that the Government embark on some major principle and that is to establish some method of purchasing - calling for bids and something like that, whenever it wants to make purchases, whether in quantities at particular times, whether it gets commission is or not is immaterial so that the Government can be buying from the cheapest sources. The Government is going to be the bulk purchaser. One hears that there are bulk purchases being made by people who have their own connections. We hope that this is not so and that we are taking advantage of the cheapest possible sources which can result to the cheapest prices coming to the consumers. Unless the commercial community and the people can be satisfied that this is done we will find that we will always have, not only as a result of the incompetence but as a result of these factors prices increasing all the time.

#### **Item 10: Contribution to the International Sugar Agreement.**

**Dr. Jagan:** The Minister of Agriculture told us the other day how production of cane farmer's sugar is increasing. We are happy to know that, but what we are concerned about is two things. Firstly, the amount that is being taken out by the sugar planters as milling cost from the sugar cane farmers. The Minister must not only talk about increasing production. What the farmer is concerned about is how much he gets at the end. One of the factors which rob him at the moment is the large amount taken out by the sugar producers for the milling cost. I hope that the Ministers of Agriculture and of Trade will go into the matter very quickly. What I am concerned about right now, when I refer to the International Sugar Agreement is what is the future for these people. It is no use having a lot of local people go into sugar production when the future is uncertain.

We would like the Minister to tell us about the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement now that Britain has decided to go into the Common Market. We know that when Lord Ripon was negotiating he put up a very firm position on the question, particularly of commonwealth sugar, but because his position was so strong the over Lords in the Tory party who wanted Britain to go into the Common Market were fearful that the whole question of Britain's entry maybe jeopardized as taken by Lord Ripon. Therefore, Ripon was called home and a new position was subsequently taken, when

the whole West Indies became alarmed. Subsequently, we were told that assurances were given by Britain but these were not the same that Ripon was calling for before - the West Indians were calling for bankable assurances. They came back and said they were satisfied, but the publication has just come in my possession and the position is one as follows: that the interpretation given to these assurances by Britain and the Common Market countries are completely different. Indeed, the Common Market countries, which are interested in beet sugar, particularly France and Germany, have more or less remained silent on the interpretation given by Britain as far as their assurances are concerned.

They have a new way of interpreting this and it is possible that after Britain has gone in, the sugar producers of this country - and I am concerned not only with the sugar workers, but also with the cane farmers - will find that the whole Commonwealth Agreement will go and we will be left holding the bag. I would like the Minister of Trade to say whether he is fully satisfied about these assurances.

Secondly, in case there is a rating on the West Indian Producers of sugar - we know the British Government cannot be relied on, they ratted on the people of Rhodesia and there is nothing to prevent them ratting on the people of the West Indies - I should like to know in anticipation of this eventuality what the Ministry of Trade proposes to do in relation to this sector of our economy, on which so much reliance is placed, particularly by this Government.

### **Subhead 13: National Expenses, Specifications Board.**

**Dr. Jagan:** I see an amount of \$45,000. So far, I do not know that we have spent that amount last year, and we are to spend the same amount this year. I wonder if the Minister can give us some information as to how far we have gone in this respect. We are forced to buy goods from Carifta countries. We are forced to buy all kinds of things. I have before me a clipping from a newspaper, the *Tribute of London*, from 1954. The headlines state, "*Tonics to drive women to drink*" and the article speaks of Phospherine, Wincarnis and all kinds of tonics. But I am not only interested in these products, I am also interested in the many products which now are produced in the Caribbean which are inferior in quality and high in price. The consumers need to be protected and to have qualities, which are up to standard. I wonder what has been done to protect the Guyanese consumers.

We heard a little while ago the Minister of Health talked about the need to educate the Guyanese people. I do hope as regards diet, that the Minister of Trade will also undertake this effort of educating the people. I think on the last occasion he was speaking of Lactogen, that there are many other things in the country, which are equally good, and that people should not use Lactogen if there is a substitute as good in quality. We have no objection to that.



The Minister referred a moment ago to aspirin. I would say that the Government must not only tell us about this, that these things. The Government must educate the people and not just use the people's needs to use the big stick, as the Minister used the other day when he spoke about Lactogen and Quaker Oats, and Dolly Oats. I would think the Minister has a duty not only to the big stick and to say: you must use so and so. Better still, it would be in the interest of the Government and the Ministry to start a massive programme of education first, including work with the bureau of standards, making analyses, using the radio and the newspapers.

In this respect, I should like to refer him to two American publications, one produced by *Consumer's Research* and another produced by *Consumer's Union*, which put out monthly magazines and annual bulletins and books, where they test all kinds of products and also give prices and suggest what are the best buys. There is also a magazine, which the consumers' society in England puts out called, "*Which*". The Government can do a great deal of good for the consumers of Guyana by securing these publications and using the *Chronicle* and the radio station to publicize these articles which test products ranging from razor blades to refrigerators, radios, motor cars, and everything else. This would be a useful service to the people and once the people receive objective advice such as this, they would be willing to switch their choice of consumer items and thereby help themselves and help the Government in its objective of concentrating on some product, which it might be buying in bulk.

I wonder whether I could ask a supplementary question just to clear up certain points. This is very important Head, Sir, and I would be grateful even if you have to take some time off another Head.

The Minister spoke in answer to my Hon. Friend, Mr. Sutton. Unfortunately, E.T.B. was thrown on the country without any proper debates in this House and it seems to be blowing up from day to day. Is there a difference between the commission charge and the services charge put on by E.T.B.? We were talking just now about the commission that it is built into the c.i.f. price and so on. Fiver percent, as I understand it, is charged on goods from Western countries. What about the 10 percent on goods coming from socialist countries? Does this also take care of the commission? Is there one charge only? Is the commission and the service charge the same?

The Minister said a moment ago, in reply to me, that the 10 percent service charge, as he called it, does not violate G.A.T.T. The previous Minister has said in this House that the 10 percent service charge was only to be levied on textiles. I believe that this was because textiles were coming in very cheap and merchants were making fantastic profits and they wanted to rake off some of that and get 10 percent. Since then, as I understand it, 10 percent has become the overall charge.

Leaving out the violation of G.A.T.T., why is there a differential rate, one to five and one to ten, between two sets of countries? Is there more work involved? If you were charging a service charge one would presume

it would be the same wherever the goods are coming from, because it is the same amount of work involved. I do not see the reason unless you want to discriminate. That is what I am trying to get at.

## Head 31 - Ministry of Mines and Forests: 23rd December, 1971

**Dr. Jagan:** When one looks at this Head, the whole question of forestry, one must really condemn the Government of Guyana in the strongest possible terms. Here is a product which we have in abundance, nearly three-quarters of our country is tied up with the richest resource that we have outside of bauxite, but very little is done about it. But we are chasing after rainbows! We are going to build a textile mill! We do not know if cotton can be grown economically. We cannot put on a proper footing an industry for which we have some of the most advantageous conditions in the world.

Something is wrong. We are only dealing with slogans. Feed yourself, clothe yourself. We are going off from timber on to making clay bricks. We are not opposed to making clay bricks and all these gimmicks. What has the Government done in seven years to take over the capital market in the West Indies? Tons of lumber, wall boards and other things are coming to the West Indies. We are supposed to be in Carifta; we have to buy inferior quality goods, higher-priced goods, and here we cannot sell beef, we cannot sell pork, we cannot sell rice, we cannot sell timber.

Since I began growing up, I have been hearing about secondary species. We cannot develop the industry because it is done in a disjointed manner. If the Government cannot tackle this properly, close up the plant. To capture markets, lumber must be produced in good quality and it must be cheap. It is not cheap because of selective logging, and the cost of taking out the so-called marketable species.

We were told over and over by the Forestry Department that many of the species are as good as the marketable ones if they are properly treated, seasoned and milled. That is a mechanical task - seasoning, treating and milling. Everybody knows the technique. Why is it not being done? I was told by the C.D.C. that it was possible to produce seasoned and properly milled and cured secondary species at about 15 cents per board foot. If that is so, then we have a gold mine in our hands which we are not doing anything about.

The Government is caught up in its own dilemmas because of its trade policy, foreign policy and everything else. This has to be tied up completely, not playing international politics as it is trying to do. For instance, Cuba. The Conservator of Forests knows that in the time of the P.P.P. the Cubans wanted to take wood pulp from Guyana to combine with bagasse to make paper. They were willing to lend this country money to start the project. The Conservator advised that all the land be taken up, we had to make a road 18 miles in the Bartica triangle to get to an area where a factory could be set up. It was in fact suggested that we should approach the C.D.C. because the company already had roads and it had a lot of timber

which could be used for making pulp. What has the Government done to help accomplish this?

## **Division XXIV – Ministry of Housing and Reconstruction: December 23<sup>rd</sup>, 1971**

**Dr. Jagan:** If wishes were horses the Minister of Housing would have been Prime Minister in 1970. Clearly, the Minister is only blowing a lot of bubbles because he does not understand the laws of economics. No one can project about building and satisfying all the consumer needs of the people, no one can do that. In the world of economics and developing science, there is such a thing as means of production and also that a factory will produce consumer goods. The Minister has been telling us about all the consumption things that are going to be produced for use by the people. What he has not yet told us is how all this fits in with the big global plan. Where all the money is to come from? It is not being generated in the Budget and from what we can see in the Budget there is a declining tendency in terms of revenue as compared with expenditure.

The economy of Guyana is not generating its surplus to finance a development programme. Even in socialist countries, full socialist programmes have not been achieved in this short period the Hon. Minister is talking about. It is easy to talk in an airy-fairy manner. Let us have the programme so we can assess what the Hon. Minister is saying properly.

When we had the last \$300 million Seven Year Plan, we know how much was allocated for industrialization, how much was allocated for housing. What was projected for drainage and irrigation has not been spent. That is why the country is in a mess. Any plan has to consider income, expenditure, where it is coming from, what will be allocated to different sectors, carefully weighing planned proportional development, what is needed for consumption, what is needed for productive expenditure before. I am not saying we must not tackle our problems. All this is very airy-fairy.

## Head 13 – Ministry of External Affairs: December 28<sup>th</sup>, 1971

**Dr. Jagan:** Yes, Sir. On one previous occasion, the Minister indicated to this House that Guyana was most economical in expending money for external affairs. We see that the expenditure has mounted from half a million dollars in 1966 to \$3½ million this coming year and the Minister made the point that so far as the Caribbean was concerned we were spending less and getting more value. I presume by that, that we are spending less per unit or per area of representation. Of course, we have to excuse the Minister because he is always dealing in quantitative rather than in qualitative terms and I am more concerned about the quality than the quantity.

In this newspaper, the *Sunday Chronicle* of December 19, 1971, some questions were put to the Prime Minister by Mr. Hamaludin. Mr. Hamaludin asked some very leading questions. He said:

*“Mr. Prime Minister, people once accused you very strongly of being a pro-American but only a couple of days ago there was a Yugoslav vessel moored in Georgetown with a floating trade exhibition from a socialist country. Further, we have signed a bilateral trade and technical agreement with the People’s Republic of China.”*

The Prime Minister in his reply said:

*“I have never been pro-American. I have always been pro-Guyana. If you examine my speeches from way back you will find I always adumbrated a policy of nonalignment. I am not particularly anti-anybody except South Africa, Portugal and Rhodesia.”*

And then he went on to say:

*“Of course, my friends of the Opposition when they talk of nonalignment would want us to be aligned with the Soviet bloc.”*

On the right hand side of page 39 of the Estimates we see listed the cities in which we have set up offices, namely, London, Ottawa, Paramaribo, Brasilia, Kingston, Lusaka, New York, Washington, Caracas and New Delhi.

I raise the question of non-alignment as the Government says this is its policy. To talk about Yugoslavia and China does not necessarily, in our view, bring the Government’s policy within the realm of nonalignment. As we are aware, there are two main blocs today in the world, the world of the socialist system and the world of the imperialist system. So far as Yugosla-

via and China are concerned, they are marginal to the world socialist system. In fact, at the meeting in 1969, in Moscow, of the World Communist and Workers Parties, neither Yugoslavia nor China was there. And indeed both of these countries generally tend to associate themselves in today's world with the nonaligned bloc of countries. The nonaligned bloc is a mixed bag, some of them are oriented to the socialist world system, most of them oriented to the capitalist world system. One would have thought that the Government, in talking about nonalignment, would have treated both systems equally. This is our point.

I think the Prime Minister is incorrect to inform the nation as he did through the *Chronicle* that the P.P.P., when it talks about nonalignment, would want the Government to align Guyana with the Soviet Bloc. This is not the question and this is not true. What are we saying if you are genuinely nonaligned then you must have representation, meaningful recognition and relations with both blocs. But, Sir, if you look at this list of countries here where we have embassies or offices it cannot be said that Guyana is genuinely nonaligned. Most of these countries are within the capitalist orbit with the exception of Lusaka and New Delhi which belong to the nonaligned bloc. As such, we say that the Government is really not practising what it is preaching. That is why we are not querying the amount of money spend in relation to the West Indian, countries, but rather, how much we are getting for what we are spending.

Taking the realities of that world as it is Sir, I would say that if the Government clearly wants to fulfil its role of nonalignment then it must have meaningful relations with the socialist world as it has with the capitalist world, and we have no such indication of this at the moment.

I should like to ask the Hon. Minister what about recognition of Cuba. In a speech made by the Prime Minister not too long ago, it was suggested that political union of the Caribbean must in the end embrace not only British territories but French, Dutch and Spanish. Besides that, the Government in its Budget Statement said that Caribbean unity and political integration is a cornerstone of its policy. Why it is this Government has not recognized the Republic of Cuba? This Government does not only claim that it is non-aligned but also that it is socialist. Why then it has not given diplomatic recognition to the Peoples Republic of Cuba? We would like the Minister to answer this question. We would like him also to say when Guyana proposes to have meaningful recognition of the world socialist system, to accord the same status, for instance, to the Soviet Union, as it has accorded to West Germany, to the United States of America and other capitalist imperialist states.

If one were to compare oneself with another Latin American country, Chile, which also claims to be nonaligned, one sees that recognition has been given to the Republic of Cuba. I should like to ask the Hon. Minister whether the Government is not according recognition to Cuba because of its desire to get into the O.A.S. Is it this which is preventing it from doing so?

Recently there came to hand a circular letter which was sent out under the name of a Mr. Haynes from the London Office not doing Government work but doing P.N.C. work. I notice under this Head that the London Office is very large compared with the many other offices that we have. I should like the Minister to tell us whether this large staff is necessary so as to carry out the work of the P.N.C. as a Political Party as distinct from the Government. We know that the Minister of Information is between the two. We wonder whether this is also the view of the Ministry of External Affairs that there is no distinction between the two and that the External Offices must carry out the work of the P.N.C.

I should also like to ask the Minister to tell us - since there is so much talk and we know that the Government of Guyana is more or less initiating this move towards the Caribbean unity - why is it that Barbados and Guyana which had a united representation at some levels have now parted company? Perhaps the Minister will be good enough to inform the House. Because we understood that this was going to be one of the areas in which the West Indies could cooperate without a political union. We would like to know what is the reason for this break up with a small beginning which was made. Will the Minister tell us what other plans the Government has to unify external representation so far as the Caribbean is concerned? We would be glad to hear because that was an objective which was expressed both by the P.P.P. and the P.N.C. We would like to know what is preventing this because if that can be achieved it will probably mean that Guyana can save a lot of money to spend on more vital services.

Another point which I should like the Minister, perhaps he in collaboration with his colleague the Minister of Finance, to tell us is since again West Indian unity, political union, is a cornerstone of the Government's policy, how is it that one fundamental question - a common currency we have not either gone along together? Or perhaps the Minister will tell us how much consultations there were on this issue of devaluation?

Although it is a fundamental matter I feel that it has to do with Caribbean unity and external relations in a way. All along we have had close collaboration with the whole West Indies on a common unified currency, and it seems now at this stage when we are embarking on a more profound form of union even the little that we have is now going apart.

Perhaps the Hon. Minister would like to tell us what the position on this score is because it seems that while one horse of the two-horse chariot is leading us in one direction, the other horse is taking us in another direction.

The Hon. Minister said that I said there was a consultation. The Minister himself said in the Paper presented to the House that there was consultation. I was getting down to the root of the bigger problem, and that is, that necessity if you are going to talk in terms of political union is to move in step with others. One of the reasons the Federation broke up, my Friend and Minister of State will tell you - was because Jamaica wanted to do



things on its own so far as incentive were concerned. How are you going to reach our objective when everybody is not going to act together? Are you going to do it by dragging them into a political federation? Or are you going to try to go along and reach agreement so that that will lead to the political union you want? This is why the union cannot come about, because they cannot arrive at consensus.

There was obvious consultation! The Minister said Guyana must preserve her own interest, but Trinidad and Guyana, their economy, by and large, is more or less the same in terms of commonwealth preference imports, in terms of exports into dollars areas – oil and bauxite. The same economic factors by and large, underlay the economies of Guyana, Trinidad and Jamaica. But Guyana goes along and acts on its own unilaterally. The Trinidad dollar is now 1.15 here. That is about what we are talking about. That is the reality. How can you talk about cornerstone, that you are setting that pace, Caribbean unity, political union, when you cannot agree on these basics? That is what is going to bring about the union, not superimposition because somebody wants it from the top; that is my point the Hon. Minister missed my point completely.

Then I made the second point. Let him dispute that the Caribbean Governments are more responsive to public opinion. They know that if the cost of living rises, as it will here because of devaluation, what is going to happen in the streets of Trinidad and Jamaica. This Government feels that it has the rigging machine, it has the Army, the Police so it is oblivious of public opinion. Let the Government deny that one.

The Minister of State says that if we were in Government we would have done the same thing; we would have set up in London, Washington. In fact, Sir, that is true; he can say that because he has the papers. When we started to initiate the whole functioning of the Ministry, those offices were contemplated. That nails that lie to what the Prime Minister is saying, that we would have been aligned completely with Moscow. The two of them are obviously confounding each other on that point. But my main point in this: is he justified in not having meaningful relations with what I call the socialist system by saying that we have not got the money or the personnel? The realities of today's world, as we saw in the Pakistani issue on the United Nations, is not how many voted but who has the strength in Pakistan. There are two power systems, and the Government in its foreign policy, we are saying, must deal with both of them on the basis of their creed, non-alignment.

It is not a question of money. If they cannot afford, I should like to ask the Hon. Minister whether they have objected to the Soviet Union having any embassy in Guyana on the same basis as the West Germans. Let them explain that, which shows that they do not mean what they say. On the one hand, they justify it on the grounds of no money, but if they really want to be nonaligned, they could cut out some of these offices. Why do you need one in Brazil and one in Venezuela? A poor country could have one repre-

sentative in the whole of Latin America, one in the West Indies including Surinam, and one in Cuba instead of one in Surinam.

I am saying what nonalignment would have meant. The Minister was virtually asking what I would have done. I am showing how a genuinely nonaligned country should behave. But they are not. They only talk to fool some other people outside of Guyana but not those who think, those who understand.

## Miscellaneous (Fiscal Enactments) (Amendment)

### Bill: December 29<sup>th</sup>, 1971

**Dr. Jagan:** The Hon. Minister was in fact arguing a while ago in favour of the Amendment of my colleague when he said that there are many people who have borrowed money to build houses and they continue year after year paying simply the mortgage charge interest and not being in a position to be able to pay the capital sum. That certainly indicates that that man is catching hell. Things are bad with him because if he can never come to the point where he can pay back the capital, certainly he needs a lot of help. That is why I say the Minister was arguing by using that example. I think the Minister would very well agree to include all the categories, to leave out, as the Hon. Member Dr. Ramsahoye is suggesting, the date qualification so that whoever is paying interest will be allowed this facility.

I wish to propose an Amendment to section 19B by the deletion of subsection (b). The reason for this is to allow a concession to be granted for the purchase of any building, because it seems to me difficult to make a real distinction between a new building and an old building for this reason. The Hon. Member Mr. Singh a moment ago asked what you regard first of all as a new building. A building which has been built and occupied a few months, is that a new building in the terms of the Act?

There may be cases where a man has a building, perhaps too small for himself and his family, he may have built it some time earlier, he sells it to another small man and he goes on to build another house. Why should not the persons who have bought from this man also get the same concession as the man who is going to build? It seems to me that once you have a growing population, especially people moving from the country and coming to the urban areas, buildings going up in this sort of situation, the Government should make the concession applicable to all kinds of purchasers.

A person buys a house and by the mere fact that he buys a house, the person who would have sold it most likely will add to further construction in the country. It is not going to happen in 100 percent cases. One can argue he can take the money and go into some kind of production. Even then, if he were to do so, it may not directly help the housing situation. The factor in being able to build is not only just loans but having the economy generating wealth sufficiently, so that money will become available by one form or another for the purpose of house building.

I raise this point to show that if the facility was granted to purchasers of any building, for the purpose of the person living in it - I am thinking now a person wanting to become a landlord, and it is a moot point whether he should not be granted the same facility - he may have taken into consideration whether it is more economic to buy an existing house or whether it is not within his power to build a new one, and so on.

Therefore, I see no reason, if he has to become indebted, why he should not be given the same facilities. In the long run, the money that will become free, so to speak, or the money that will be obtained by the original owner, is most likely going to be used for the further expansion of housing. I, therefore, move to deletion of this subsection. Perhaps the Government may wish to give this some consideration. The Prime Minister is not here and maybe the Minister would like to consult him.

## State Pensions Bill: December 29<sup>th</sup>, 1971

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, there can be no doubt about it that there will be many cases in any country of people who should be honoured, who are respected by the country as a whole. But we will be hiding our heads in the sand if we fail to recognize that Guyana is not only a seriously, gravely divided society but, as one of the Heads of our University said the other day, "*a highly political country.*"

Sir, because of this we cannot arrive at by-partisanship even on such questions. At least the Government does not make any attempt even on such question as honouring people who deserve to be honoured. In view of this one cannot give a blank cheque to the Government to use willy-nilly as it likes. One has to go by experience and the experience in this country has been that over the past seven years this Government has moved stealthily, and one would even say corruptly, against the national interest. Major issues? I recall the issue of the signing of an agreement with Reynolds Metals Company which was not disclosed to this House. It is a matter which affects the nation, the people in this country. It is a question of public morality. Who is going to judge who deserves what on what yardstick? On what basis is it going to be? Is it going to be a P.N.C. card? Or loyalty to the Peoples National Congress, service to the P.N.C.? Or is it to the Nation? What do we mean by service to the Nation?

We showed that if the Government was doing something that is in the public interest we will support it. This was definitely shown on the occasion when the Government decided that it will nationalise the Demerara Bauxite Company. We gave this Government in this House the support to do this. Had it come with the Reynolds Bill which it signed surreptitiously it would not have the support here. This just shows the standards of morality that we are talking about. Had they come with the Reynolds Bill, which they signed superstitiously, they would not have got the support here. We have seen other cases.

My colleague has already referred to the way the Government feels, but this feeling is reflected in its behaviour, that the Government is the P.N.C. There is no distinction between Government formed by the P.N.C. to govern for the nation and the P.N.C. I raised the question with the Minister of State about one Member of the London office sending out circulars using Government stationery, using Government time, for P.N.C. work. This is what we are quarrelling about.

When we agreed with the Prime Minister that the Law should be changed to permit the nationalisation, certain commitments were made publicly by the Prime Minister in this House. These are being dishonoured. They are not being implemented. Machinery was to be set up to establish a basic thing in the sugar industry. A basic point - democracy. Now we hear a new

route is going to be sought: labour code instead of machinery. How can one have confidence?

When I spoke to the Prime Minister, we were told that on such questions as the Public Service Commission, that the Opposition will be represented so that there will not be all these charges that people are getting jobs by kisses and favours, by partisanship, and loyalty. The Prime Minister agreed with me that one individual named Vernon Bhairam would be appointed for one month only on the understanding that this consensus will be arrived at so that these national bodies, where the executive is not supposed to interfere, will be run in the interest of the nation and not in the interest of the P.N.C. The Prime Minister agreed with me. Lo and behold, it was changed to one year, or maybe two years. I gave a name. There are several names. It seems that the distinguished Maha Sabha, after a certain date has become *persona grata*, when the whole state machinery is used to interfere in elections.

How can the public have respect for the Government and give the Government *carte blanche* to be able to use the exchequer's money as it likes? We were talking about payments to Captains. The Hon. Minister of Finance and his colleague, the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture, more or less made the impression that we did not want to pay Captains. By all means they must be paid. What we are opposed to is the method of electing them by fraud and using them to be loyal to the Government instead of being loyal to the people with whom they live.

In Moruka, the P.N.C. cannot win the elections for the seats on the Amerindian Village Council; the P.P.P. won five out of nine seats, but on the Election Day for the Captains, which was announced overnight, more people voted than those who voted for all the village councillors or in the elections in 1968. Where did they come from overnight? They are using the public money to try to hold up this machine, to build up a political machine, which is not going to be held by those methods. We see it in community organizers. We see it in public works. They have them all over the country- co-coordinators. We see them checking scales in sugar estates. Neither the M.P.C.A. nor the Government union, which it set up with a lot of vagabonds, thieves, can win in any free and fair elections at that level.

The union that wins the elections is allowed one person to weigh and the Government appoints two. This is how democracy operates in Guyana – paid out of the public purse.

This is related to the whole setup. We are charging that the executive arm of the Government takes the public money and uses it to build up P.N.C. machinery. We see it in other places. Proxy voting at elections. Pressures of this kind. If this country is to go ahead, the Government must appreciate the fact and not only say the P.P.P. is talking about what is happening in the country. All kinds of people today are concerned. The Archbishop of Guyana before was talking about corruption.

More and more people are becoming concerned. The Ministers can live

in their little cells and think that everything is all right, but the fact of the matter is that you cannot build a society like this no matter how much you make appeals. The Churches have been appealing to people for generations. They say: "*Behave well*", "*Thou shalt not steal*", "*Work hard*".

My Hon. Friend sent me a book. I was just reading it. I see the Archbishop Pantin here. They do not go to functions now. They boycott the Governor-General's functions. This is an indication of the times. Even people like the Archbishop are forced by the situation to take a different position.

The fact of the matter is that this country today is a sick society. The Minister will know this and his colleague, the Minister of Home Affairs, will know it. If the gates were open outside of Guyana today, if there were no Immigration Act in the United Kingdom and if all the restrictions were not placed on people, you would have to take all the paper from the Ministry of Information, all the supplies available, and print passports only, because people are fed up.

If you are interested in your county, please stop this. You cannot hope to build a just, moral and egalitarian society. Even Archie Codrington talks about this. You cannot hope only to talk and to practice differently. You cannot have corruption at the top and hope to build a proper society at the bottom. This law is going to open the flood gates to further corruption of the society with taxpayers' money being used to bribe and corrupt people.

We see where Amerindians, who used to be Captains, who used to work with their people, are now opposed to paying them, because of money, because they are looking to this salary – We are not opposed to paying them, but let them be elected fairly and squarely. In this case there will be no election, not even a rigged election. As somebody said, the only small man who will become a real man is the President in Guyana House. He has to agree. There is no yardstick here. He cannot say, "*No*". Many times I have written to him about Bairam and other people.

I told the Governor-General on one occasion, "*while it is true that you do not have the constitutional power, yet sometimes you can do as the President of India once did: threaten to resign and then the thing, at least, will start to work.*"

If all small men have to become big men by looking to the Government for salaries and positions and honours, then we are really in a hopeless mess. This country is facing a dismal future. You are in the seat of power. You are dealing the cards. You can put up aces all over the place, or you can put up jokers all over the place. It is for you to decide, but so far as we are concerned, the Government has not shown by example that it deserves this kind of power at this time, therefore we cannot agree to this bit of legislation.

We are not opposed to giving pensions to deserving cases. Let them be treated in the same old way as they were treated in the past, that is, let special measures be brought to this House. As my colleagues said, there has been no occasion, or very rare occasions, if the cases deserved it, that

the Opposition has withheld support.

I suggest that in the circumstances we follow this route until such time as the Government demonstrates that on certain questions there should be a bipartisan approach to national life in Guyana. When that is established, they can be assured that the Opposition will grant these powers. As one of my colleagues' said the other day, we saw where an obeah man was honoured and that kind of thing is not desirable in the present circumstances.

I wish to support my colleagues on this Amendment and I think this is one area where, as the Hon. Minister of Finance said a moment ago, we can have bipartisanship. He used the word a little while ago in relation to bauxite. That is a far more controversial field than what we are now talking about. We are talking about honouring distinguished Guyanese. This is not a question of politics. They recommended themselves. The Government talks about bauxite. Nationalisation was the only area on which we agreed, that is, to permit Guyanese to take over the resources. The takeover is one thing.

My friend knows from his little readings that there is such a thing as anti-imperialist socialist nationalisation and state capitalism. We never agreed with the Prime Minister or anybody on the Government side that we will have a bipartisanship so far as everything in the bauxite industry was concerned. That is importing into the subject far more than was ever dreamt of at this time of those discussions.

To come back to his concept of bipartisanship, here is the area where it will work and if we have the principle of unanimity in the great Security Council of the United Nations, than we should try to achieve that principle of this noncontroversial, non-political matter of awards to meritorious Guyanese. I hope the Government will accept this Amendment.

March this year, there was no provision, so obviously there was an opportunity to get by with what the Hon. Member referred to, because you could not have pointed to anything in the Standing Orders which said you must debate it. Now, to rectify, I have no doubt, this situation, this Motion was debated in this Honourable House and passed unanimously.

This is like asking what happens if five days are not allotted for the general debate on the Budget or seven days are not allotted for the consideration of the Estimates. We have grown to accept the Standing Orders as our guide. We are getting into the field of speculation, and useless speculation, in asking questions like that.



## New Year Wishes: December 29<sup>th</sup>, 1971

**Dr. Jagan:** Mr. Speaker, I did not expect that this was going to be the occasion for felicitations for the New Year. I thought that we would have had another opportunity to discuss the question of devaluation but, be that as it may, I want to take this opportunity to wish you, your family, the members of your staff, Members of the Government, members of the United Force, Members on our side, and also the reporters, who have had the good or bad fortune to listen to a lot of sense and nonsense, day in and day out, in this House, a very happy New Year.

I think that there is a great deal which has to be done in this country. It would be good if we all could make some effort to make this House perform meaningfully, to discuss promptly such things as devaluation. I hope that we will have an opportunity to discuss this very early in the New Year.

On the question of discussions, I hope that our Attorney-General will have more staff so that he can bring forward more Bills, which we understand cannot be brought to this House because of the shortage of staff, and so that the House can be kept busy and important questions, about which many Guyanese are concerned, may be debated and discussed. In this way we will have Members, and not only Members, but the people, wanting to look up to the Parliament as an institution from which they can get guidance, from which they can learn and get education.

I do hope that we will be turning a new leaf in the coming year and that we will make more improvements than those which we may have made in the recent past.

One again, I wish everyone a very Happy New Year.

## Suspension of Standing Order No. 82

**Dr. Jagan:** I have no serious objection of this Amendment which is proposed but I would like to say that it seems that the Government is coming forward with this Amendment to the rules to provide for a prorogation of this House. This would seem to be what is intended. There was some correspondence between the Leader of the House and myself on the question of a recess, but apparently, because we did not agree, the attempt is now being made to prorogue the House, and in order to prorogue the House, this Amendment has been necessary so that the Special Committee can continue with its Sittings.

I would like to raise a matter of great importance to this House. Normally, my colleagues and I would not be opposed to a recess, but a recess in the history of our Parliament has not been something which has been in vogue. It may be to have this in the future, as a matter of principle, so that Members on the Government side, Members of the Opposition, can regulate their work accordingly and thus the business of the national Assembly can be effectively carried out.

What I am worried about is that this attempt to have a recess seems to have particularly engineered in order to facilitate the Speaker, who will be going to a Parliamentary course and, following that, to a visit to West Germany. Here again, no one can object to the Speaker going to a course or on the visit to another country, but the Standing Order provided that in the absence of the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker should preside. I recall when the Hon. Member Mr. Derek Jagan was appointed Deputy Speaker; the Hon. Prime Minister made an observation that he hoped the Deputy Speaker will fill the chair, when occasion demands, fairly and impartially, and that there will be many such occasions which will arise in the future. If that was the intention of appointing a Deputy Speaker, having him preside when the Speaker is absent, why is it the Government is getting around using all these rules in the order first to recess the House and when that manoeuvre was objected to by us, seeking now to prorogue the house and further to get an Amendment to the Standing Order to continue the business of the Special Committee after the House is prorogued.

I would have hoped that the Government would have been more honest in its dealings not only with this House but with the country at large. What is required in Guyana today is political morality so that a standard will be set for all Guyanese to be follow. It is of no use having teachers coming to parliament. And teachers are told: "*you must set the example for your children*" when at the highest level all kind of sharp practices are being employed, which cannot fail to be recognized by the ordinary people including school children.

Now I would like to say a word about this question of prorogation and

all these Motions.

I am speaking on this Motion. I am trying to show why the Government is coming forward with this Motion.

Sir, you may not have it, but I have the evidence and I am putting it to you. I am trying to argue logically. I may not have studied logic as Your Honour has done in legal studies, but my scientific training, which some of these people do not have, has taught me to argue logically.

I do not think that this House should be prorogued at this time because there are other very urgent matters before this Parliament. There are many Motions, many questions and, above all, a Motion of Censure against the Speaker, a Motion of Censure against a Minister, and those Motions should take precedence over all of these matters, but here again the Government does not put those Motions before the House to be debated. Instead, it is seeking the ruse of having a prorogation and a long recess when the business before the House, which the Opposition had sought to bring, will not be taken care of. While I have no objection to this Motion I seriously object to the way the Government is conducting the affairs of this House and also the Speaker permitting these things to happen in this House.

## Financial Paper No. 2 of 1972: 27<sup>th</sup> July, 1972

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, I only rise to point out that from time to time Members on this side of the House are admonished that they should not do this, or do that, they should move by way of formal Motion in this House with respect to discussions on certain questions as we were reminded only last week. I had to refer to one occasion that Motions put by Members on this side of the House do not see the light of day. This is because the Government has rarely taken the opportunity to fix meetings on Wednesday which as you are aware, Sir, is reserved for Members' Motions if there is no urgent Government business for which priority is given. Month after month, week after week, this House sometimes does not meet. And when it meets, for instance, in this week we say the House will be sitting on Monday and then a date is fixed for Thursday.

Last year the Prime Minister gave an undertaking in this House that meetings will be held on Wednesdays so that adequate time will be provided for discussion of Members' Motions, but this undertaking is not being honoured. I wish to draw the attention of the Hon. Leader of the House to this undertaking given by the Prime Minister and also to the observation which I have just made that he will see to it that Parliament meets on Wednesdays. Apart from Wednesdays, on some occasions when we do not have much business that Members' Motions and, in fact, other Questions which have not yet been answered should be put on the Order Paper so that they can be debated.

Sir, I think, it was December, 1970 the Prime Minister declared that the Ombudsman's functions will be unchanged particularly with regard to the question of corruption. Immediately after, a Committee was set up and as far as I understand only one meeting of this Committee has really been held. I understand that the Hon. Minister of Finance summoned other meetings but, I suppose for lack of quorum I think three other meetings were not held.

Surely, this is nearly a year and a half and if a declaration then made by the Prime Minister is to be realized then something must be done to get this Committee functioning so that some recommendation on whatever has to be done will be done as quickly as possible. I do not believe this should be a matter which should be dragged on and on. I do not know if it is that Members are not attending meetings because they do not have the time; if this is so then they must be thrown out, and other Members will be put in their place. I do not know what the reason is; perhaps, the Minister will be able to tell us something. Maybe my information is wrong but that is how I have it. Perhaps he can inform the House what is the position on this question. I raised it because I feel it is a very important question and the matter should be handled very efficiently.

Sir, I wish to speak on the Head concerning the Public Service and Police Service Commissions, Items 11 and 12. I raise this matter because since 18<sup>th</sup> February I wrote to the Secretary of the Public Service Commission and on the 17<sup>th</sup> January, 1972 I wrote to the Attorney General and Minister of State, Mr. S.S. Ramphal, on these matters. In fact, I have not got even an acknowledgement much less a reply to these matters. This has to do with the appointment of personnel to the London Office of the Guyana High Commission. Some time ago two individuals who are not in the Public Service were employed by the Guyana High Commissioner; this was in the period January 1965 to May 1966. These officers were Horace Caines and Boris Haynes - employed as executive officers. No doubt this has to do with work concerning Guyanese students, nurses and so on. Apparently that was the explanation which was then given.

That is what I understand. I do not know exactly where it was given, I cannot say. Before I go into that point, perhaps I should say that the payment for these officers was not done, as I understand it, through an authorization from the Accountant General's Office but was paid through the Crown Agents. Subsequently, this was rubber stamped. Later, the Public Service Commission employed these individuals as executive officers. Mr. Caines, I understand, was a P.N.C. activist in London. He did not have the minimum qualification of G.C.E. for entry into the Public Service.

I am not referring to any particular Member of any Commission. I am referring to the Commission as a whole, from what you have just read, and apart from that, I have already earlier on today pointed out that the Hon. Leader of the House is not acting by convention, according to what you have just said. Sir, you have said we must act according to convention, but where are the conventions in this House being observed when it comes to Motions and Questions? Will the Hon. Leader of the House fix a date next week so that we can discuss this matter by Motion? I will put a Motion right now and then I will stop.

I have had to complain to you time and again. You say your hands are tied, you cannot put Questions and Motions on the Order Paper, and if the House is adjourned, you cannot summon it. You tell me all of this and the Hon. Leader of the House refuses to call meetings to discuss Motions. If this practice is continued, I am going to continue to speak here and you can rule me out of order. I am prepared to observe all the rules, the conventions, etc. I do not want to disobey them or your Ruling. I make my position clear. We will continue to speak if the Government continues to behave in the manner in which it is behaving.

The Prime Minister and I discussed this matter. The Prime Minister made a statement in the House that the Parliament will meet on Wednesdays, and the Government is not allowing the Parliament to meet on Wednesdays. Why meet and waste time again? Sir, you are knocking your head against the sea wall. I was not casting any aspersions on the individuals on the Commission. I was talking about the Commission.

One must be allowed to make general observations. I am not saying this individual or that individual, who cannot answer here. I am talking generally about how this was done. I should like to know who is responsible, whether collectively. These people are not answering. I wrote to the Secretary but I have not got even an acknowledgement. What recourse do we have? You do not hear from the people concerned. You do not get a Motion put on the Order Paper. How is the public to know?

To continue, I have said that Mr. Caines did not have the minimum qualification for entry into the Public Service, but he was appointed subsequently by the Public Service Commission as Executive Officer. Mr. Haynes was appointed as Chief Executive Officer.

I am coming to that. The Chief Executive Officer is the position equivalent to the position of Second Secretary, and my understanding is that to become a Second Secretary virtually requires the qualification of a graduate of a University. Mr. Haynes does not have such a qualification but he is appointed to this post. What is even more alarming is that the High Commission Office in London is not only involved in doing Government work, diplomatic work, but P.N.C. work. A letter sent out by Mr. Hamilton Green, Secretary of the P.N.C., stated that Mr. Haynes can be contacted as regards applications for membership and so forth and so on. I sent a photo static copy to the Minister of External Affairs, but as I said, no reply.

Is this what we are paying all these salaries for? The vote for External Affairs has jumped from \$ ½ million in 1966 to \$3 million this year, and every year we see additional expenditure. I should like to know whether any action has been taken to discipline Mr. Haynes, has any inquiry been conducted to find out why it is Mr. Haynes is carrying out P.N.C. activities through the High Commission Office and while he is a Public Officer attached to the High Commission. These are questions that must be answered, but perhaps they are too embarrassing. This is why there is no answer from the Public Service Commission or the Minister of External Affairs. This is why we see such things as we had the other day about the appointment of a former High Commissioner, Sir Lionel Luckhoo, at the London High Commission...

All right, I will come to that at External Affairs. I will take it at the appropriate time. I see your point. But since I was dealing with the meanderings going on at the London High Commission I thought I could have raised the question about Mr. Lionel Luckhoo at the same time. Anyway, as you said I can deal with it at the appropriate time. But I should like the Minister responsible for this Head to say whether the Public Service Commission has made an enquiry into the conduct of Mr. Haynes, whether the Minister is aware of these irregularities in the appointment of Caines and Haynes by the Public Service Commission and whether he proposes to do anything about it.

Sir, I did not mention mainly the question of distribution of literature. I am talking about the question of membership where a letter from the Sec-

retary of P.N.C. clearly stated that Mr. Haynes can be contacted at the London Office in connection with this kind of activity. I am asking whether any investigation has been carried out. I wrote to the Minister of External Affairs telling him of the matters in detail. I sent him photo static copies of all the documents. I shall send them to the Minister of Finance. I was going to speak on Item 16.

I am sorry the Minister of State is not here. I was hoping that he would have been here to answer some questions as regards these matters concerning expenditure by this Ministry. I do not mind. I should like to speak on Item 18. I will raise both together. I was raising the point about Sir Lionel Luckhoo a moment ago and you suggested that I raised it at the appropriate time. I hope that the Minister of Finance will be in a position to tell us about the details because this is not only about posting but it has to do with finances no doubt, or perhaps it was done gratis to the Government and people of Guyana. I should like to know when Sir Lionel was appointed to the London High Commission this year; I wish to know also whether this appointment continues? Or has it come to an end?

Sir, I do not know whether these questions would be answered next year or whenever. Perhaps the Minister will be in a position to answer them now. Probably the Minister will tell us also what functions Sir Lionel performed for the Government of Guyana when he was posted to the Guyana High Commission in London this year.

Well, I asked that before, whether the appointment is continuing or whether it has come to an end. I should also like to raise a matter of policy and this is in connection with the recognition of Cuba and the posting of an Ambassador to Cuba. As I said I am asking these questions again because I do not know when those questions will see the light of day. You know very well many things appear on the Notice Paper and they never appear on the Order Paper.

I have not accused you at all. I am merely taking this opportunity to raise these points because I anticipate they will never be answered positively. I know that on certain occasions the Government pleaded lack of money for posting other Ambassadors abroad. But, Sir, the whole question of the Government's commitment has been and this was emphasized in the Budget Statement earlier this year that one of the cardinal things of Government's policy is Caribbean integration. From time to time Government spokesmen have said when they speak of the Caribbean they do not only mean the British Commonwealth Caribbean, they mean countries which are of French, Dutch or Spanish origin in this area.

If this is so, especially since Cuba is a socialist country and this Government professes to be socialist, since 1970 we were told a trade mission will be going to Cuba that has not materialized, we wonder what is the policy with respect to having closer relations with this Caribbean territory.

Recently, we saw where the Government entered into diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic and I think our High Commissioner in

Jamaica has been accredited to the Dominican Republic. May I ask by what yardstick does this Government recognize the Dominican Republic and fail to do so in the case of Cuba? I know that at one time the Prime Minister after coming back from the United States, I believe it was in 1965, said that after seeing and hearing about all the circumstances, he understood that the Americans had justification for landing their troops in the Dominican Republic. But we know those who are following international affairs know that the present regime in the Dominican Republic is a regime which is a successor to the dictatorship of Trujillo, a successor which has been put in office through American bayonets.

American troops landed and expelled the Government which previously had come into office at a democratic election. I refer to the election of Juan Bosch. I ask, by what yardstick? Because, if anything at all, one can say that the present regime in the Dominican Republic by no stretch of imagination can be called socialist, or anti-imperialist, or nonaligned. It does not pretend to be. The present President was one of the generals under the hated dictator Trujillo, who ruled that country with an iron hand for 30 years. This Government recognizes that regime, this Government which claims to be socialist but refuses to have relations with Cuba. Where is the trade mission, which we heard about since 1970, which was to go to Cuba? Why has there been no diplomatic representation even on a nonresidential basis? My friend is saying *sotto voce*: "Carifesta". That does not mean anything. If you are not being dictated to by the United States of America as regards choosing your friends, then I can see no justifiable reason, no rational grounds why this Government should not recognize Cuba, have trade relations with Cuba, etc. I hope some definite answer will be given to this question.

As regards Item 18, I see a new Item, Contribution to South West Africa People's Organisation, a contribution of \$5,000. I have no objection to this contribution, poor as we are, to make a contribution to liberation movements. Guyana must have an internationalist position of anti-colonialism, anti-neocolonialism, and anti-imperialism but we call for a position of consistency. Why is it that we choose to help some and refuse to help others? What is the basis? What is the yardstick?

Some time ago when the Government decided to grant \$50,000, it also said it would give sanctuary to African freedom fighters in this country. We know right across our borders many people are tortured including nuns, people who need asylum here in Guyana. Here is a case where sanctuary and asylum can mean something. Offering sanctuary to Africans all the way in Guyana, I am not saying it means nothing, but in practical terms it does not mean very much. Those people want contiguous territory from their base of operations, either in Tanzania, Zambia, Guinea or some other progressive country in Africa which is adjoining the colonialist states or the fascist states like Rhodesia and South Africa. But the Government of Guyana would not make a categorical statement that sanctuary will be given



to freedom fighters in Brazil. Why is it if you are great freedom fighters as you want to make the world to believe and how is it you are afraid to do a simple humanitarian act? This is what international solidarity means.

What about Vietnam? On Vietnam they choose to remain quiet. Not a word from the Government of Guyana. The Vietnamese want help, financial and otherwise. The Government of Guyana even if it does not want to give any money at least, it can add a voice. This is an act of solidarity too. Today we hear...

Do you mean for the presence of that body? Yes, the records of that meeting indicate that when Mrs. Gandhi introduced Madame Bindh, there was a standing ovation; a very forceful resolution was passed at that meeting condemning United States aggression in Vietnam. But what do we do except pass resolutions? The United Nations Secretary-General now is talking about the bombing of dykes. Last year when I went to Hanoi, in the high rains I saw the flood waters rising in the Red River, and I saw how much labour it had to take simply to elevate the dams a little bit with boulders and other things.

And these criminals, the Americans, are today bombing civilians, deliberately they are blowing up dikes, mining ports and harbours. For less than this, the Germans, the Italians and the Japanese were charged and tried as war criminals. Some who pretended that they did not give the order to kill people, nevertheless, had to accept responsibility. Why is the Government afraid to speak out?

Here is a moment when all those who say they are genuinely nonaligned, all those who say that they are fighting against colonialism and imperialism and no doubt this is the rationale behind this grand fair, surely they should add their voice. All African Movements, S.W.A.P.O. included, all the Liberation Movements in Africa I have heard them at many conferences, all speak very strongly about Vietnam, and they take a strong position about Vietnam. Why is it the Guyana Government and the P.N.C. are only supporting Liberation Movements in Africa and refuse to support other Liberation Movements outside?

Is it a question of money? Because at one time I heard it said that the other Movements are getting support from elsewhere and the Africans are getting none. If it is a question of money only, what about a statement? What about a Resolution in the House? What about the whole House signing a petition condemning American aggression? They would not sign. Yet we see later on in another Financial Paper where we are going to spend a quarter of a million dollars for the Non-Aligned Conference. A big jamboree! But to what end. Yet they would like the world to feel that Guyana is one of the progressive nonaligned countries.

Sir, Fidel Castro has said that every revolutionary would be judged by his position on Vietnam. Angela Davis, and long before the current wave of anti-administration opinion developed in America, there was Martin Luther King, and there was Mohammed Ali – all speaking very strongly on

Vietnam. How do we make a separation between African Liberation Movements and the main front of anti-imperialist struggle today which is supported by all the African Liberation movements and strongly supported too? When I was in Hanoi I met many African delegations there, some were from the Portuguese colonies. The black people in the United States speak strongly on behalf of the Vietnamese people. They fight against their own Government. So strong is American public opinion today on the Vietnam question that the Democratic Party machine was defeated in the nomination of its candidate for the forthcoming elections. Mac Govern was able to win the nomination.

Sir, in view of all this evidence, the Guyana Government remains silent. Whom is the Government trying to fool? I hope that Members on the Government side are genuine. They say we are always attacking them; we are always very critical, let them prove their bona fides – anti-colonialism, anti-neocolonialism, anti-imperialism, pro-socialist. Let them prove it by simple measures. It is not what you say; it is what you do that counts. Saying is very easy and very cheap. We are asking what is the help being given by the Government of Guyana to the freedom struggle in Vietnam. What assistance the Guyana Government is giving to the people who are continuing the struggle against American imperialism in this hemisphere – I mean the Cuban people? The stand that Guyana takes on these fundamental questions will really indicate whether it is truly nonaligned and whether it is genuinely fighting on behalf of those who are oppressed.

I should like to make a pertinent observation on the comment made by the Minister. He referred to an officer. I should like to tell you, Sir, and the House that it seems that the practice by the Ministry of Home Affairs is that no officer will say, *“Please refer to the Minister”*, but now we come to the House, the Minister says, *“Please refer to the officer”*. You see what is happening here, Sir? It is all nonsense.

I wonder if the Minister will tell us why it is retrenchment is taking place at the Hosororo Agricultural Station and also the Wauna Land Settlement Scheme in the North West District. We are told that agriculture is to be emphasized in the Government’s continuing programme and the thrust will be in the Interior areas. It seems very contradictory to me to find those statements being made and having to reconcile that with retrenchment of workers at Government Agricultural Stations. Perhaps the Minister will be kind enough to tell us why these things are happening.

Will the Minister say whether it is true or not that persons who were working full-time were put on part-time work and others who were working part-time have been retrenched at the Hosororo Agricultural Station? If the Minister is correct in what he is saying one would assume that the Central Agricultural Station at Hosororo will have more work to do and not less in terms of plant propagation, in terms of developing seeds and other activities. In other words, an expansion of agriculture instead of a cutting back. These people are not the skilled kind of labour my friend is

talking about. In any Scheme you must have a certain number of unskilled labourers and that is where the cutting down is taking place. There are foremen in a gang but there are no men to work.

I should like to speak on Items 33 and 35. Sir, I should like the Hon. Minister to give us specific answers to these questions which I propose to ask which is of great concern to the country at the present time. First of all, with respect to the Alumina Plant. We were told a few weeks ago that the Plant was to be closed for 3 weeks. Sir, we do not have opportunities to ask the Minister some of these very pertinent and important questions these days.

Item 35; firstly I will refer to one matter dealing with item 34 since it deals with forestry. Not too long ago I read where there was a great deal of difficulties at the Timber Seasoning Plant especially since it was suffering a shortage of logs and rough lumber. I wonder what the Government is doing about this question because here is a unit which can provide employment to Guyanese and also not only directly here in Georgetown, but in the Interior, in the North West District. For instance, in the Barama Mouth a sawmill was closed which was providing a great deal of employment to people there, not only in the sawmill but in the logging industry. That area is now a gravely depressed one.

It seems to me that the Government should consider acquiring that sawmill in the same way it did the assets of Guyana Timbers Ltd., after C.D.C. decided to close down. When I was in the North West recently, it came to my attention that one individual had to transport logs for nearly 200 miles and in the process of transporting these logs to reach a destination in Aruka near to Mabaruma, he lost 35 logs on the way. It took him over two weeks to get the logs down to that area. Apart from the establishment of a mill and possibly logging operations, there is the question of establishing perhaps a logging pool, which can purchase logs from the people on the spot so they do not have the problem of transporting logs far distances and also being given whatever prices one or two saw millers, who are now operating, choose to give. This would help not only the industry but also the employment situation generally and particularly the very depressed and stagnant situation now in that area.

Well Sir, as you know, I appreciate you are tolerant and sometimes the Ministers are not aware, and even if they are, some of the officers may know but maybe the Minister ... On Item 35, I see here three posts of geologist and assistant geologist. I see also a post of geophysicist. Not too long ago, I read where we are getting some kind of United Nations assistance on mineral oil exploration. I do not know what it is for. Perhaps the Minister will tell this House what has so far happened during the last seven years. We had companies which were given leases for the offshore areas. How far have we got on this question of oil? Are we any further today than we were, say in 1964 or before 1964?

I recall that Soviet geologists, who had come here, had said there were

definite indications of oil and they had recommended a programme of testing which, if it had been carried out by the Government, no doubt, we would be more or less in a position to say specifically where the oil is to be found. This was my understanding of the tests which were then recommended by the Soviet geologists. I understand that would have taken seven years. Well, we had more than seven years which have passed and it seems to me we are back at square one where we started out.

Since we are at this Head, minerals and geologists, etc., perhaps the Hon. Minister will tell us about the market for alumina, the plant which was closed down for three weeks, we would like to know how long this plant will be closed and how soon it is expected that the workers will resume work in this plant.

## Financial Paper No. 3 of 1972: 31<sup>st</sup> July, 1972

**Dr. Jagan:** I wonder if the Hon. Prime Minister will tell us whether it is true that a large quantity of equipment was held up by the Customs, equipment which pertains to the telephone tapping, whether this is part of that kind of equipment that he is talking about, which is not in the public interest to disclose.

I note that the Hon. Minister of Information is asking for an additional sum of \$50,000. I do not know what this amount will be used for, whether it is for additional publications. This Ministry has grown quite significantly from a sum of less than \$¼ million in 1964 to nearly \$1 million and it seems to me since a Ministry of Information has been created, this Ministry keeps growing and growing. I suppose this is the rationale of having any separate Ministry. It must have its own staff to justify its existence, put out a great deal of materials, whether in literature or films etc., in order to justify its existence.

I am not sure whether this amount will be part of the payment for the tent which is to be brought from the United States of America to be placed over the Cultural Centre, rental including the cost of experts, cost of transportation, etc. Perhaps the Hon. Minister of Information will tell us why is it that this country had to go through the expenditure of having to import a temporary tent for the Cultural Centre building. He should also explain to us why it is necessary to have this expenditure under Items 2 and 3.

I think I heard over the radio that films are being produced to show the cooperation of the people of Guyana backing the Government in different ways, putting their shoulders behind the wheel, and so on. We know a great deal of this is sheer propaganda and a large amount of the taxpayers' money is being used simply for propaganda purposes. But on basic questions such as cooperation of all the ethnic groups in this country, such as support from the various sections of the community, one finds that very little is done in order to win over this kind of support. We have instead police methods, administrative methods, judicial methods, in the process of coercion for the Government to achieve its purposes. It is disgraceful that on top of all of those methods the taxpayers have to pay for a great deal of propaganda work which is only meant to deceive.

What has happened? Why has the Government not moved to the setting up of fair employment measures in Guyana so that all these various communities in Guyana are dealt with squarely? When we have things like that done, then we do not have to produce films to fool people that there is racial harmony, and there is national cooperation. These are the fundamental questions which will show whether or not there is genuine cooperation. When we see organizations such as the Rice Producers' Association, which represents the farmers in the country, playing a meaningful

part as it did formerly in the Rice Marketing Board, when we see the Government stop using the State machinery for the purpose of trying to control here, there, and everywhere, when steps are taken in the sugar industry on the question of recognition of a union which represents the majority of the people, that will be something.

What do we find? End of scene one: the police eject on orders from the Ministry; the police are ejecting the Secretary of the Maha Sabha; then registrars and judges are manipulating the whole judicial process in order to throw out those who have the confidence of the Hindu community and to put others in their place.

A judge was given an appointment, and he is told by another letter that the appointment has been revoked. Subsequently, a decision is made. Is this the way we are going to run Guyana to achieve national unity? Or we are mainly trying to fool the nation by a spending over \$1 million a year when the same job can be done for less than a quarter. What attempt has been made to reconcile the question of the Immigration Fund so far as one section of the community is concerned? A small sum of money. But it was mainly in keeping with the methods of the Government to bulldoze everything without trying to see how it can meet, after consultation, at least half way, some of the wishes of those who are opposed to it. It is for this reason I object very strenuously to these expenditures which this country cannot afford.

Many times I try to speak to the Minister of Health, I cannot get her. The Permanent Secretary of her Ministry tells me that the vote for sending people abroad who cannot get medical treatment in this country has been exhausted. This vote has been exhausted at the middle of the year, yet there is no money. There is a Contingencies Fund – why it cannot be voted? The Government votes from the Contingencies Fund for all these expenditures. As I said, when you try to get in touch with the Minister you cannot reach her, she is always busy.

But these are essential services. The Government cannot afford to buy equipment and other things necessary to properly staff the P.H.G.; therefore people have to go to Venezuela, they have to go to Jamaica, to the United Kingdom, and elsewhere for medical treatment. Two cases came to me. These people have to depend on charity. Why is it some of this money cannot be used for that purpose?

The Members of the Government are heartless, they do not care. I do not know how the Government intends to make the small man a real man when for instance at Quebama a launch, the "*Aracoona*", which is a gift has been laid up for over two years. No effect is being made to repair this launch. I refer to these things because it pains me to see how the Government is squandering the public money and when it comes to basic essentials it does not have money. The Members of this Government cannot be found, they cannot be seen. Let the Minister tell us what exactly these amounts are to be used for. Why is it necessary to squander the public's

money at this time?

Items 1, 3 and 4; Sir, I note here the sum of \$216,050, "*to meet expenses in connection with the Conference of Non-Aligned Ministers.*" Will the Minister of State tell us whether this is the final amount which this country will have to bear or this is merely, as we see with so many estimates, just a little bite and then later on, as they keep spending money, we will have to pour out more? I should like the Minister to tell this House how much this Conference is likely to cost this country. I say this because at one point I gathered information that this was not going to cost us very much, that many of the nations which are participating will be footing and meeting their own bills.

I may have misread this, but I notice too that at a press conference which was given by the Minister it was stated that the Government will make a profit of about \$400,000 from the sale of motor cars, or if not the Government, somebody may be who is responsible for this Conference. I should like to get this very clear, whether that profit which was anticipated will be accruing to some Committee or the other which was planning for this Conference and whether expenses which we are now asked to vote will come out of that revenue. Will the Minister of State tell us how this profit will be made? Whether the cars will be entering the country duty-free, whether they belong to the nations which were participating? If so, whether, after they are sold, they will be sold without duty added. I wish he would also tell us whether the \$400,000 is really income from one pocket of the Government to another pocket. I should like this to be clarified because it seems to me that the cars are coming in duty-free and sold later on with duty added, then that seems to be where the profit will be made.

I should like to know whether all this expenditure also is going to be part of the payment for flying down motorcycles all the way from Japan. If we were managing things so properly how is it that those who are managing the affairs did not anticipate that we needed so many motorcycles to be used by outriders and what not for this Conference, and if so, why were they not ordered in good time so that expenditure would have been saved to the taxpayers of this country? That must have cost this country a tidy sum.

I presume that this expenditure is not really for expenses for structural work. Perhaps the Minister will tell us what expenses are involved under this Head and whether works expenditure is excluded, that is, expenditure on putting partitions in buildings and other expenditure of a works nature, whether that is coming in a separate budget, or whether that is coming under expenses for the conference as a whole. It would have been better to put all together so that in the end we would know how much this Conference is costing the taxpayers of Guyana.

I wonder if I can say a word which I missed. While we are dealing here with quantum, I would have hoped that the Minister would have come to this House and in qualitative terms tell us what line the Government – I am not concerned mainly with the money – will take on the whole question of

foreign policy, international affairs, etc. For instance, we have tabled a Motion on Vietnam. I understand that today it has been put on the Notice Paper. Would the Hon. Minister indicate to the House whether we will have, before the Non-Aligned Conference, a debate in this House as to the likely line that the Government proposes to take at this Conference? If this is not proposed, perhaps the Minister will tell us now what is going to be the Government's position on such vital questions as Vietnam, the aggression of United States imperialism against the Vietnamese people, the serious bombings, the blockade which is against international law, and mining of harbours.

This is the field of the Hon. Minister and I hope that he will tell us something. Government has been silent on these issues. The last Conference which we attended at Lusaka took a very strong position on Vietnam. What has the Government done on this issue, since I presume it assented to this Resolution? In the Motion, notice of which I have given, I suggested that the Guyana Government should take the lead in proposing to this Conference that the United States should be branded as an aggressor, that Nixon and company should be regarded as war criminals in the same way that the fascists, the Germans, the Italians and the Japanese, were regarded at the Nuremberg trials.

I should also like to know whether the Guyana Government, in keeping with its general attitude towards Caribbean unity and integration, will propose that the blockade, economic aggression against the Republic of Cuba by the United States should be broken, that a strong Resolution should be taken at the Non-Aligned Conference urging the breaking of the blockade by the Third World countries, the nonaligned countries and the recognition, diplomatic and otherwise of the People's Republic of Cuba. These are important questions. Otherwise we would have been wasting money to have only a big show in Guyana. If the Guyanese position is going to be sound, if the Guyanese position is going to help in carrying this body forward to a progressive position, then it can justify this expenditure and even more.

I fear that all we are going to have here is a circus, a lot of talk, a lot of pious Resolutions passed, as happened in Zambia, and possibly no action taken. I agree with Resolutions, they are good. As somebody said, Resolutions are the language of the poets, the dreamers; action comes later. It is a pity that Resolutions passed at the Non-Aligned Conference in Zambia, good ones, passed by the Guyana Government that they were going to take a lead to force the others – have so far led to nothing. When we look at some of the people who are coming as invitees – a long list including Brazil, Dominican Republic and so on, when we see a long list of the people who are going to be invited as observers we wonder what the Non-Aligned ideology has come to. Is Brazil a nonaligned country? Is the Dominican Republic a nonaligned country? I do not have the list with all the names.

Some of the others are coming from the Latin American area. Some of



these countries will be here – like Malaysia, like Indonesia! Indonesian imperialism, American imperialism helped to boot out one of the founders of nonalignment, Sukarno. And they set up a Puppet State there. The British, after the war, went back to Malaya in the same way as the Dutch went to Indonesia and the French to Indo-China to re impose colonialism, to fight against those patriots who were decorated after the war. Chin Peng was decorated in the streets of London; he was given a medal of honour, but soon after the war he was hunted as a terrorist with \$30,000 on his head, dead or alive. These are the people who then were not talking about nonalignment. These are the people who were not at the Bandung Conference. Today they play a big role in this organization. Some of the worst military dictatorships, puppets of imperialism in Latin America, are going to be observers at this Non-Aligned Conference.

Sir, not only we have said this, but this is what the founding members felt about the concept of nonalignment. They did not want to be sucked into the Cold War treaties, Seato, Baghdad Pact, etc. Many of them were socialist inclined, they were not Marxists or communists, but because they did not want to be sucked in by the Cold War strategies in the West they formed a new political entity. But emphasis was always, from the very beginning, against colonialism, against neocolonialism, against imperialism. They removed Sukarno, they removed Nkrumah, and they tried to break Nasser in 1956. These were the founders of nonalignment.

Now you have a mixed bag. Okay, let us have a mixed bag, but let the Guyana Government – we will back them – take a lead in pressing them forward. But has the Guyana Government taken a lead? Even the Resolution passed at Lusaka and Vietnam, the Government was afraid to say anything about it.

Others – Peru, which does not claim to be a socialist Government, has entered into diplomatic relations with Cuba. What about this so-called anti-imperialist pro-socialist Government?

There are the valid questions which you must answer and then we can say, *“Well done. Okay, spend the money. Let us have the people here in Guyana”*. Guyana, by taking a forward position, will be able to influence some of the reactionary ones and some of the fascist states to go forward. Then we can justify the expenditure.

I fear if this is not done, if Guyana does not take a position - a progressive position, then we will end up as the last Conference in Santiago, U.N.C.T.A.D., because you have such a mixed bag. Declarations are made, endless debates, but in the finality nothing tangible. We do not want to have Conferences merely for the sake of having Conferences. This is a poor country and we cannot afford to waste money if something is not going to materialize out of those expenditures. I am not saying you must be like a shopkeeper and every time you spend money you want to see the result. I am not suggesting that by any means. I am saying that we must not throw away money if results which we expect will not be forthcoming.

My view is that the nonaligned group of nations came into being in a particular historical period and perhaps for justifiable reasons with a firm position, ideological political position – firm.

Today, the Cold War position is not as acute as it was then, which brought into existence the nonaligned nations and if, therefore, since the environmental factors have changed for the coming into being of nonalignment, and if nonalignment today will not have the categorical imperative that it then had, and the firm stance it took, if today it is watered down by having quite a lot of reactionary states, even some fascist states like Brazil, then I say that like U.N.C.T.A.D., the Non-Aligned Conference will not achieve very much except to fall into the trap of becoming an instrument of imperialism.

The Prime Minister went to the Prime Ministers' Conference and took the line, "*we must beware of the two super powers.*" The Minister of State went to Kuala Lumpur and voiced there not only the same sentiments of the Prime Minister two years before, but even of the Prime Minister of Malaysia, who said the same thing. "*We must beware of the super powers.*" Increasingly, at the United Nations, politics are becoming polarized, the socialist states and the Third World materialized on one side so much so that in the Committee of Twenty Four, the United States and Britain walked out. Is it the objective of the imperialists today, in their new strategies and tactics, to use those who call themselves the Guyana Government?

Those of us, who see the unity of economic and politics, see the need for an anti-imperialist economic planning strategy. I saw where the Hon. Minister of the Mines and Forests opened some conference which had to do with economic development. No matter where you go today, the emphasis is on economics. But economics cannot be divorced from politics and this position, Sir, must be made clear. Otherwise, we will fall into the trap of maintaining the status quo while we make pious statements that we are being oppressed, we are getting poorer and poorer because of the metropolitan countries, and so on and so forth, while we keep shouting, "*beware of the super powers*", equating qualitative difference that the United States of America is imperialist and the Soviet Union is socialist. Without making that distinction we fall into the trap, set no doubt by the imperialists in order to keep the Third World countries, the nonaligned countries as dependencies on them, albeit in a new form as we see today in Latin America.

I know the facility with which the Hon. Minister of State is capable of using the English language. He tries to make it appear that we on this side of the House are being obstructive. We are not against Amerindians being brought to build a structure. What we question is whether such a structure is worth \$60,000 to the taxpayers of Guyana. Maybe the Minister of Works should say how it cost \$60,000 to build it. We are talking at cross purposes. Tell the Hon. Minister of Works to answer if it is not true. The Hon. Minister told us that I have not been informed by my friends...

Sir, for the benefit of the Hon. Minister and the House, I do not have to

get word from the Soviet Union what Breshnev says. For his information the Soviet Union has always been in favour of nonalignment, from the time it started. Let the Minister tell us what is the American stand on nonalignment. I was in Washington in 1961 when the Non-Aligned Conference was meeting in Belgrade, when Washington condemned the Non-Aligned Conference for not going against the Soviet Union.

The Americans were unhappy with Sukarno because he nationalised the companies of the Dutch. They were unhappy that cooperation was developing between the Soviet Union, the socialist world, Indonesia and Ghana, etc. The Hon. Minister has quoted us telegrams and communique. Let him read from the official record of the No. 1 adviser to Kennedy, Schlessinger. Let him tell us what Kennedy's views were towards Nkrumah and nonalignment. I crave your protection, Sir. All the troubles in Indo-China, in Laos and Cambodia when the British were trying to persuade the Americans to accept nonalignment, the Americans went against it. It is written in that same book *A Thousand Days, John F. Kennedy in the White House* by the No. 1 Adviser.

We have plenty of time in this House. This is what this House is here for. I should like to put the records straight, that the House is being misinformed by the Minister of State. The socialist world position is consistent. It is consistent in the sense that it cooperated with the nonaligned world and as time went on it had to come to the rescue of those who were the initiators of the whole concept of nonalignment. After India signed the 20 year treaty of friendship with the Soviet Union, propagandists from America, etc., were saying that India was not nonaligned. Look at the friendship treaty. But the whole drama of the India/Pakistan struggle the alignments of Pakistan to Seato and the Baghdad Pact and the Western imperialist allies, the whole Resolution of India's problems of nonalignment, a nonaligned position, which would have been subverted with ten million refugees on our backs, the whole question of Bangladesh, democracy in a Third world country was resolved as a result of the support and close alliance with the Soviet Union. The Guyana Government did not say a word on the whole question of Bangladesh, Pakistan and India. Why did it not? Sir, the Members of the Government come to us and talk about generalities of the Third World. They talk about the rich and the poor. They talk about super powers but these are generalizations because the Third World has anti-imperialist states, it has fascist states; it has pro-imperialist states. We make a distinction between those who align themselves with imperialism and against imperialism, and those who, like this Government, which says one thing that it is against imperialism and when confrontation comes in any part of the world does not say a word. The socialist world in my view...

Obviously I should like the Hon. Minister to say on our behalf, welcome. I want to repeat, we make a qualitative difference between anti-imperialist States such as Tanzania, such as Cuba, Guinea, in the Third World, such as Chile, such as Peru and India. India spoke out very strongly

on the Vietnam question. Why did the Guyana Government not take a similar position? India does not go about equating the two super powers in the same breath as our colleagues are doing here. We do not only want to create another mini-United Nations, a broad organization simply for talking. We want in the Third World of course, cooperation, but meaningful cooperation which will mean something. We must show our alignment with the progressive anti-imperialist states in the Third World. But I say, the Government is not fooling the Guyanese people with all this jazz and generalizations.

We must cooperate. The same sort of thing caused the watering down of the O.A.U. At first the Casablanca group was going ahead making big strides. They came together, for a long while they were stagnated because of the reactionary bloc. Let us face facts, if you want to be a pressure group on the fundamental international issues of today. The nonaligned countries have not been able to have a significant say, whether it is Middle East, Vietnam or Africa, they have not been able to do anything. For several reasons. Because they will never be able to take a strong position on any fundamental question which concerns imperialism. Because in any state of struggle whether it is of the Middle East, Israel and the Arab countries, whether it is Africa the issues are: are you for or against imperialism, neocolonialism, and colonialism? This is what it is.

Come into the theatre in this hemisphere; with Cuba, with Chile, you see economic aggression. How do you expect to have a wide all embracing thing when, for instance, Brazil is the gendarme, the subagent of American imperialism in this hemisphere? How do you expect it in groupings such as this, amorphous – with all these people? It means that if you do not have a firm ideological position, then the Non-Aligned Conference will not have the political impact which it should have, if we are to justify the expense and time and so forth. This is my main point and I hope it is not missed, because we do not only want just to talk in terms which can be quoted in the newspapers and bandied around. We want to talk in clear terms.

I have been reading some of the documents, I have been reading some of the background information, and even among some of the major non-aligned countries Egypt, India, Yugoslavia, there have been division about whether they should continue at some precise time, whether they should have the Conference or not, because they have been examining the whole question of the impact of the nonaligned world on fundamental questions which plague the world in different theatres. Therefore, that is why I say the Guyana Government must take a lead. As Dr. Raul Rao said at the last Conference, nonalignment can mean nothing unless it takes the position against colonialism, neocolonialism and imperialism. This is not only what Dr. Rao said. This is what is practised in Cuba, and this is what we are saying. If the Guyana Government takes that position we will bless it, we will allow the Government to spend the money and so on.

I repeat, today in the ideological warfare which is going on, the imperialists are using their friends, some consciously, others unconsciously, to talk in generalities, like super powers, like rich and poor, developed and underdeveloped, classifying the developed socialist world with the developed capitalist world without making any fundamental qualifications. And they even have some of our journalists parroting the same thing. They mislead the people by these generalizations. The time has come when we must not only talk, but talk in precise terms and we must practice what we preach. In this respect, the Cubans are consistent but the Guyana Government is not consistent. And until it shows this consistency in what it says and what it does, we will continue to talk, to vote, to march, to demonstrate.

Item 3, I have already made an observation about the cost of publications, the amount of propaganda material which is being put out by this Government which, in the end, I cannot see bearing much fruit. Only the other day I say a supplement in the *New Commonwealth*, a blue Tory magazine in the United Kingdom. I am sure that must have cost us a lot of money to put out that supplement. I know that for any Government, propaganda is a very important question but there is a limit to what a poor country can afford.

We have a radio station, we do not know what are the accounts for this, how much the Government has to spend for propaganda there. I recall once raising an objection to a programme which was put out nightly by Garner Ted Armstrong, and I was told that the radio station could not remove that hogwash because of the big revenue it was receiving, about \$5,000 a month from the outfit. So that if we do not lose money because we have to accept subsidies, so to speak, from the Garner Ted Armstrong outfit, it means that we are confusing, brainwashing, misinforming the Guyanese people about what the world is all about, what historical processes are, what is meant by socialism? That is one.

We have the *Chronicle* now which, I am sure, is also costing taxpayers of this country a great deal of money. Is it still necessary to have all these multifarious publications put out by the Ministry of Information? I have alluded to the fact that this Ministry is spending about \$1 million a year. This money can be more beneficially utilized by diverting it into productive purposes. By productive I mean instructional things, the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Health, other places, where you can impart education, knowledge of a technical nature, things which are required in a country like this. But a of the publication material put out by this Government is propagandist in nature, and I say we cannot afford this huge amount of money. It is wasteful expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

Item 4, this Item here really gives the – I do not want to use the word, “lie”, because I understand the world is taboo here – falsehood to the Government's often repeated statements of the importance of agriculture in our economy and the fact that we are doing so well to feed ourselves. This

year, not too long ago, a news item indicated that we paid last year or we imported last year about \$384,000 worth of Soya bean oil from the United States of America. Last year we voted in this House \$486,000, I believe, for the payment of coconut oil, and I presume copra also, imported from the West Indies in 1970 and 1971. And now we have another sum of \$307,000 to meet the cost of subsidy with respect to 1,700 tons of copra raw oil imported from Carifta countries.

We were just told how popular the Prime Minister is, that they are demanding his photographs. I wonder when last the Prime Minister has gone to the mouth of the Pomeroon where they are growing coconuts and producing copra. If he had been there, they would have chased him. What is the position, why is it we have to import, we have to spend so much money to import soya bean oil, coconut oil, and copra into a country like Guyana, which was suppose to become, under the whole Scheme of Carifta, the bread basket of the West Indies? We cannot meet our own requirements must less take advantage of the deficiency in edible oil production in the West Indies. This is because of the bankruptcy in the Government's policy.

Last week, the Deputy Prime Minister regaled us about African palm oil. Okay, nobody says you must not grow African palm oil, but what about coconut? The P.P.P. Government had a \$60 crop bonus for coconuts. This was abandoned by this Government. Put in an acre of new land under coconut, you receive \$60. We heard this was being given to P.P.P. supporters. Lot of people in the Pomeroon got these subsidies. Price: 12½, 13½, 14½ cents per pound. Three grades. This was the price in 1964. Meanwhile, the price in the West Indies has gone up to 19¼ cents. How do we expect the farmers in Guyana to continue to produce coconuts to meet the requirements of the people of Guyana when prices have remained unchanged in the last eight years, when the cost of living figure has gone up by more than 26 points? Is it what we are going to do, continue to spend the taxpayers' money to import oil from the West Indies?

At one time an Agricultural Station at Anna Regina was propagating coconut seedlings; that was closed up. I do not understand whether we are going to be called from time to time to pay taxpayers' money to import oil from the United States and from the West Indies when this can be grown here. Let the Minister tell us when will Guyana become self-sufficient in oil. It is a disgrace that this country should continue to have these deficits in oil production. The Minister must tell us whether the Government proposes to increase the price of copra. His colleague the Minister (Mr. Kasim) who is a coconut producer will agree with me – and he does not have to agree with me because this is common sense – that the cost of production has gone up, the cost of living has gone up. These are the factors which cause production of local domestic products outside of sugar to fall. Milk prices are lower than they were in 1964. The farmers in the Mahaica/Mahaicony area were paid 4c less per gallon than obtained in the P.P.P.'s time. Because the farmers made a little protest I understand very quietly

the price was raised to 70c per gallon. From 60 cents in the P.P.P.'s time they dropped it to 56c, and we understand it is now raised to 70c.

What about copra? Does the Government propose to maintain the price at the same level as it was in 1964? Surely if the West Indians are paying 19¼ cents for copra we should actually be paying more because a lot of the coconuts coming from St. Lucia and some of the small islands where wage rates are lower than in Guyana, and if they are paying 19¼ cents for copra the Government should see to it that we pay more. It is better to subsidize our own farmers than to subsidize foreign people. Concerning the importation of soya beans from the United States and the West Indies, I know the Minister will get up and say, "*We are growing palm oil,*" but palm oil trees take years to grow. He must in the meanwhile tell us whether the Government considers it a fair price to pay farmers in certain areas of the country like the Pomeroun Mouth which is a very suitable area – the Hon. Minister knows this – to grow coconuts from which copra is made. There are other areas on the coastal region of the country which are suitable. We are not saying we must not grow soya beans or palm oil and what not. But I do not think it is necessary to abandon coconut. The Government continues to hold the price at the level it was in 1964 and on top of that the farmers told me they are always being robbed, they are being cheated. This is a practice which is known in the rice industry too; farmers are cheated on grades also. Therefore on that basis it cannot be expected that production will increase and it seems that every year we will have to come to this House to ask for another subsidy to pay for coconut oil.

Sir, the Hon. Minister said the Government is not giving incentives in the form of bonuses, it is not giving increases on prices because the Government's method is to help farmers by way of improving drainage. The recent floods at Pomeroun have shown us what has been the result. The statistics are there – from 30 percent allocation of the Development Plan to drainage and irrigation in the 1960-64 plan to 13 percent in their 7 year Plan (1966-72) and even less than half of the sum allocated was spent. What about loans? Go and talk with the Pomeroun farmers. They cannot get loans. How many loans have been given during the last seven years through the Credit Corp for agriculture? The Members of this Government only talk. They are drifting like a boat in a storm; they are from one thing to the other. It needs a concerted and coherent policy. There must be drainage and irrigation. There must be credit for farmers. There must be incentives. There is nothing wrong with it. There must be fair prices. Why should the farmers in the West Indies get 19¼ cents where the cost of production is lower? The Minister does not answer these cold economic facts. He is talking vaguely: "*We are going to help in other ways*". Where? The figures have not shown it. The Drainage and Irrigation Scheme has not shown it. The credits to agriculture have not shown that Government has helped the farmers.

Sir, I rise to ask some information of the Minister of Works, Hydraulics and Supply about this expenditure for twenty houses. I wish to speak on

Items 6 and 7. Sir, I notice that this expenditure is for a mobile sawmill unit. I wonder if the Minister will tell us where it is proposed to operate this sawmill. It is presumable the word "mobile" means it will be going from place to place. I am asking this because on the last occasion when I spoke in this House I mentioned a very distressing situation in the North West District particularly in the Barama Mouth area. The Minister then said that Government did not consider it right and proper to buy a derelict sawmill which had closed down. In view of the fact that we have such a great demand, both actual and potential, for timber – I understand we have secured a market for timber in China – there is a tremendous potential market in the Caribbean which is continuing to import large quantities of timber from North America. If the Government can ban salt fish in Jamaica and no doubt this will be followed in other countries as a *quid pro quo*, being a Carifta Member, we should certainly demand that they should ban all timber which Guyana can produce.

Surely we have been hearing for many years how many excellent species we have in Guyana which, properly treated, properly cured, properly milled, can stand up against any timber from any other part of the world. If this is so, I do not know whether the Government has given consideration to setting up not a mobile unit but sawmills in different areas, because I see the necessity of having units which will be able to take advantage, as I said, of this potential market even in the Caribbean, not to speak of other countries where Guyana woods would certainly be in demand.

I hope the Minister would be able to tell us whether this unit is intended to work some time in the North West area because I understand that it may be going into the Crabwood Creek, Corentyne area. I hold no brief for anyone but in that area there are several sawmills, in Bartica there are several sawmills, I do not know in what other areas this mobile unit will be operating. This is a lot of money here, \$258,000. This is not a capital expenditure. This is only maintenance and operation. I hope this Minister will be able to tell us about the economics of this whole operation and whether a proper feasibility study has been done on this before it was put into operation.

I note the legend indicating that twenty houses were bought; the sum being sought now is \$620,000. I should like to know from the Hon. Minister whether the Government is satisfied that this is a reasonable price for these houses. I do not know what they are, but it seems to me the sum is very high per unit.

I notice the question by one of the Hon. Members in respect of the Government purchasing a building in Brickdam. I understand that this building was valued at \$80,000, the purchase of which was not recommended by two Government engineers, and the Government went ahead and bought it for \$120,000. Is it because this house belongs to the Willems family, who is a big part of the P.N.C. apparatus that this chicanery is going on, and can we assume that such underhand things are going on in Guyana?

It is a disgraceful state of affairs in Guyana. I should like to know from



the Hon. Minister what steps were taken to see whether the Government was getting value for money. Too much money is being spent today. The people are reeling under heavy taxation and high prices in Guyana. Every day we see hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money being thrown down the drain and in many cases I say in dishonest operations, contracts being awarded to Greenland Cooperative Society above the prices at which they could have been given.

The time has come when a thorough investigation on these practices should be carried out. I hope that straightforward answers would be given to these questions because the public is becoming concerned, the public who has to foot the bill. The Government apparently is oblivious of what is happening outside of its own circle. But, Sir, we would like to know. The question was raised a little while ago about the Benab for \$60,000. We are told that this is not true, where did you get the figure from? If it is not true, let the Government say so. And after the delegates have left we will soon find the leaves are rotting and everything else and it would be left as a sore thumb; then the Government would come along and say, "*We do not have money to keep it going.*" As it is finding it does not have money for so many essential things which first priority should be given. Every day we find more and more "*those who have, more shall be given.*" Why is it necessary at this particular time to spend large sums of money? I thought we had Guyanisation. Why are the Guyanese people not given loans to build their own houses? Is this not the policy of the Government? So that these people can go and make bricks, because that seems to be the big thing now – self help and so forth. Let us all get into operation, not only the man at the bottom. This is the trouble in this country today, as a result of which people are having less and less confidence. This is why everyday people are leaving.

Now that the Government is providing some money for emergency works, I wonder if this Minister or the Minister of Agriculture would tell us whether Government proposes to vote any sum of money for relief, aid to the farmers, aid in the form of loans for them to rehabilitate their farms and grants for losses suffered, and so forth. This is important because one Member said that the Government will give plants. This was announced by the Hon. Prime Minister when the floods were in high season but subsequently, when I went to the Pomeroun, I found that the people not only did not have enough plants at the place but also had to pay for them at the Charity Station.

I hope the Minister will tell us something about this important question because while it is important that the Government should do works which will help to prevent the kind of flooding which we had this year, it is important also that those who have lost should be given some form of help. I notice a decision where the Drainage Board was sued and a court decision was made asking that compensation should be paid. Let us hope that those who have suffered elsewhere will not have to follow suit and sue the Drain-

age and Irrigation Board for negligence in maintaining works causing them to lose so substantially.

Item 6, Cultural Centre. I asked earlier about the tent for the Cultural Centre. Will the Minister say whether it is true that this Government will have to pay a sum of \$26,000 or more for rental of the tent and other associated costs, plus no doubt, the cost of transporting this structure in order to make the Cultural Centre useable? Perhaps the Minister will also tell us why it has become necessary to have such a structure brought all the way from the United States at this time when the building should have been completed in good time.

May I ask further whether there is anything in the contract with Greenland Cooperative Society, which I understand, subcontracted to another construction company, for what may be called penalties, that is, if they do not complete the job on time they will have to incur penalties, and whether, in fact, the cost of bringing the tent from the USA will have to be borne by Greenland Cooperative Society.

## Approval of Government's Policy Adumbrated in the President's Address: 20<sup>th</sup> November, 1972

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, the very first paragraph of the President's Address congratulated you on the able manner in which you have guided the Session of this House over the past year, and noted with admiration the firm and impartial manner in which you have presided over and conducted the sittings. I deeply regret on this very first occasion to say how misplaced this statement seems to be. For when I sought today to discuss at the adjournment of the House a very important matter you referred to the Judiciary and you referred to the Ombudsman. The Parliament is the highest forum in this country. The Parliament is the forum which makes laws. The Parliament is the forum wherein talks about all the matters concerning the people of this country, important matters bearing on the liberty and freedom of the people, and you denied me the opportunity to debate an important question.

Sir, I do not want to remind you of the ineffectiveness of the office of the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman himself has on more than one occasion referred to the narrow limits under which he has to work. We know even matters which were referred to him, matters which he has dealt with have not been brought to this House, and these matters have been shelved by the Government. Therefore, Sir, what use is it for you to tell this House that people whose liberties are denied by administrative measures should seek remedy by going to the Ombudsman. What is necessary is for the House and the nation to know not only the double talk but the chicanery that this Government is practising. And it seems to me that you are trying with your high office to shield the Government to prevent this from being stated.

It is not a question of whims and fancies. On one occasion in this House the Prime Minister stated that opportunity will be given for the House to meet on Wednesdays when Motions by the Opposition will be discussed. I will come to that. Those opportunities are never given. Opportunity is provided under the Rules to make Adjournment Motions and to be taken on the ground of relevance, urgency and so forth. Sir, could it be truly said that this is a matter which is to be treated in a manner which it has been treated by you today, that I am doing this mainly because of fancy? Surely, the Speaker knows that a previous attempt was made for this matter to be debated in this House. The Speaker knows that the printing of one newspaper was suspended for three weeks. The Speaker knows that by a telephone conversation which I made today the Ministry of Trade had before it an application since June and on the 25<sup>th</sup> ...

Surely, this House must debate all matters relevant to what is happening in the country whether it is administrative or not. You say that the matter was raised since June that it is not urgent. This is not the question.

Application was made since June. In October the Ministry of Trade said they knew nothing about the application even though there were letters on the file pertaining to that application, even though there were interviews with the Ministry of Trade pertaining to that application. Because at that date the Ministry said it could not have found the application, a copy of the old application was put in. Contact with the Minister of Trade cannot be made. *"He is a busy man"*, the Prime Minister says. Last Friday when I spoke to him, since the 25<sup>th</sup> October, after three weeks, he said the application is approved.

Imagine the chicanery when the application having been approved has its stamp, the date, the 25<sup>th</sup> October! It is a disgrace that a civil servant now turned Minister has to resort to this kind of chicanery. Is it any wonder that the moral standards of the country are at such low ebb today, when Ministers, ex-civil servants, are behaving in this manner? I hope, Sir, in future, in keeping with this first paragraph, you will see the necessity for dealing impartially on matters when they come before you and not be influenced by the Government who does not want these matters to be debated.

Sir, when the Administration acts in a way as I have just pointed out, when it impinges on the fundamental rights of citizens, that is not for the Court, that is for the Parliament, and the Speaker is the guardian of the rights of the people of this country. Please do not look... I think I have said enough.

On the question of the Speech, we heard a great deal from the Hon. Mover and Seconder, but unfortunately we are not wiser than from the President's Address as to the matters which are seriously affecting the people of this country today — the question of unemployment, the question of the rising cost of living, and the question of crime. We hear in this Address nothing about the Government's Ten Year Development Plan. The old Plan which was debated in this House, which was supposed to have performed miracles, was scrapped since the end of 1969. From that time we were told year after year that a new Plan was in the making. Up to now, we have not seen this Plan even though we have so many experts now, even though we have now a Minister of Economic Development and Planning.

What do we hear instead from this Report? We hear that there is to be an action programme for economic development, page 2, paragraph 4, which is to come out an Economic Plan which is to come out at the Non-Aligned Conference. Does this mean that we are going to wait until the Non-Aligned Conference works out an economic plan which this Government will then be guided by? We know that at the time when the Non-Aligned Conference met, there was a Committee sitting on the whole question of economic development and planning. That is public knowledge, and I assume that what is said here has reference to that body. Surely we cannot wait or necessarily take our cue from a broad-based body such as that, for we know that while the Non-Aligned Conference has in it some

states which have a very positive position, there are others who do not want to take a firm anti-imperialist position. There are countries such as Cuba, Chile, Algeria, Tanzania, on the one hand. There are other countries such as Trinidad and Guyana, on the other hand, there are other countries such as Malaysia and Indonesia, on the other hand...what are we hoping to get?

The Seconder of the Motion said, "*let us forget all about the external forces, and let us get to our own path chosen by our own people.*" Surely, by now, so long experienced in the Government, so many experts advising, so much experience in the international community, the Guyana Government should be in a position to make and place before this House a concrete Plan, not, as every day we hear so many millions for this, so many millions for that, without a coordinated whole, but something so that one can see the whole question of financing, the question of income generation, the question of employment opportunities, in detail. All these things are within the capacity of planners today. If the Government does not have the expertise, surely, it can seek help from the United Nations. It gets technical experts; it gets other kinds of experts. It can certainly get experts in this field. I am not talking now of those who had advised in the past, like Mr. Davenport coming from the United States, or the Governor of the Bank of Guyana, coming from West Germany.

I am talking about people who have had a great deal of experience in the West, in the Non-Aligned Countries, who, from their own experience, would be able to help this Government in formulating an overall Plan which we could be debating. This is long overdue. I repeat, the Government has been taking a line which unfortunately matches up with even the most right of the rightist. The two super power lines which it has been propagating is the same line which Malaysia is also propagating. The Minister of Foreign Affairs said, "*They walked out of the Conference, they did not like us.*"

Rao Raol from Cuba made a speech that the Non-Aligned Conference would become a museum piece unless it is prepared to take a firm position on questions such as colonialism, neocolonialism and imperialism. Raol does not talk nonsense like the Prime Minister about two super powers. He does not talk nonsense like the Foreign Minister whose line is the same. Do you want me to bring the speech that Fidel made last July which is the same content as Raol's? You have a copy of the speech. The Cuban Government and the Cuban Foreign Minister do not double talk like this Government. They have a consistent position. They do not on the one hand talk about fighting against colonialism and neocolonialism and at the same time talk about fighting the two super power lines, because they know that it is inconsistent to take that position. You cannot fight imperialism and at the same time try to isolate yourself from the socialist world. This is impossibility.

We just heard a long repetitious speech which did not get to the core of

the problem. The Minister of Finance a few days ago warned and said that Guyana will not be able to go fast in keeping with the philosophy enunciated by the Prime Minister about ownership and control of our natural resources. Why? Because of external enemies, the enemy is strong. Cuba recognizes this and starts out from the basis that the enemy is strong and ruthless. Therefore, Cuba does not take this opportunistic pro-imperialist line that this Government takes which is synonymous with the line taken by another pro-imperialist rightist regime that the one in Malaysia. My friend the Minister of Foreign Affairs says that they walked out from the Conference. The only difference between the Malaysians and this regime is that they are not so demagogic.

When Raol set the pace at the Conference and was followed by Tanzania, Algeria, Chile and others, the "stage managers", the Guyana Government, was obviously caught with their pants down and they took a consensus. Why not vote? Consensus will give opportunity to the Guyana Government to be able to tell the Americans when it meets them, "You know we were with you, but the majority was against us", and when they meet the Vietnamese to say, "You know we are with you." This is how they behave. If they are not behaving that way, let them tell us how is it that they make nice speeches yet the Minister of Home Affairs denies the showing here of documentary films on Vietnam which were made in Hanoi.

If you do not know the Minister of Home Affairs has seized the films. The Prime Minister does not know what he is talking about; he wants to deal with the law which he violates at every turn. But the fact of the matter is the Minister of Home Affairs, despite all their sympathy, seizes films on Vietnam. This is the kind of double talk and the chicanery that has got this country in its present mess. This Government's inconsistencies have caused it to get into a "lockjam" and they do not know how to get out of it. To solve the problem of Guyana what is the basic problem? Unemployment, cost of living increasing, crime, prostitution, and shooting up the people. To solve these problems one must get down to a consistent position. This Minister who is now talking tells us "We are going to take them over," but when he met the *New York Times* reporter he said, "All we want is partnership". Let me nail this lie for a moment. This falsehood of the Prime Minister.

In 1963, when there was the blockade, when there was no gasoline in the country, when a tanker came from Cuba with gasoline, we attempted to take over three or four big tanks at the Base, right round by the police station, to put the gasoline into them. They were empty for years. The Americans said: "No, you cannot use them." We told the Governor: "We are going to take them over." The Governor said that if we take them it will endanger the relationship between Great Britain and the United States! Go back a few years before that. When the Prime Minister, then Leader of the Opposition was in London, when he said: "No Independence, P.R.", when they wrote into the Constitution of 1961: "prompt and adequate compensation", could we pay prompt and adequate compensation for nationalizing sugar and baux-

ite when we could not even take over some tanks which were right here? This is the level at which they enter debates, to fool the simple minded, but time will tell.

To come to the basic fundamentals. First of all, if this country is to go forward, we must have a strategy of development. Number two; there must be confidence in what is going on in this country. Number three, there must be participation. These three things, if put together, one will then be able to see progress. If not immediately, at least in time to come. Let me deal with the first item of strategy. They know what is the right thing to say. They say that all over the world. Ownership and control of the resources. They say that. In the next breath they excuse themselves for not doing it by saying: "*Oh, the enemies outside are powerful.*" Doesn't Cuba know that the enemies are powerful? Doesn't Chile know that the enemies are powerful? What does Chile do? What does Cuba do?

The Cubans do not talk about two super powers. The Cubans develop the closest relation with the socialist world. They do not do as these, who try to work within the imperialist orbit of dividing and ruling the socialist world. They talk about relative strength. Compare Chile and compare Guyana. In Chile, the Government has no parliamentary majority. It has an opposition of the kind that the P.P.P. faced in the 1961-1964 period, irresponsible working closely with the C.I.A.! In Chile the Government has no control over the administrative machine, the Civil Service, the Army, or the Police. What is the position here? They have got control of the administrative machinery. They have so manipulated the Police and the Army that they have become not a national force but a P.N.C. force. Therefore, one can say they have control over it. They have a majority here, albeit by fraud. They have opposition. It is no use telling us about internal force. They say they have no internal unity.

They have to worry about internal strength but the P.P.P. opposition today on these vital questions of ownership and control does not behave like the Opposition in the 1961-1964 period. The Prime Minister himself when he went to New York in 1962 was spreading falsehoods about 1,000 Cubans being in Guyana. His Government does not have that today. It was the P.P.P. which allowed an Amendment to the Constitution, the clause dealing with prompt and adequate compensation, so the Government could nationalise, so where is this talk that there is no internal unity or there is all this opposition internally? The P.P.P. has made its position quite clear, that the Government will be able to get the P.P.P. to take over the commanding heights of the economy. Chile can do it with less support than they have. Why is it that they are afraid? It is not that they are afraid. They have put up these imaginary blocks, self imposed, because it suits their basic fundamental position and that is to try to delude the people that socialism will come to Guyana via the cooperative. Thus, this fraud of cooperative socialism.

The Hon. Member Mr. Zaheeruddeen who seconded the Motion, a few

years ago when he was writing essays about the Cuban Revolution and when he was annoyed that they were not printed in the *Mirror*, did not talk this way, but he has learned from the Prime Minister the tricks of the trade in opportunism. So we have this manoeuvring going on, all kinds of statements being made here and there, self-contradictory when you put them together. The basic reason why we have this set of contradictions is because the Government has not got a firm anti-imperialist position. This is the reason why we cannot make any progress, why we cannot have a new Development Plan, because a new Development Plan will have to spell out carefully, not just verbiage that we are going to feed, clothe, and house ourselves by 1976. We have to have it carefully thought out, formulated and analysed from all angles. This is why we cannot have it. People are suffering, people are disillusioned in Guyana.

Sir, I was making the point about confidence as an indispensable ingredient for success. It is not enough mainly to have a Plan even if the Plan is correct. What is absolutely necessary is that there must be confidence by the people of the country. Can we say that today in Guyana there is confidence in this Government? In the days of the P.P.P. when we were attacked for so many people leaving this country you will recall Sir, that the gates of England were open, when anyone could have picked up his boots and departed without any restrictions? Today, those gates are closed. If one has to go to Canada and the United States it poses interminable problems. We see the long queues every day. Yet more people have gone away since this Government is in office, far more than was ever imagined to go away during the time of the P.P.P. If there was the same freedom to leave as there was in the time of the P.P.P. Guyana will probably be denuded of almost half of her population, and I do not think I am exaggerating here. Go in Canada, go in a place called Scarborough you will see a Guyana colony there, and daily the colony is growing. Not only ordinary people who are this Government's supporters want to leave but even business people who are its supporters, small businessmen and others who see no future in this country. Basically this is happening because there is no confidence in the Government. The leadership that the Government is today providing is not inspiring the people to stay here. I admit, I agree that people have to make sacrifices in Third World countries, but how do you expect people to make sacrifices when Government Ministers are living it up, their lifestyle is such as to create a wider gap between the rich and the poor.

Our Hon. Friend the Attorney General and Minister of Foreign Affairs at one time, not very long ago, said, "*You people used to make me the butt of your target, \$4,000 a month. Why are you not saying anything about the \$10,000 and \$12,000 a month?*" This is what we are talking about. Rover cars, Daimler, big allowance \$10 a day pocket piece for Ministers in our time reduced from \$15 in the Interim Government has been increased to \$65. Tell us what it is. They are calling on the people to make sacrifices. Surely we agree with this. Why the Members of this Government do not try to follow



the lifestyle of Castro? Why do they not set the example to the people? We must have a Government free from corruption. What about commitments made by the Prime Minister about setting up an anti-corruption body with teeth in it? A body to see that there is no discrimination in the country. Then the people will begin to have confidence in the Government.

Participation is the third ingredient to success. They tell us about self-reliance, they tell us about sacrifice. Fifteen years ago the Western countries were betting on India, ridiculing and reviling China, saying that it is communist. Surely, they have their self reliance and sacrifices. This is why they succeeded. But that is not the only reason they succeeded. They succeeded ... The Hon. Member is talking about democracy when at every step of the way they shoot people down and then ask questions after. They refused permission to people to march and tear gassed them when they marched. They refused to give newsprint and they get civil servants to do their dirty work. Is this what this Government calls freedom of the press? Is this democracy? What we have in Guyana today is fascism and neo-fascism? The Hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs is diverting me unnecessarily.

Well, Sir, you have to rebut the rebutters, the hecklers. I want to make the point that sacrifice alone is not the answer. You must have participation. Let the Minister of Labour and other Ministers like the Minister of Mines go to Chile and they will understand what participation means. Oh yes, I saw my friend sojourning there. Having gone to U.N.C.T.A.D. he was there again at the Health Conference, I was surprised to see him there when he should be looking after the health problems here. People are dying in the hospitals for want of care. Cubans are not dying from shortage of doctors and health inadequacies.

Sir, the point I want to make is that no matter how sound your plans are – and that is here – unless you have the participation of the people, their confidence in addition to their participation, the country is not going to succeed. We are hearing “*nice noises*” from the Minister of Labour but he does not get down to the root of the problem. The question of union recognition. This is a primary question. A few days ago we read where the masses of the workers at Mackenzie have no confidence in the Union. How are you going to resolve this question of worker participation? Are you going to select from the workers or are you going to select from the union? Clearly, the primary question of democracy in the Trade Union Movement must be sorted out; this implies democracy elsewhere in the society. One Hon. Minister is crowing every day that Village Councillors are not attending meetings, civil servants are not going to Local Government meetings. Why is it? It is because, basically, there is no democracy. These councillors were put there on the basis of fraud and many of these who are elected were looking for rewards to be paid. They have not been paid, so they were absenting themselves, they do not care. I notice they are being given allowances; they are bribed in order to get the work done. But bribery is not going to

succeed. Fraud at elections is not going to succeed.

You have to come down basically to the question of representative institutions like the Rice Marketing Board. In the colonial masters' days the R.M.B. had equal numbers of Government representatives and representatives of the farmers but because the chairman was drawn from among the Government's nominees, it always operated against the farmers' interest, and because of that, we amended the law to give the farmers a clear majority of 13 out of 16 on the Board. This was even moving towards what they are talking about every day, Cooperative Republic, cooperative socialism. They very thing they say they believe in, they are sabotaging it so far as the biggest earner for the small man is concerned, and that is why the production of rice has fallen.

The Secunder of the Motion used to picket a few years ago calling for increased prices, and today he gets up in the House and argues against increased prices. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture, until the last few days, was arguing consistently against increasing prices. All of a sudden! We understand the poor fellows. That is the law of opportunistic adaptation, chameleon. The Members of the Government know all these things that I am talking about, but basically it is their dishonesty. It is their opportunism that prevents them from doing these things. Eventually they will have to do what the P.P.P. has been saying. On any question, even milk price, by bits they come to it, but bits cannot succeed, because at the same time, the position is becoming worse. A vicious circle is set up. The bits that they are advocating have failed in Latin America.

Eric Williams says what is needed is not Puerto Rico or Cuba, but between Puerto Rico and Cuba. The between Puerto Rico and Cuba, during the last ten years, was tried out in Latin America. Let Mr. Singh tell us about his experiences. Let him tell us what happened to Frei in Chile, the halfway house they are now advocating, partnership which these two gentlemen said was the philosophy of the Government, as quoted by the *New York Times*. Yet the Prime Minister talks about ownership and control and nationalisation, and because they fall between these two stools, the former Minister of Finance, now Minister of Works and Communications, says the question now is pace of nationalisation. This is how they manoeuvre to try to cover up their sins and shortcomings. This is the Nixon formula. Why get Zaheeruddeen to talk about Rockefeller and the multinational corporations? He was not straight in his thinking so that is why he left us. I am sure the axe is going to fall on him as it fell on the Y.S.M. Congress Members in 1967, when they were calling for nationalisation of this, that, and the other, and relations with Cuba and the socialist states, when they shouted them down. Why tell us?

This is how they pretend to be progressive, talking about multinational corporations. This strategy of imperialism now is partnership with them. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said so on a tour of Africa, that this is the thing to be done not only with private people but even with

Governments. But where are we going? The Alliance for Progress which Kennedy started in 1961 as a counter to Castroism has failed in Latin America. The Economic Commission for Latin America, its main props, regional integration, Carifta, like L.A.F.T.A., import substitution – they tried that for ten years in Latin America. Land reform, they talked about that too, yet they are worse off today than they were ten years ago with this same between Puerto Rico and Cuba that Williams is talking about, that the Burnham Government is now adumbrating and carrying out. Any intelligent person will see that it has failed. Experience in Chile has shown that it has failed; even in the so-called most industrialized countries of Latin America, Mexico, Argentina, Brazil. They are manoeuvring now to see if they have to come back to elections in Argentina and so they come and stage a show for democracy. Under Kennedy it was alliance, now under Nixon it has turned from alliance to partnership. It is clear, let me repeat for the Hon. Minister. A domestic and foreign policy must be coordinated, and I do not want to argue with the Hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs, who is going to tell me, "*We have a progressive policy.*" I do not concede this. Their main line of two super powers is what Yankee imperialism wants today, because the whole world is against American imperialism. What they do not want is the Third World to move closely with the socialist world without which they cannot fight imperialism. You choose to make a distinction between China and Russia and the other socialist countries and you play the game of Nixon that is why the Seconder of the Motion can make all these distinctions and say we will make our own. What is our own? What is our own and what they are practising now is what has been pushed down their throats. The Seven Year Plan was pushed down their throats by Arthur Lewis, Davenport, the Yankee Adviser to the Prime Minister, the Governor of the Bank of Guyana, Horst Bockelmann. We told them that it would fail. They scrapped it before it finished. Now they are bringing a model which as failed in Latin America and they call it their own.

Let us for a moment concede, for the aura of importance of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, that they have a progressive foreign policy which I do not concede, as I told him in the Lobby. Even if they have, this alone does not make for progress. DeGaulle had a very good foreign policy but this domestic policy was for capitalism. Brandt, who just won the election, had a good foreign policy but the local policy is still based on capitalism and imperialism.

The two things have to be coordinated, domestic and foreign and the domestic economic policy. They say they are waiting on the Non-Aligned Group to formulate something. But, Sir, the Non-Aligned Group has three different positions on economic questions. Cuba, Chile, etc., I name them: Williams in Trinidad, Guyana's Burnham and all through, like Indonesia, or Malaysia which walked out of the Conference. The other day they went to the Conference on Heads of States in the West Indies and they broke up because the Less Developed Countries, the smaller islands, are catching

hell at Carifta.

Therefore, they have to make some concessions. But those concessions are not going to solve the basic problem because it is still being made within the umbrella of the multinational corporations that my friend is talking about, their dominance in the Caribbean. They have not faced up to the main fundamental questions.

But like Kennedy, with his Alliance for Progress, let us catch a few shows here and there, let us build a few schools here, and a few health centres there – we get like them. Like the La Jalousie Health Centre that the P.P.P. built. The Government abandoned it, no dispensary was put there, no watchmen. The cows went in and now at long last they realize that they need a health centre. And from the newspaper report it is stated it would cost \$1,900 and if the people do not contribute \$1,000 they would not have it. This is a disgrace. Here what they are quibbling about? Who destroyed it? The fact of the matter is the cows went in also.

But it is the Government's policy of drift that has caught this country in this calamitous position. That is a classical example of its policy. That Health Centre should have been kept up from the time the P.N.C. got in Government, but like the one at Handsome Tree, it has been abandoned. Wherever it has no support it penalizes the people; it uses coercive methods and forces the people to do self help if service is to be given to them. Do you expect that a country will make progress like this? This Government has betrayed the people of this country.

Sir, let me come back to the main questions. There must be a correct domestic and foreign policy. I submit that the domestic policy of the Government's economic planning is a new strategy of imperialism; I submit that the foreign policy which appears to be progressive is the new foreign policy of Nixon imperialism. I submit that this country, it got many millions; from \$128 million at the end of 1964, the debt burden has jumped to \$508 million this year. What can we show for this money? We are told about agriculture, but the proof is not in the pudding. Where is it? What prices people have to pay for local foods? That is the problem. Do not show us some split peas and some peanuts. That was growing in the time of the P.P.P. too; we started it. But where is it today? Can you buy it in the markets? How much you have to pay for it? This is how you measure agricultural success! After eight years what can this Government show? Money alone is not going to help this Government.

At the Conference in Trinidad, one moment they refer to Cuba, the next moment they stretch their arms, *"Please United States, do not hurt me too much, I am going to join the O.A.S. in order to get loans from the Inter-American Development Bank."* This is how this Government operates. It cannot make up its mind. The time has passed for this vacillation; basically the Inter-American Bank had been working for the Alliance for Progress for the last ten years. The man from Alliance for Progress, Abel Santa Maria, has resigned. Why? Because the whole thing has been a fiasco. It must be a

fiasco because you cannot make up your mind. You know Uncle Sam is going to blockade you if you take a positive step, so that the same moment you vacillate and say, "*All right, we are going to be with you; don't worry we are still with you, so you must let us in.*"

But the Government has been getting money. From \$127 million to \$508 million in eight years. The P.P.P. did not have all this money. When we left that included all the debts previously. What has this Government done with this money? Money alone is not going to solve all your problems. It is no use the Minister going to U.N.C.T.A.D. and saying: "*Third World countries are swallowed up with debt payments.*" Any fool can make noises like that. Because the figures are there to show, but the question is what strategy is adopted? Nothing is said here except vague generalities about agriculture and industry.

"*Where are the factories?*" Mr. Burnham used to ask in our time. Where are they now to give employment? They will be caught between two stools as many who have tried this road before: Sukarno, Nkrumah, Obote, and others. Even those who talk about revolution. The Mover of the Motion used the word revolution.

Frei used to talk about revolution and liberty too. The Foreign Minister is telling us about liberty and democracy. Frei, that was his slogan, revolution in liberty, that Castro had a dictatorship. Where is Frei now? Working with the C.I.A. working with I.T.T., trying to sabotage a Government which wants to do what they say should be done, own and control the resources of the country. Their inconsistencies, their vacillations, in time will catch up with them. But what is so tragic about it all is that the Guyanese people have either to run away, or roam the streets...

A boy, about 17 years of age, showed me his shoes, holes right through. He wants work, he is roaming the streets trying to find jobs. Crime is developing. Shooting people, calling them criminals. Shooting them in their backs and giving our statements which no reasonable person will believe, and the day the man is shot and killed, they issue a statement that the man was wanted as a criminal for two years before. What blasphemy! Not even respecting the dead after shooting him. You are disgraced for being a Minister of Home Affairs.

I withdraw that, but he deserves it. Then they give a statement that the man was approaching the policeman with a weapon in his hand, some kind of pipe. Then, the policeman in self defence shot, but he missed. When the man is near to him, point blank, he misses. That man should not be in the Force! He misses when the man is point blank! He can hit when the man is running away! The Government has to have a credible position.

As I said, it would be perhaps not tragic if they could get along with the way they are going – had it not been for what is happening in the country today. This is their dilemma. When the issue of terrorism comes up in the United Nations for debate, they abandon their friends in Africa with whom they always want to be identified, because Africans make a distinction be-

tween crude criminals and liberation movements such as in Angola, Guinea, Bissau and Mozambique, but in the West Indies, now, because they cannot face the electorates with free and fair elections – in Trinidad – all of a sudden, we hear about terrorists in the West Indies.

What is the distinction between terrorists, as they call them, in the West Indies and in Africa? Is Granger a terrorist with whom 60,000 people marched against the Williams Government? Is Weekes a terrorist? In the same way, daily, they are harassing people who have a democratic right not to be harassed – at Enterprise. And when they talk with their Venezuelan friends, they say they will have cooperation at the technical level to fight terrorists. Whom are they talking about? I am talking about their joint sins. This is why they were caught in this contradiction and they had to vote with the United States and against their friends, to back them. Today's terrorists are tomorrow's heroes and the more they suppress the freedom of the people of this country, whether it is press freedom, whether it is freedom for free and fair elections...

I notice the *Chronicle*, the Government's mouthpiece, said the other day in an editorial, that our entering the House with slogans calling for free and fair elections was a gimmick that failed. Let Carl Blackman write in the columns of the *Chronicle* and elsewhere about the two films he saw in London, one called, "*The Trail of the Vanishing Voters*" and the other one called "*The making of a Prime Minister.*" He saw them; ask him if they were gimmicks. He would not write about that. His bread is well buttered and that is how this Government hopes to win and to develop this country!

I repeat what is needed in Guyana today is a consistent position, the stopping of mouthing about revolution and socialism and so on, less demagoguery and more sincerity and honesty of purpose. We are willing to cooperate. We have said so over and over, but you cannot expect us to cooperate under these conditions. The Prime Minister once told me that we must have a by-partisan policy on bauxite. Yes, we agreed to nationalise and we forced the Government. But the Government cannot expect us to agree to maintain the same super structure - \$10,000 and \$12,000 a month – we will never agree to that.

Sir, there is a difference between employees and bosses. You should know that by now. And if you do not know that, I am sorry. If you are going to tell me that we were talking about those people, then Lord help us! We asked for a by-partisan policy. Do you think that the P.P.P. will agree to take the bauxite and put it in Philips Brothers hands? I was told that Allende is doing this, that Philips Brothers is the marketing agent. This is a falsehood. How are you going to get anywhere? The Prime Minister always likes to go in for hilarity and we must excuse him. He would like to reduce the state of affairs in Guyana to this level and so we must excuse him.

I wish to conclude by calling on the Government to have a consistent policy based on sincerity which will include the three points I enunciated at the beginning – correct strategy for economic planning and develop-

ment which means correct domestic and foreign policies, that there must be true participation by the masses of the people in Guyana which will generate the necessary confidence without which Guyana cannot go forward. This, above all, is necessary today.

## Supplementary Estimates: 23<sup>rd</sup> November, 1972

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, may I say something on this? I wish to speak on this Head from a different point of view, and that is, is this a legitimate cost to be borne by the taxpayers? No doubt the Minister, in attempting to resolve industrial disputes, sought a way out by paying the checkers at these scales at the taxpayers' expense. It seems to me that this should be an expense to be borne by the employers. If they have defective scales and time and time again this has been proved – I think the Ministry of Labour is satisfied that these scales are not functioning properly, if that is so, and the workers were being robbed and as a result of this, it was affecting production, industrial relations, there were strikes and so forth, then it is the duty of the estates to pay the workers who will be there to look at the interest of the workers as a whole.

The Minister in his wisdom has decided that this must be borne by the taxpayers. One can think of a lot of more valuable services which can be given by this money, \$55,000 for example, at the public hospital, which I visit every day in Georgetown. I am not sick; I go to see people who are dying from the lack of proper care. And to compound this problem, the Government appoints people who have no interest. On what ground is the Government appointing somebody there? We read in the papers about workers' participation. The Minister himself made a speech the other day. My colleague has just pointed out the fact of how some of these Government appointees operate.

If we are to have workers' participation, then surely, the workers should have the right to appoint either two or three, and the cane farmers who are directly involved should have the right to select the third person. I suppose this is another case of patronage where the Government is saying: we are footing the bill; therefore we must appoint the people. This cannot lead to what the Minister sought to achieve in the very beginning, that is, good industrial relations to end disputes. Why it is in only one case, there is one election, and in another case there is no election? It seems to me that the Minister should try to get the sugar planters to pay and in keeping with their own pronouncements about workers' participation, they should have all the checkers directly elected by the workers so the workers will have confidence in them and will have control over them. If they do not work satisfactorily, if they work in a lackadaisical manner, then the workers will have an opportunity to throw them out and there we would get more satisfaction, even if the Government had to spend the money.

I am glad to say that after, he was able to tell us that the Government is not now footing this bill, that the sugar planters are footing it. He went on to clap himself on the back by referring to the President of the Union being a member of a Commission, but any Government which is worth its salt



must have workers' representatives along with employers and so-called neutral people, maybe a chairman. This Minister tells us about this one person. We should have had more than one from the union which has the confidence of the workers. If he had said that, we would have congratulated him. What about the previous commissions, when the Government refused to have people like Weekes, like Professor Davis, Head of the Faculty of Economics, like the chap who examined the bauxite industry and his book was removed —

Government should have a democratic election. It is not selecting — so as to allow the union to have twenty-two members. It is not the union appointing them. There is an election where any worker votes, where the M.P.C.A. has a right to nominate, the G.A.W.U. has a right to nominate. What the Hon. Minister does not like is that the G.A.W.U. representatives win the elections. Let him say that. Hear the Minister talking about rigging. This is one election which they said they conducted, and even though we know they rig elections, they cannot win. The case falls, especially now the Government is not paying to have nominees, in keeping with the other announced principles, workers' participation, and I am surprised to hear the Minister say that a worker who is a workers' representative must not have anything to do with strikes and must not help other workers and so on. Not during his working hours. How do you know whether in the period when he is not working he is not giving help to fellow workers?

I wish to make one observation arising out of what the Hon. Minister said. I say this because he misinformed the House about the P.P.P.'s position. He said he was glad to hear what my colleague said that this side of the House, our Party has stated that cooperatives are a farce and they cannot work. I wish to correct this slander because the P.P.P. has never said that. The P.P.P. has said over and over, it is in favour of cooperatives, and the P.P.P. long before the Hon. Minister went into politics had been talking about the role the cooperative can play. What we did say and we repeat is that the cooperative movement and cooperatives themselves will not be the means by which socialism will come to Guyana. We said that it is socialism which will permit the cooperatives to grow and develop. That is a fundamental difference and must not be twisted as the Hon. Minister is now doing.

The Prime Minister only yesterday said it is not the intention of the Government to nationalise and take over the commanding heights of the economy. What we are going to find in the end is a lot of book cooperatives, a lot of frauds, and a lot of officers appointed, one checking upon another. I remember under the British they had social assistance and the number of people they had administering the social assistance was almost half of the vote. I am just making the point if we do not watch out and do what the P.P.P. has been saying, that is, have socialism and break up the commanding heights which are in the hands of the sharks, then the cooperative will not succeed and we will be building up a big bureaucracy which

will only be costing the taxpayers a lot of money as it is costing generally today without any real development.

Items 3 and 4. On a previous occasion when this Head was discussed, item 3, Acquisition of Overseas Offices and Residences, we raised the question of the cost of this Chancery in Washington. I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether this will be the final expenditure or whether much more will have to be spent perhaps to furnish and do other things in lavish style at the taxpayers' expense.

On item 4, Industrial Development, I notice in the margin that this money is being asked for to provide for the acquisition of Guyana Gajraj Ltd. I wonder if the Minister will tell us how much was paid for this finally, and whether the partnership arrangement will now come to an end, or this is merely to pay for the share of the Government, and, if so, what was the value of the property and how much is the share, if that is the share or whether it is the whole payment for acquiring the whole thing. It seems to me when the Government is proposing these things, before you take the Heads as you do, the Minister should give the House some information then we would not have to ask questions. The public should know what the Government is doing then arising out of what they say we will then be in a position to ask questions or not to ask questions.

I am just making a suggestion because we are completely in the dark. We do not know what questions to ask even.

I should like to speak on item 14. Sir, I notice under item 14, the sum of \$435,000 for hydroelectric power surveys and the legend states that it is to meet the cost of additional hydroelectric surveys in the Upper Mazaruni.

As I recall, and perhaps you will recall too, prior to the last General Elections in 1968 the Government announced that it was going to embark on a big hydroelectric project costing more than \$200 million and one will have assumed therefore that all the preliminary work, the surveys, were finished at that time. Because how could the Government have then stated that it intended to build this hydroelectric plant. This was what was told to the electorate. It is the same way we hear now "*Big things to come*", like those big balloons about the \$200 million hydroelectric project at Tiboku Falls in the Mazaruni. Why surveys now when then we were talking of building a hydroelectric station to give us electricity? It means that something is wrong somewhere. I hope it is not my logic. Maybe the Minister will tell us what this is all about. I am not against surveys; let this be understood. But I thought Sir, that we had passed that stage long ago. Or is this money for something else that is the project itself?

The Government and the party which was leading the Government were flying a kite in 1968 when they said they were going to undertake a very big hydro project. Now we are told that we do not have any money to do it. I suppose all the balloons, which we are hearing now, \$60 million for this and \$80 million for that, after a while we will hear too there is no money for it. This is why we were calling all the time for a comprehensive programme.

I see at another point there is some reference to the Electricity Corporation and I was going to ask —

This ties in with the whole question of hydro development because Preece, Cardew and Ryder had long ago suggested that the Government should have embarked on a small hydroelectric project at Malali and this would have tided one over with the domestic requirements, not for big industrial purposes, and this was not done. This suggestion was made before all these big Schemes. It was first started by D.E.M.B.A. Since the Hon. Minister has asked I will tell him, late 1950s.

After the recommendation of Preece, Cardew and Ryder, and after the P.P.P. Government nationalised the Electric Company, the Cuban Government had agreed to finance this Scheme. This is in the record. Let them look at it, and if that had been done, the Electricity Corporation would not be in a bankrupt position where it cannot even pay its own income tax. They did not do this Scheme according to the recommendations of the P.C.R. because they fell in love with this bigger Scheme. Now they are telling us they are still undertaking surveys. Now they have gone to the Cuyuni, having abandoned that one which was to have provided all the requirements not only for domestic consumption but for industrial purposes. Now we are told they are examining a project in the Cuyuni which will meet our immediate requirements, I presume they mean domestic requirements, and therefore one comes back to the Government going around in circles and getting nowhere.

It takes ten years for the Government to make a decision whether to proceed with thermal or whether hydro is cheaper. P.C.R. recommended this since 1960, that after buying initially a few steam plants, they should go to hydro. If the Government found in its Development Programme, through all its meanderings all about, that it could not find the money for the big one, then it should have gone in even for the small one which would be economic. This was the point made since 1960. By now, the projections of P.C.R. for the Electric Company were that in the first ten years they will make a net profit of \$20 million including the financing of the hydro station at Malali, \$20 million in the second ten years, \$40 million. Now, the Minister says in the coming year they are going to decide whether to continue with thermal or proceed with hydro.

Sir, I wonder if I can raise a supplementary point dealing with housing. Yesterday, I heard the Members from the Government side speaking about housing, and this afternoon the Minister gave us some figures on the average cost on houses people have to pay in order to purchase houses or even the self-help houses they have to pay between \$50 to \$80, I presume that is, per month. One of the factors which contribute to the high cost of housing is the question of land. I had taken an opportunity to visit the Ruimveldt area and beyond, and you may have done so yourself and probably must have seen that these new houses which were built during Carifesta, (1) the lots are very small, (2) the streets between the lots are very narrow and (3)

the houses are looking like gerry-built houses as they used to be called in the UK during the war. That means they are temporary, they are put up rather quickly. They all look alike; there are no variations to them. With a little bit of imagination they could have been built in such a way for Guyanese people who are accustomed to their —

The point I wish to make is this. We should not be creating slums of the future. We should not be building things which are eyesores of the future. There must be some architectural beauty to big housing areas which are being built. The Minister must know that the cost of one of these houses, the 2-room houses, with a little bit of land — I have seen them I do not know who built them — is \$7,000 — odd.

The Minister said that houses were available between \$8 and \$20 a month. No doubt the Minister is referring to the houses which were built in the time of the P.P.P. and those are scarce as hen's teeth. I do not know what he means by "*they are available*". But let the Minister tell us whether this Government is building houses which working-class people can rent at \$5 or \$8 a week; they were built during the P.P.P. time.

I am wondering whether this high price, which clearly workers will not be able to pay to build a house, \$50 - \$80 a month is due to the fact of the high cost of land and the high profits which are made in many cases. It is true this is supposed to be self-help. If the Government is involved in housing, it has to look at all the aspects of this question, self-help, private building, houses built by the former C.D.C., to see that they come within the reach of the working classes. I would not say that the Government is really solving the problem of the workers.

One of the points I took up with the previous Minister was the question of making house lots available to people very cheaply so that people can take their time and build their houses. We know that land is very expensive. Three cents per square foot is still expensive. Which "*world*" is the Hon. Member talking about when he says we have the cheapest land in the world. We have been reading articles in the *Guyana Graphic* about China where they have solved housing problems, unemployment and so on. Why don't you tell us about China? Why don't you emulate China? We have said that one of the cheapest ways of solving the housing problem is to make plenty of land available to the population at large, who want to build houses for themselves, and this means getting lands from the sugar estates because you have the P.P.P. pushing you all the time.

I told the previous Minister, but nothing is done, that the Government should get the estates to either transfer the land for nothing or effect an exchange for lease lands at the back. We will agree to the Ministry of Finance to do this, but they would not do it. This is what should be done so that estate land could be given to sugar estate workers, villagers, people in the city. We have a lot of unemployed, we have a lot of timber in the bush, and we should have no housing problem in Guyana. A man wants to build. He cannot get land easily. I am not talking about what the Government is

doing. Why should we build future slums? And they call them Housing Schemes! Guyana has plenty of land and we should think of the future. We should give a man a decent place.

I want the Ministry to say specifically what it proposes to do on this question of getting sufficient land from the estates to provide house lots. Even sugar workers cannot get house lots today. This is a fact and many people would want house lots. They are preparing a small amount and it is out of the reach of the small man. We are saying they should tackle the first question of getting sufficient land. In this way they will accelerate. We all know what is the price of land in the city.

## Confirmation of Consumption Tax Order (No. 82): 24<sup>th</sup> November, 1972

**Dr. Jagan:** The whole question, Sir, of this imposition on the price of liquor has been done, according to the Government, to offset the increased cost of the price of flour. The Government claims that the cost of flour has gone up because the international price has gone up.

This matter needs to be looked at very closely from several points of view. Has the Government done a careful survey to find out what is the price now of flour in Canada compared with the price in the United States of America?

We know that at one time the Canadian price was lower but because the American Government was giving a rebate on export prices it resulted in its moving into setting up what is called a soil bank, in other words, paying farmers not to produce and giving export rebates so that more sales can be made abroad. Because of these factors the American price became lower than the Canadian price, which was a true price.

But since this flour mill is tied up, no doubt, with an American Company and the whole objective of the American Government has been to export more products, we want to know whether the price quoted by this company in Guyana – the Minister must have all the facts – on which they base their import prices, their costs, whether that price from the United States is the same price today in Canada and other markets, Australia and so on. It may be that because the Soviet Union bought a lot of wheat and flour there must have been a shortage and thus the market price rose particularly in the United States, because as we understand it the export subsidy has been removed.

It may be that American subsidiaries are continually buying from the United States in keeping with orders which were made since the time of Johnson, that subsidiaries must buy in America even though they can buy cheaper in other countries. I want to know whether that is so.

Secondly, we would like to know whether the Government has gone very carefully into the costing, into the profitability of this monopoly, whether the Government is satisfied from the rate of profit being made, that this increase would have caused the Government either to become bankrupt or, if not becoming bankrupt, to lose money. In other words, we must have the facts. How much profit was this company making? What was the rate of profit on investment? How much more the extra price of flour would have added to the cost? Perhaps these figures were given, but I have not seen them.

The other side of this coin is that the Government has instituted these taxes, but we have not been told by the Government how much is the estimate of revenue? In other words, what is the likely subsidy we have to

pay? How much additional revenue will be forthcoming from these taxes? These facts must be made very clear, otherwise it may be that we are continually subsidising a foreign company and, secondly, imposing too much taxation on the public.

My colleague referred to costs in considering profitability. In a monopoly, one has to consider cost. We know that this company contracted out to the Guyana Marketing Corporation to market the flour at 25 cents a bag and the G.M.C. subcontracted to Greenland Cooperative Society which has no trucks. Nobody knows, nobody can find out who are the owners, who are the directors of this company. The Minister says that I must go the Cooperative Department. I have been there endless times. I have written to the Manager and I have not received a reply because you want to put things in the cupboard. A lot of chicanery is going on. Take the facts but tell us about who are the directors and managers of Greenland Cooperative which, no doubt, through Government influence has been able to get this lucrative contract as it has had other contracts. Is this the reason why we are pandering to the company by now taxing the small man who has to get his little rum every weekend?

In a matter such as this, the Government should call the Opposition in and give us all the facts, let us see all the facts and the figures then we do not have to talk and waste time in this Parliament. The public must be satisfied that all these things are being done in such a way that the public will not be penalized, but when we do not have the facts, and when we see deals such as the one with the Greenland Cooperative Society, people get concerned. We would like the Minister to tell us at this stage what is the real position and not to forget the amount which is estimated to be obtained from this taxation.

I should like to make just an observation on this Clause. The Hon. Member referred a moment ago to the measure which was enacted during the time of the P.P.P. to establish the Industrial Development Corporation. As I recall, the wording then in the similar clause to this was that the Government would stimulate, facilitate and undertake the establishment of industries. "*Undertake*" was the key word. I recall – I think it was in 1966 or 1967 when there was an amendment to this law when the name was changed from Industrial Development Corporation to Guyana Development Corporation –

I am making a different point. I am saying that when the Government amended the law previously it took out the key word "*undertake*" and we then attacked the Government saying that the key word was taken out because their sponsors in Washington did not want the Government to establish industries. What we said then is borne out by the facts because all these years the I.D.C. has done very little except big publicity campaigns. We have an example of that right here in the latest *Financial Times* where it says the investor in Guyana is offered 83,000 square miles with rich forests, a variety of skills, mineral resources and an exciting potential in agricul-

tural development, while the Prime Minister is going around the world at Non-Aligned Conferences telling them we will own and control our own resources.

Where do we stand? They took out the key word "*undertake*". No doubt because it did not conform to their philosophy or the philosophy which has been imposed upon them, that is not to establish state-owned – I am not talking about nationalisation. I am talking about the Government taking the initiative to establish factories. No doubt they want to wind up that organisation and merge it now into G.U.Y.S.T.A.C. That should have been done long ago.

I am surprised to hear the Minister saying, that is under consideration, because there are two separate bureaucracies the people have to pay for, and all we get is an advertisement like this. I know when I was Premier they were always coming to me with things like this and I rejected them. They merely spend money to do nothing. Go to the industrial estates. Nothing has been done. We want to know whether the Government has in mind to establish many industries on its own and whether the clause as now written without that key word will permit of such activities on the part of the Government. The Hon. Minister must say so because at the time, I recall, we thought it strange that the Government should have taken out the word, "*undertake*."



## Sugar Industry Special Funds (Special Provisions) Bill

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, it seems to me that the Government should have brought a Bill which is completely different from the present one. I say this because while what is being sought here is quite all right, that is, to give pensions to sugar workers who have given years and years of service and who on retirement get nothing. No one will quarrel with this. What we are concerned about is the question of the administration of this whole thing.

From the Bill it seems that the whole administration will vest in the Committee which is responsible for the Price Stabilisation Fund. And this Committee, as we understand it, by law is made up – I speak subject to correction – of five sugar planters' representatives and two persons appointed by the Government. The time has come when unions should administer things like pensions funds. This is their function in socialist countries and not puppet unions, but unions which have the confidence of the workers.

Every now and then we hear from the Minister of Labour how solicitous this Government is to the workers etc., how much it has done. Why does he not take a trip to one of the socialist countries? Let him go to China since you have such good relations with China and see how the trade unions function. How on questions of pension funds and holidays and things like that –

This Opposition should have been corrected long ago. How is it that since 1967 when this recommendation was made only it is only now this Government has sought to bring forward this measure?

Sugar workers who have given years of service receive \$3 and \$4 per week *ex gratia* payment and many of them do not qualify. It depends on goodwill. If you are a good stooge, belong to the company union, you will get *ex gratia* payment. We proposed that a completely new entity, completely divorced from this Price Stabilisation Fund Committee, should be set up to administer this fund and we are now making a second point, that the sugar planters should not be let out, as is now being done by the Government. They came to us when we were in the Government and we refused to entertain this.

Sugar planters were paying people over \$300,000 a year for *ex gratia* payments but they wanted, through the company union, to raid the other sugar funds, in this case, the Price Stabilisation Fund and now we see the Rehabilitation Fund, and remove themselves from any responsibility they had. We could not agree to that. Therefore, we are proposing that this Fund should constitute not only the two which we have here, that is, contributions from the Price Stabilisation Fund and the \$5 million from the Rehabilitation Fund, but it should also include what the sugar estates have been contributing all along.

It is a disgrace that workers have to receive only \$3, \$4 and \$5 a week. Many are not receiving anything. Some had small loans, up to a thousand dollars, to build houses. They cannot afford to pay because the payments are \$2 per week. And since the local authorities have embraced sugar estates, these poor people have been called upon to pay rates and taxes. How are they going to meet \$2 payment for their loans and meet rates and taxes out of a pension of \$3 to \$5 per week? In addition to this, large numbers do not receive anything at all.

It is clear that a scheme should be worked out which will meet all these demands of the pensioners, embrace all, raise the pension, so that the people can live decently. Wipe out the loans and pay the contribution from this fund towards the rates and taxes. The Labour Welfare Fund has been paying this all along, but since the local authorities have come in, the estate workers have been called upon to pay rates and taxes.

We say we want an independent administration that can look sympathetically at the cause of these poor people. Sugar producers and the two civil servants do not know what is happening, I refer to the civil servants, they may be in sympathy but they do not know what is happening. The sugar producers know, but they are out of sympathy. This must be completely administered by a group in which the workers' representatives constitute a large majority and they must be able then to calculate what it will take to meet the needs of these people, how much money will be involved, where the money is to be got.

The Hon. Minister told us that some of the funds are not liquid, they are invested. I have been trying for the last six months to find out how much money is in this Price Stabilisation Fund, and in the Rehabilitation Fund, where the money is invested. We know in the case of the Labour Welfare Fund that a sum of \$5 million is invested, no doubt, in Government securities, but we cannot get information about the others. Call up, they do not answer you. This is not good enough. We know the Government is hard up. Even its sponsors are not giving it handouts any more, as they used to, and so the Government is raiding all these funds and the workers' welfare is not being met, legitimate demands of the workers.

Sugar workers need all kinds of things, house lots, preparation of house lots; they need loans to build houses. The Labour Welfare Fund has not got the money because the Government is using it. The Minister should have the facts now to tell us, not to tell us in generalities – "*the funds are frozen, they are invested.*" We want to know what the amount is. We want to know where they are invested, and if they are invested in Government securities, the Government must unfreeze them so that the people's welfare can also be met. Those are our main contributions on this question. The Government should look at this sympathetically in view of the fact that it has expressed concern about the working people and it is always talking about jailing sharks. The Government jails the small man all the time. If they are sharks we do not mind, but do not let the big sharks go away.

Yesterday, reference was made to a unanimous report of the sugar planters being negligent in the case of the clarifier deaths at Canje, yet no action is taken against them. The Labour Inspectorate has done nothing. They have the power to prosecute. What is done about that? Nothing, what is done about prosecuting Beharry who donates money to the Congress Fund so they can collect \$150,000? They do not prosecute them because these sharks are the ones who are contributing to their coffers. This is how they are operating. The time has come not only to profess interest in the working class but to let us see it in practice. I repeat. Let us have an independent board to administer this whole thing outside of the hands of the sugar planters and the Price Stabilisation Fund Committee. Let us have contributing to this Fund not only from these two Funds, but the contribution of the sugar planters, a contribution which they were making all along towards *ex gratia* payments. Lastly, but not least, let us get the information about the status of these funds and whether these funds are invested so that we can understand properly how far one can go towards making proposals for the relief of these people who are suffering so much in the sugar estates.

I wonder whether the Minister will be in a position to tell us whether the *ex gratia* payments which will be made to sugar workers, and which were not covered by the National Insurance Scheme, will be the same as now paid. I presume this exercise is to bring in all the people who are not covered. That is why I ask this question, whether it is proposed not only to bring in additional people but whether the amount which is clearly inadequate will be increased and is envisaged by the calculations made for the expenditure of \$14 million.

The Hon. Minister is only saying that the sugar industry will be let off and a lot of poor people will come in. We heard the Hon. Minister of Labour say that under the N.I.S., the minimum payment is \$15 to \$17. What I want specifically to hear from the Minister, is whether consideration has been given also to the amount which will be paid, that is, is the rate going to be the same as the workers are now getting? And what is contemplated, is it just to give some others who were not getting anything? As he mentioned three categories, we want to know whether that point has been considered.

The Minister keeps reiterating about this wonderful Committee and that is the point I was trying to speak about yesterday when you stopped me. This was the committee for which G.A.W.U. was asked by the Prime Minister to name individuals. Two distinct lists were proposed including well-known people. The first list was rejected, the second list was rejected. The Government rejected all the names proposed by the workers' union. I am not talking of the M.P.C.A. Even the Hon. Minister admits this union has no status among the workers. We know what recommendations the commission gave. The workers got \$8.5 million for five years once for all bonuses, whereas, in one year under the P.P.P., the workers got \$6.3 million.

These are the facts.

If we had a real wonderful Commission, perhaps the tale would have been much different. And that is why I would have thought the Government would have gone into this question. It is not enough to tell us that the Commission proposed this. The Government should have seen to it, whatever the Commission recommended should have taken that into consideration and also the vital question which we raise – how much will the workers get, is it enough to live on, and then the Government would have seen how to get more funds. Perhaps more is necessary to be got from the Funds, and then come to the House with a full picture.

We are not satisfied only that more people will receive. The question is, will they be able to live? Figures have been given to show that these people cannot live on the pittance they are receiving and, therefore, the Government is not really doing anything to hide behind the fact that this was a wonderful Committee and it made its recommendations and all we are doing is implementing the recommendations. It is not good enough at this stage of the game especially after five years have passed since the Committee recommended.

## Local Authorities (Postponement of Elections) Bill 1972: 1<sup>st</sup> December, 1972

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, *"We believe in democracy. We believe in free and regular elections. We believe in the dignity of the individual and his right to express himself freely."* This is the Prime Minister speaking in Washington in 1966 as now highly published and no doubt highly paid for by the taxpayers in a series of articles in the *Financial Times*, August 25, 1972, and subsequently printed no doubt en mass for distribution as leaflets. This is how the money goes.

Let us come back to the quote: *"We believe in democracy. We believe in free and regular elections. We believe in the dignity of the individual."* Sir, this is the main question which is before this House today. What is the argument adduced by the Government's spokesmen? That G.A.L.A., representative, as the Minister of Local Government puts it, of sixty local authorities which is more people than the Opposition combined, is demanding that elections be postponed.

Let us see the equation. The Government is taking advice from G.A.L.A. G.A.L.A. is representative of sixty local authorities. The Local Authorities were elected by the P.N.C. but everyone knows they were elected by fraud first, in six districts, and because of those frauds the Opposition Parties boycotted the remaining Local Government elections. So where does the equation bring us? In a circle starting out with the P.N.C., starting out with fraud and ending up with a fraudulent request from an organization which is a creature of the Government, a creature of the Local Authorities which were fraudulently elected. That is the kind of logic we have in this House from the Ministers of the Government who propose to convince people in Guyana.

The Guyana Association of Local Authorities first of all, let us see how it came into being. A previous Minister of the P.N.C. Government, Mr. Llewelyn John was at one time the President of the Union of Local Authorities, and was also President in the first year after these bodies came into being. But in the last election, fearing that Llewelyn John might win again, what did they do? They asked for a vote by show of hands; secret ballot is not to be entertained. They do not even trust their own supporters their own people who have been hand-picked!

Let us see how these people got there to G.A.L.A. The then Mayor of Georgetown, John Ford, nominated eight Georgetown Councillors to attend, with himself and the Deputy Mayor, as delegates to the Conference. Was the P.P.P. there? Was the United Force there? How are the delegates selected? On what basis? In other words, the whole thing is a fraud. A P.N.C. outfit which is composed of councillors who were elected by fraud. Therefore, this argument does not hold any water that we are heeding the advice of a representative institution which speaks for so many people.

If this body was so strong, as is alleged, if the P.N.C. is so powerful

throughout the country, will they tell us why they were not able to get their supporters to fill the cinemas which are boycotted because the cinema owners are carrying out proxy exercises? How is it you are so strong, you speak for all the Local Authorities, a cinema is closed because of a boycott called by P.P.P.? You cannot win elections, because you are fraud boss number one.

This Minister when he was not paid, and promoted as a Member of the Elections Commission, we have what he said. He said clearly, that the registration list by no means could become the electoral roll. It could not. It would not. This is what he then said when the P.P.P. was expressing fears that this was a hand-picked outfit, and it referred to those who were making the registration lists. His line was, the Commission had nothing to do with that, and as regards the charge that the voters list will come from that, he said, not at all.

We have his exact words. I quote what he said on June 30, 1967:

*"The national register could not be the electoral roll. Compilation of the electoral roll was a matter for the Commission who shall exercise general directions and supervision over the registration of electors. The Commission has nothing to do with the preparation of the national register. Whatever might be the purpose of the register, it certainly could not be the electoral roll."*

But it was his Party's Government which validated the extracted names, 21 years and above, from the registration list to be christened and baptized as the electoral roll. This is how they win elections.

As regards the electoral roll, they get up here and beat their chest, how powerful they are, but they have been made a disgrace internationally. The night before the second T.V. film was shown, *The Making of a Prime Minister*, it was advertised on T.V. They showed the Prime Minister walking like this, and then they stopped him. Still Commentator: *"This man should not be attending the Prime Minister's Conference tomorrow. He won by fraud."* This is what people have seen all over the world, and then they have the gall to come here and talk about representative institutions such as G.A.L.A. The T.V. commentator pointed to a house in Western Berbice: *"A dead man voted from that house. He was hanged fifteen years ago."*

Local government elections, an average of 29 percent of the people voted by proxy. How can they come and tell sensible people that G.A.L.A. speaks for more than the Opposition put together? Examine the facts. R.P.A. elections, which are conducted in the countryside, they can win no seat. Let us take another area adjoining the rice cultivation area, sugar estates, cane scale checkers' elections conducted by the Ministry of Labour. G.A.W.U. contests, M.P.C.A. contests, also their own union, whose secretary is a man who stole money from the N.I.S. This is the kind of morality they practice in Guyana. Stole money when he was an employee of the G.A.W.U. from N.I.S. Why is it MP's here cannot win a seat, their union cannot win a seat

in the sugar belt? How then can they represent all the Local Authorities in the country? Whom are they trying to fool, with what logic?

The Hon. Prime Minister promised in 1971 in this House that machinery will be established to determine who should represent the sugar workers. When we were in the Government, when we tried to bring a poll, they said we will manipulate a poll. They are the bosses, they will supervise the elections; why then are they afraid? It is crystal clear. Examine the boycott of all their stooges and puppets and bootlickers, successful boycotts. They are using police to intimidate them. That is why policemen cannot go about helping to solve the crime problem.

On Wednesday, six P.P.P. supporters were picketing as a protest about the postponement of elections at Bush Lot, and another four at Fort Wellington, were picked up. The Sergeant tells the police: "*Pick them up; there is no industrial dispute in this area. What are they picketing about?*"

"*Pick them up; lock them up.*" They are taken to the police station, put on bail and told to report in a week. This is how the Members of the Government work then they come and tell us, "*Put up constructive suggestions.*" They tell the people to cooperate. How are they going to cooperate when they are being robbed and cheated, when there are crooks all over the place, from the top of the Government right to the bottom? You cannot expect any different system at the bottom when they are stealing at the top.

Look at the record; you heard it yesterday. Ask the Ombudsman. Where is the Ombudsman's report about Hamilton Green and David Singh? This is the position. Yesterday we heard the record. It was so stunning that even they were shocked. Of course, they do not know what is happening. That is why the President of G.A.L.A. had to be chastised in the public press. This is not self-criticism; we know how parties are run.

This is just an indication. Those criticisms, those attacks, were an expression of disgust even on the part of the Government and G.A.L.A., because they realized that the system is breaking down. You cannot expect people to cooperate under these conditions.

One would hope that we would take the words of Mr. Cheeks very seriously in respect of the functioning of local authorities. We had a series of articles the other day in the *Mirror* about China. It was said that there was no unemployment, no stealing, and no corruption. You do not want to have elections but you have the stealing and the corruption. In China they may not have elections because all the people are there backing them. That is obvious and clear. But these are not having elections, Sir, because they cannot win elections. That is the difference; there is a big difference between the two.

They are having problems. Their godfathers are not as generous as they used to be. They cannot bring forth their Plan which has been in the making for so long. Perhaps they cannot see where all the money is to come from. It is axiomatic and I think that even the ideologists in the P.N.C. will say that. The budding ideologist is groping, but nevertheless he is bud-

ding. They will admit that without the people's cooperation, no matter how many Plans you have, no matter how much money you get, you will not succeed. The writer of those three articles compared side by side China and India. I did that on many occasions in this House.

India was a recipient of much more foreign aid and help. At a Conference recently it was announced that India was today burdened with debt payments to an extent of 30 percent of its budget. This amount was swallowed up in debt. We are near that with 20 percent already and with a moratorium.

Let us come to the basic reason why China succeeded. The basic reason why China succeeded, why the Soviet Union succeeded before that and why Cuba will succeed in the western hemisphere is that the people are backing the Government and the people are involved.

I was having a discussion with the Minister of Economic Planning in Surinam, Mr. Essex, and when we were discussing this question he said, "*But we do not have the same kind of population as you have in China or in India to carry out this massive infrastructure work by the people's involvement.*" I reminded him that maybe that was so but we have 25 percent unemployed, that half of the youths cannot find work and are liming all over the place, that it is necessary to mobilize these people even though we do not have the millions that those two countries have.

But how are you going to mobilize them? Do you expect to mobilise them when there is so much patent fraud and hypocrisy all over the place? The Government must have a moral position. A Mao Tse-Tung, a Lenin, a Castro, got the backing because of their life style because of their moral position, because they were prepared to die for the people, if necessary. Can we say that here?

We are not speaking now just because we want to be in Local Authorities or we want elections just for the sake of elections. We are speaking out of deep concern about where this country is going. All right, postpone elections! But do you expect that you will remove the cause of the things which you are complaining about now, that is, the noncooperation, which G.A.L.A., or somebody else, calls "*sabotage*"? I do not know what the sabotage is. There is fighting in court, but what do you expect the people to do if there is unrepresentative local government, if there is discrimination, as we heard yesterday? The facts are glaring. Are the people to defend their rights in the courts if there are dictatorial regimes at the central Government as we experience here all the time in spite of being told that it is a parliamentary democracy and the same attitude is exercised at the bottom? What do you want the people to do? They must have recourse elsewhere even though they may get cowboy trials. They have to exhaust the process.

It seems to me that the Government has been gearing for the elections. It was gearing for them. Look at the proxies; they are all here without names. There is just the name they signed without authorizing anybody. These are



proxies which your agent signed. Here they are duplicate copies! That is why a lot of them have boycotted this. Soon you will have to feed them out of the Treasury. But apparently the campaign has not been so successful. Some of their bootlickers are afraid; they are getting worried because their cinemas, their shops, their stores, even priests and pandits are not getting any work. They are now beginning to realize that it is not profitable to become a proxy collector. Of course, some of them are promised to become Ministers in the next Government, some are even threatening your position, Sir.

We hope not by fraud. It would seem that the proxy collection did not come up to scratch as they had expected. But be that as it may, probably they felt that if they had an election and it was contested the fraud in proxy collections, in tampering with ballot boxes, will become so patent, so well-known, so well documented, this time it will not be the making of a Prime Minister only, they will probably have to make several films of the Making of Lord Mayors, sixty of them. They cannot stand this Sir; it does not go well with their image that they are trying to create. The Prime Minister is trying to create: "*Oh we have good boys, we are decent fellows*", and so they do not want any dress rehearsals before the elections which will expose the whole thing. I think these are the two basic factors. Therefore, they resort to this high-handed autocratic method.

When you talk about the Constitution as the Hon. Member Mr. Cheeks was just talking about a little while ago they always refer you to the point: "*Go to the Courts.*" Sir, you know respected lawyers now in their Associations are questioning the judicial process in Guyana. It is not only politicians but lawyers. When there are people who begin to lose confidence in the rule of law, in institutions whether it is legally, administratively or otherwise. My friend says liberty is a living reality in Guyana, freedom of speech. Yet we know what happened to one newspaper administratively. They are so ashamed that when pressure appears to become visible they speak and they resort to underhand things like back dating permits. How can you set an example to the community at large in a society which is completely breaking down into more crime, disorder, loss of respect? You cannot expect that you are going to get anything else if you sow winds such as these; you are bound to reap the whirlwind.

The Hon. Member Mr. Cheeks made a very good start, but I do not know where he was at the end. His betwixt shows his balancing act; this is indicative of his coming out of the United Force and going under the wings of the P.N.C. I was waiting anxiously to hear the conclusion when he sat down. This is the kind of thing that happens even in this Chamber. Poor Mr. Cheeks, look what has happened to him. He started out logically, but ran out of steam, because of pressure one way or another, they exert pressure on people. Sir, fear cannot build a country. People are not going to do anything; they are going to do things for a while and you have to understand that merely making excuses is not a way out. You heard shouts yes-

terday: "Why didn't you have elections? You postponed elections?" I am glad Mr. Cheeks has put the records straight; of course, he was justifying his own position. This is how he put it: "There was full and sufficient reason why no elections could be held in his period of four years at the Ministry of Local Government."

He went on to say which you must emphasise also that the longer period was in your P.N.C. regime. This is four years up to 1968 but elections were not held until 1970. If there was full and sufficient reason in 1968 not to have elections, can one not see that there was more than full and sufficient reason not to have elections in the period when the P.P.P. was in office? One recalls the burning and the looting; one recalls civil servants on strikes; one recalls that there were no valuation officers and so on. I only quote from what your previous Minister said which amply bears out the point that there were sound reasons why it was not held at the time. Whether this is so or not, this is no time to go into all that.

This is no time to go into all these things. This Government knew when it passed the Local Government Legislation that elections would be held this year. If the Members of the Government are so confident that they have all the support, if they represent more people than the P.P.P. and United Force combined, why is it they are not holding the elections, because from their argument they will win the elections. It is patent that they cannot win the elections because they have no support in the countryside, and therefore they have to resort to this dictatorial measure, violating what the Prime Minister says, so that the same people who were attacked bitterly will be able to continue to run the show. They are in a dilemma —

No, Sir. They are in a dilemma in that in the areas which were not contested, they won all the seats and therefore they do not have anybody else on the list that they can put in. They have to resort to the age-old colonial practice, which they condemned, of nominating people, but they will go on like this.

Bypass the R.P.A., put Rice Action Committees. But the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Rice production has fallen and similarly agricultural production is stagnating, and so on, as reflected in the city in the high prices of staple foods which the people have to eat. Had it not been for the controlled price of rice, they would have a riot on their hands right here in the city, by their own supporters, but they are doing it at the expense of the farmers. They do not mind because the farmers do not support them, and so they are caught up in all these dilemmas. Ultimately, they have to resort to these totalitarian methods in order to continue in power in office.

I repeat. We are not criticizing just for the sake of criticizing. The Government gives the impression that we have nothing to say, we are never giving any suggestions, we do not have any programme to recommend. This has been said over and over, but the Government is afraid to do what it should be doing both in foreign and domestic policies, because it is serving two masters at the same time, imperialism on the one hand and trying

to serve the working class who voted for it. Elitism whether it is at the central Government level, or Guystac level, or the corporations' level, or the local Government level, is not going to solve the problems. Elitism has to give way to participatory democracy, to the involvement of the people.

G.A.L.A. has called for decentralization. Why has all this not been done? G.A.L.A. is caught up in the contradictions also. It sees that certain things need to be done. Some of the Members are no fools but they also see that it is not possible to do it with incompetents, with crooks, and with an incompetent central administration. Look at local government. In the P.P.P.'s time, they blamed us. There was no Minister in the P.P.P.'s time that was solely in charge of local government. But how many they had – Mr. Cheeks, Mr. Joaquin, Mr. John, Mr. Mingo and now Mr. Salim. Five Ministers. I think this record is broken only by the Minister of Health where there were eight in the last eight years. They do not know. They speak but they do not come down to formulating things which are basic and which have been enunciated as principles. The thing cannot work. We have a Chairman in this House who does not know, things are referred by people lower down to the Ministry and he does not even have an estimate. I want to make two points.

As Mr. Cheeks pointed out, at the local government level, it is even more vital to have the people involved because they see, they are near to the problems, they see day by day, unlike the central Government where things are hidden in reports and all kinds of things to which they have no access. The ordinary man is no fool. He may not be versed in what some of my colleagues in the Front Bench always like to applaud that is good English, nice dress, nice appearance, nice image, etc. I do not only believe in being nice in surface when fraud and corruption are behind. Niceness cannot cover dirt, otherwise it will not last very long, and this is the problem. The people, maybe, they do not have all these graces, but they know basically what they want. These are the ordinary people, like those who fought in China and got political powers who are today building. This is the way they did it in Cuba, too.

What are you doing? You are suppressing the majority of the people all the time. You are discriminating against them; you are defrauding them at elections. You are setting examples of dishonesty. What are you going to do? Do you expect them to cooperate? Eventually what are they going to do?

This is seen even in a big country like Argentina where they thought that dictatorial rule would help. But they had to come around to elections again even though they are going to try to defraud it here and there. They had to come back because, as I said, basic and axiomatic to development is the participation and the support of the people. Western capitalist countries are beginning to realize this. You suppress it here and it has to come out somewhere else. It must come out in noncooperation and ultimately in revolt. As the night follows the day, there is nothing secret about this. This

is just logical. This is why some societies prefer to have things evolve by democratic procedures.

We are only warning. Government has a majority and it tries to steam-roller with this majority. Parliamentary democracy does not function simply by steam-rolling everything. The end result of all action must be where it is going to get you.

The Minister (Mr. Hoyte) is now lecturing trade unionists how they must not strike. You must send me a copy. Let me read the whole thing and then give me an opportunity to come and answer you for about two hours.

They are realizing it. They cannot make it without the people's cooperation. That is why there are pleas to the workers, but they cannot fundamentally get the support unless they come down, whether at the local government level or the trade union level, to basic democracy as at G.U.Y.B.A.U. to solve the question of trade union democracy. Even in their own ranks, among their own supporters, they cannot solve it. Thus there are all these pleas, the twisting of things and criticizing of foreigners. The foreigners helped to put them where they are, these trade unionists.

The Government, at one stage, heeded the Trade Union Movement when it wanted to make an anti-strike law. Because the Trade Union Movement backtracked on its own position, the Government had to retreat. We are calling on the Members of the Government today: if they have the interest of the people of this country at heart they should scrap this, otherwise I predict that a slogan, the slogan which fired the blood of the revolutionaries in America in 1775, "*No taxation with representation*", will go up and down this country. That is bound to come as the night follows day, no matter how much rigging they do and no matter how much steam-rolling they do in this House.

## Budget Debate: 15<sup>th</sup> December, 1972

**Dr. Jagan:** In this Budget we have been presented with some impressive figures, both for the current and also for the capital Budget. What is necessary at this time in the history of our country is to look very deeply into the figures which are presented. In fact, not only these figures but the general propositions which are put in the Budget.

On the first page, we read glowingly of a 7 percent rate of growth, of the gross domestic product, but even by the Government's own admission, this is a deficit rate, for the cost of living alone, the Government has admitted to be 5 percent. Then we have to add to that, population increase, which is also in the vicinity of 2½ to 3 percent.

If we examine the Budget itself, we have to try to see where all this money is coming from. I refer particularly to the current Budget. Surely, production has not been increasing significantly in this country. The Hon. Minister himself admitted that last year the volume of production fell, but the gross income was maintained because of increasing prices. But if we look at the figures over a long period, 1964 to the present time, we will find that there have not been significant increases in production in the sugar industry. In 1963, there was a total of 317,000 tons. This year, it is likely that the production will be about the same, perhaps a little more. Rice production in 1964 was 173,000 tons in 1970 it was 134,000 tons. I give round figures, last year and this year, even less. Timber production 1964, 1,517 tons valued at \$2½ million roughly; 1970, 852,000 tons nearly a 50 percent decrease valued at \$2,407,000. I give these figures only to indicate.

In the field of bauxite, of course, production has gone up from \$11/3 million to \$3 million in 1970, alumina from 288,000 to 344,000 tons, not a significant increase. In the case of bauxite, this is a wasting asset and in true budgeting, perhaps, we should be setting aside a sum each year for this wasting asset, so one can say when it is all depleted we have that sum of money which we can use elsewhere, for on the Government's own admission it has not been able to generate surpluses from the current Budget for its own development. This is a fundamental question especially when one is looking for income from a wasting asset like bauxite. One must think about it seriously.

My main point is that the growth in revenue from 1964 to the present time has been quite significant from about the current Budget of \$70 million in 1964 to \$174 million. If this has not come basically from production then where has it come from? It has come, I submit, mainly from taxation. And this is why the Guyanese people are smarting under so many hardships today.

I do not think the Government can produce figures out of the air to show that production has sustained this large increase in the revenue. The rev-

enue has increased in customs and excise from \$32 million to \$69 million, which is an increase of roughly 214 percent. This is due to the cumulative taxation which was imposed in 1966 through to 1969. And from 1969, although we have been hearing about tax-free Budgets, outside of the Budget we have had increases in electricity charges, increases in telephone charges, increases in postage rates, increases recently in rum and other liquor taxes, increases in local authority rates and taxes and so on.

Normally, outside of the rates and taxes for Local Authorities, all of this, in the colonial times, came at Budget time. They were regarded as taxation but this Government wants to create a favourable position that there are no taxes, that the Budget is free of taxes. It bowls these googlies between the Budget Statements and comes along at Budget time to give us these figures. I submit that the masses of the people have had to pay taxes upon taxes which have largely accounted for these inflated Budgets.

What have they done with the money? This is the next question. I have already shown that very little surplus, generated from the current Budget for the purposes of our development has gone towards the Development Programme. This Development Programme speaks of a deficit in the consolidated account, of a deficit at the end of this year which will be nearly \$102 million as against a figure of \$6 million in 1964. That was the net deficit in the accumulated account. This, Sir, is the classic deficit financing which has led to the recurrent curse of inflation in Latin America and this is what the Guyanese people are feeling today.

Where does the money go? Let us note some of the Heads. General Administration has increased from \$16 million in 1964 to \$62 million in 1973, a 388 percent increase. The bureaucracy has grown by leaps and bounds. I see my friend Kitt at the back there. That is how the money goes. He is part of the bureaucracy. For one Jack Kelshall you have three or four. That is what is shown up here. Police expenditure has gone up from \$4½ million to \$9 million, that is, it had doubled. Prisons went up from \$6.58 million in 1964 to \$12 million, 180 percent. Expenditure on the Army in 1966 was a little less than \$1.98 million. It went up to \$8.98 million. External Affairs went up from \$500,000 in 1966 to \$4.2 million this year, an increase of 854 percent. Information was \$118,935, less than a quarter million. It went to \$1.8 million in 1972; an increase of 485 percent.

Let us see, on the other hand, what has gone to the people. General Administration has increased by 388 percent; Social Services have increased by 207 percent; Social Assistance has had no increase at all from 1964 to now; Pensions and Gratuities have increased by 171 percent.

These are the figures which tell the tale behind the Budget. The people have been taxed but the people are not getting value for money spent. The money is being squandered, wasted. It is not going even for the development of our country, it is not going even to replenish an asset like bauxite which is being dug out of the ground.

We do not say we must not have expenditure under different Heads

such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. But what has to be seriously examined at this time of the Guyanese history is the question of priorities. First things must be done first, which means that we have to look after those people who are having a difficult time today to make two ends meet. Our public debt is becoming an increasing burden on the taxpayers. It has jumped from \$10 million in 1964 to \$35 million. This is a 341 percent increase. This is the position. Who pays for this? Who pays for the over bloated administration and the squander mania but the people through a cut in social services? The Minister of Economic Development will tell us talk in absolute figures, but absolute figures must be talked about in relation to where the money is coming from; it is coming from the people. That is why we chose to deal in percentages. It is coming from the people; if the people are paying the taxes the people have a right.

Sir, where does the money go? Let us look at the Budget Statement. We see at the top of page 36:

*"... Increases in expenditure fall mainly in the following areas – Defence \$1.4 million, Foreign Affairs \$0.5 million, Land Development, \$0.5 million, Post Office \$0.3 million, Works and Communications \$0.7 million, Education \$2.3 million, Health \$0.4 million, Trade (subsidy) \$2.4 million, and Public Debt \$3.9 million."*

From 20 percent of the Budget last year the public debt has jumped this year to 21 percent. Let us not live in the clouds. It is going to increase further because the Government has been given favourable considerations, 5 year and 10 year moratoriums, and quite a large number of the loans which the Government has, and the more they borrow, the bigger the proportion in time it will have to pay. And thus we have this steadily climbing proportion of the Budget which goes to finance the huge debt burden. The Government gives us a big Programme for Development - \$145.2 million. It is clear that they have not either been able to spend this kind of money or to get this kind of money in the past. There is no doubt that what is being done is merely putting a figure. The same way we had it, in 1968 Guyanese people were told that over \$200 million will be spent on the Tiboku Hydro-electric Project. This is what is being done here – guess estimates. It was not that the P.P.P., as my friends are saying, was dealing in guess estimates. What they are referring to is the 1960/1964 programme for which we wanted \$200 million. There were estimates including the East Coast Road which the British had paid large sums of money to have surveyed during the Interim Government period plus the whole electricity expansion Scheme. Sir, Kenneth Beril gave the justification to the British Government for cutting down the programme from \$200 million to \$100 million on the grounds that if we borrowed so extensively to finance such a big plan by the '70s Guyana will be faced with a 31 percent debt burden on the Budget. This was the justification. This was the justification. But Sir, where has the pro-

duction gone in Guyana to justify, the Minister of Economic Development is arguing which argument I use – that productivity and production can increase. But where is the money going? Where did it go last year? Page 30 has shown what was done last year. But when you look at these figures you will see –the biggest expenditure is for sea and river defences, Rice Rehabilitation Programme, silos. They have not got the rice to put in the mills much less in the silos.

This is how productivity and production are going up. This is how they are expanding development money which they are borrowing “*harum scarum*” all over the place.

The Hon. Prime Minister says we are getting it, yes, you are going to get it, when you buy silos; you are going to get it, when you buy pumps; you will get it, when you buy fish trawlers; you will get it when you buy these products of packaged unemployment. You will get it because in the present situation of Anglo-American imperialism, they will give you these things. Of course, the Chinese will give you textile mills and other mills, in the same way that the other socialist countries will be prepared to give you factories, to develop land Schemes, and to take payment out of the products produced in this country.

I suppose the Chinese deal is based on that kind of proposition, but are we going to get the Yankee and the British and the Mexicans, and the Colombians, who sold us trawlers by remote arrangement, to buy Guyanese products? This is what we have been quarrelling about. Development does not only mean spending money. It is not only a question of quantum. It is a question of analysing of the total situation, planned proportional development as socialist economists will say, integrating planned proportional development of the economy putting emphasis mainly on the private sector for industry and agriculture, and integrating this with progressive foreign policy, which does not rely on playing the Nixon game.

Let us go back a bit. The \$300 million Plan which was formulated in 1966 for seven years, was going to usher the millennium in Guyana, was going to solve all our problems in the same way it is now being shouted that we are going to feed and house and do everything ourselves by 1976. It is the same old story. The one before failed and all this will go the same way.

We heard the Hon. Minister of Housing and Reconstruction speak about drainage and irrigation, agriculture, and he told us that Hutchinson was a colonial with colonial concepts and we must not borrow from foreigners. Will the Hon. Minister tell us whether he was not one of those who praised Hutchinson, whether he was not one of those who worked out a feasibility study for the Mahaicony-Abary Scheme?

The Hon. Minister is trying to confuse the House. I know more about this than you do, although you sat in that Ministry for years. Hutchinson condemned the small Scheme, Demerara East Coast Conservancy. He condemned empoldering such as Black Bush Polder, because he said, particu-



larly these two Schemes would contribute to the further inundation of surrounding areas. We know what happens every year with flooding in the Mahaica-Mahaicony area. Why did I do the Black Bush Polder? It was done by the Interim Government which had brought all the Mr. Brown's and all the plans from the different Schemes.

In the Hutchinson proposals, it was intended to completely condemn and abolish the East Coast Conservancy and to have timed drainage and irrigation from the Demerara River to the Berbice River, which would have tied in irrigation and drainage. The Hon. Minister tells us about pumps and drainage, and he compares the situation with the sugar estates, but what do the sugar estates do on the East Coast? They use the conservancy for irrigation water, but in times of flood, they release the four kokers at Lama and Maduni and flood out as far as the Abary.

The whole objective – and the Minister knows this – is that drainage on the coast is not only caused by rainfall in that particular area that is being cultivated, but water rushing down from the back, and the Hutchinson Schemes were intended to control the back waters to prevent flooding in the front, and also in time of drought to have irrigation by gravity. What have they done that is different from that? Let him tell the House and the country about the Scheme which he worked out for the first phase when he was in charge of drainage and irrigation. Let us concede for a moment that it was not Hutchinson's Scheme. I am saying that the principle enunciated by Hutchinson – these people cannot understand – was what the Minister worked out an engineering project for. He did it for \$32 million. I asked him after he worked it out how much it would cost, I said, "*Go back and do some feasibility exercise. Let us know how we will be able to finance it, where the income will come from.*" He was able to show, and he has the figures, that this Scheme, based on direct and indirect income from increased production, increased acreage, will be self-financing in 17 years. Your masters in the Colonial Office said, "*No*".

The Minister now tells us that we have to go into the economics of these Schemes, that the Tapakuma Scheme was not an economic Scheme. But, Sir, the economists also have to take into consideration a thing called "*social costs*". This is why people like D'Aguiar can succeed in running a beer factory and a soft drinks factory but when he comes to the Ministry of Finance, as part of the Government, he fails.

There is a thing called "*social costs*". If you do not provide gainful employment to people or succeed in keeping them in the countryside what is going to happen? Not only do you have to find money to give social assistance, which we see from the Estimates stands still, but you have increasing crime. Your prison population goes up. That is happening now. They admit that the prison was built for 250. When I was in prison in 1953 they had about 25 remands. They now have to make a special jail at Timehri to take care of remands alone. Social costs have to be taken into consideration in calculating whether a Scheme should be carried out or not.

Everyone knows that Essequibo is a depressed area. We heard a speech by the Hon. Member Mr. Ambrose. Obviously you can see that years of P.P.P. education have done him well. He made a very important point that if agriculture is to succeed in Guyana we must relate average income in various sectors of the economy, in industry, such as bauxite, such as sugar, such as urban versus rural incomes, standards of living and so on. It was a very important point.

All we are hearing is *"We are going to feed and house and clothe ourselves."* Let us take the first. I was in Western Berbice on Wednesday last; they are trying to get the people to grow a second rice crop. They told me that for the last crop the average yield was roughly 7 percent of what were the expectations. That was because of floods. They are encouraging them now to grow a second crop of rice. Now we hear talks about pumps. This is what was told to me. The pump is not going to help that. Where are they going to bring the water from? As the estates pull out the water from the Abary for their irrigation the water gets salt in the front part where the rice farmers are operating. Therefore they cannot cultivate. How are pumps going to help them?

The Minister told us about a feasibility study. Was any economic feasibility study done on all these big road programmes in the McKenzie Road Highway? We would like to see it. They do not make feasibility studies on a lot of the infrastructural Schemes they are doing. A feasibility study caused them to build the \$35 million silos. First of all, you have to get the rice to put in them. You are the Governor of Leguan and you do not know what is going on in a rice area. They say they do not want 50 percent of their salary deducted from their pay every fortnight. Drainage and Irrigation comes first. There must be priorities. The priorities will then help us to increase this production. That is one aspect of it.

The price structure in Guyana for rice, milling or copra is such that it cannot encourage the farmers to produce. This is why we have been having a decline in agricultural production. You have not told us what has happened to the Land Settlement Schemes such as Mara, and Brandwagt Sari, such as the one in Moco-Moco in the Rupununi, the big place that the Government built as decanting centre at Annai. What has happened to all these things?

In the developed countries we know that in order to get agricultural production going, as in the United States, they have a two-priced system where they pay the farmers a high price even if they have to sell it at a low price in order to keep the people in the countryside and to keep agricultural products from going up. But we may be asked: Where are we going to get the money to do this? We may be told that industrialized countries have a larger industrial sector. When we look in the Budget Speech we see that for last year income tax from companies amounted to \$48 million, and \$43 million is estimated for this year. Why not nationalise these companies? Why not take money from this nationalisation so that you can subsidi-

dise the farmers, so that you can keep them in the country so that the income will be generated? This will have a dynamic effect on the economy as a whole. I thought my friend was studying Marxism/Leninism.

For the benefit of this Hon. Minister let me tell him for the first and last time, the P.N.C. Opposition at the then time caused to be written in our Constitution a clause which read: "*Prompt and adequate compensation if anything that is nationalised.*" It was the Hon. Member Mrs. Willems with her defenders of freedom who were saying why this clause has been put in our Constitution. I was not afraid. You and your supporters generated an atmosphere of fear which permitted that clause to be put in the Constitution. Let me give you another practical example. Wait, just a minute. The year 1963 when –

They were dancing in the streets with the C.I.A.; a Cuban vessel answering an S.O.S. sent a tanker with gasoline and kerosene. When it came here the question was where to store it. We knew that they were some tanks at Atkinson which belonged to the Americans but which along with the whole property had been released to the Government of British Guiana. When I referred to this that we are going to store the gasoline and kerosene there the Americans said they would not allow it because this is Cuban oil and it cannot be stored in American property. I told the Governor that I am going to nationalise them, take them over. The Governor said if this is done it will endanger the relations between the United States and the United Kingdom, and as such being in charge of foreign affairs he would not allow it.

A manifesto enunciates what the Government will do for a particular term of office and under the conditions of 1964, tell me, had the P.P.P. won would the P.N.C. support the P.P.P. for nationalisation of anything? As late as 1970 at the 1968 Elections the P.N.C. stated openly all over that they will not nationalise. At the election campaign – you had no manifesto. Sir, from 1968 they said they will not nationalise. As late as May 1970 the Prime Minister's Permanent Secretary no doubt taking the cue from the Prime Minister, because no civil servant today speaks on an issue like that without knowing what the Prime Minister's views are, Mr. Henry went to New Amsterdam on May 26, 1970, and spoke – the clipping is there, and their ideologist of the University was also involved in the debate. Dr. Lutchman argued against it. They were only talking about meaningful participation, now they are blowing the trumpet about nationalisation. I am saying that we could not nationalise, and I do not know if logic is beyond this Minister.

The P.N.C. will not support any Amendment of the Constitution as we did.

Sir, I come back to the point. In their manifesto they said in 1964 they will not nationalise the sugar industry. They are blowing the trumpet about nationalisation. They gave us how much income they made this year. What they did not tell us is the amount of money that D.E.M.B.A. was paying in income tax. They did not tell us that. However, I leave that point because I am not going to argue against nationalisation.

I want to ask them why berate the fact that D.E.M.B.A. was doing this and doing that. Go to Kwakwani and you will see a worse situation there. That is why I held up one quarter million acres of land and I refused to give them a lease. And you gave them the lease in 1965. You signed the secret agreement with them.

We heard incidentally, that the P.P.P. was doing nothing against D.E.M.B.A. We wrote to them and asked them about the land over on the west part of Demerara, which they were not using at all. It was then that they built a bridge across the Demerara River just to do a little bit to fool us that they were working all over the place. But the Government must not blow hot and cold. On the one hand, they say we must own and control our resources. Castro said the same thing. Castro has put it into practice. Allende said the same thing; he has put it into practice.

This is the position and therefore they must not say that in one breath, and then in the other one comes along and say it is a question of pace. They have the records, we have nothing to hide, where it is shown that the P.P.P. was going to move on the lands on the west which were not being utilized, and to go ahead on our own. This is why the I.D.C. was created and it said, *"to facilitate and also undertake the establishment of industry"*. If a constitutional clause prevented the P.P.P. from nationalisation, then the P.P.P. was going to resume and withhold, as we did with Reynolds, one quarter million acres of land, and go in for our own development.

This was the P.P.P.'s strategy, but what excuse you have? A secret agreement with Reynolds in 1965! This is why you do not want to nationalise Reynolds. In order to circumvent the Constitution, that handicap which they put in – they allowed the Colonial Office to put in – it was necessary to adopt that kind of strategy. We are not apologizing for our programme. What we are asking these people who say, ownership and control, is to be consistent and not to do as the Minister of Mines said: all we stand for is partnership, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs say: they must forget about D.E.M.B.A., D.E.M.B.A. is a mental block, or words to that effect.

This Government is in the fortunate position of having an Opposition which will give it support for a radical programme which it is not doing and in order to hide its puppet status, to rationalize it, it talks about pace and tactics. The Government is aware that this crushing burden of taxation will continue to exert its debilitating effect on the human resources in Guyana, which in turn will affect the whole productive forces in our country.

Cost of living —the Government would like the Guyanese people to believe that it has no responsibility in this at all, that two things are responsible, and one is foreign prices increasing out of its control and local people trying to take advantage of the situation. To put the record straight, let us see what are some of the factors which add to this heavy burden which the Guyanese people are carrying today. We had devaluation. We had taxation. We have failures in agriculture, industrial, and trade policies. I would

like to refer to these.

Devaluation on two occasions in 1967 and 1971, will the Government say that this did not contribute to the cost of living? Government admitted that it did the last one so as to help the situation in Guybau. What has it done with the windfall that has come to it directly and indirectly from the company by way of taxation? I have already said what the Government has done, expanded the State apparatus and the coercive apparatus of the State, financing the huge national debt which is growing, the same with taxation which has increased by leaps and bounds. Apart from the taxes which I have mentioned which are done outside of the Budget, the Guyanese people cannot bear any more taxes, that is why the Government cannot come forward with any more taxes.

Agricultural policy, prices. The milk producers had to go on strike the other day before they increased the price which was lower than it was in 1964. From sixty cents a gallon in 1964, it was dropped by them to fifty-six cents. The price of copra remains today the same as it was in 1964. They import soya bean from the United States, nearly \$½ million. They import copra and coconut oil from the West Indies, \$½ million. Tax payers have to foot that bill. West Indian producers of copra are getting 5 cents per pound more than they are getting here.

This is the reason why the cost of living is killing people today. Production costs have gone up to the farmer. In addition, as my Hon. Friend Mr. Durant reminded the House the other day, larceny in the countryside is rampant. As a result, cattle, sheep, goats are disappearing and people cannot go in for production, even of ground provisions. Apart from that, there are floods and droughts. This is a fact. When the statisticians begin to talk, as they are now trying to talk, about controlling prices they must take all the factors into consideration because their past policies have contributed to the present impasse both in agriculture and with respect to the cost of living for urban workers.

On the question of Carifta and Regional Integration, what has Carifta brought? Branch plants, dearer and inferior goods, and what else? Consumption tax on the Guyanese people. Consumption tax has gone up, duty has been taken off from the goods which have come from outside but what I am saying is that in the process of the Government trying to recoup the money by consumption tax, people are also penalized because they have to pay higher prices for the branch plant products coming from the Carifta countries.

The Government has its policy. What I am saying is that policy has contributed to the increase in the cost of living. The Hon. Members do not want to admit it. That is their business, but it is a fact.

The External Trade Bureau was established on the ground that it would reduce the cost of living. But apart from the question of principle there is the question of inefficiency and corruption. Why don't they let in some breath of fresh air into the place? Involve all who are interested to see what

is going on. Controlled prices are good but it is no use fixing prices which are, first of all, uneconomic; which are so marginal that the merchants will not stock the goods and they go into black market; it is no use running the thing so that you have dislocations in supply, you have shortages all the time, and, as a result, the prices that you set mean nothing. People are forced to pay black market prices and no matter how much price control you have you are not going to succeed unless you run the thing properly.

Tell us what you will do about the cost of living. The Government gives some income tax relief, \$1.3 million. But the defence levy alone, a 3 percent tax on everything coming into the country, is nearly \$4.6 million. Why have they not abolished this? Either they must have subsidization or they must cut out the defence levy. There must be one or the other. What happened to flour? You put a tax on the people. In 1962 when we put a Budget, you all were shouting "*Rum is a poor man's drink.*"

We demand for the people of this country a policy of subsidization. This was done in the time of our colonial masters. They talk much about our colonial masters but the colonial masters used to subsidise essential commodities during the war and long after the war.

In your manifesto there was a promise of free school books to children; university education was to be provided to all. Human resources are going to waste, 600 students apply with minimum qualifications, and 500 pass the entrance test to boot. Less than 200 are taken. This is how the people are being helped.

We call for an end to the 10 percent surcharge on goods coming from socialist countries. Why is it that these so-called "*socialists*" have put a surcharge of 10 percent on goods originating in socialist countries? Where is their international solidarity? This is contributing to the cost of living.

When the P.P.P. was in the Government I was Minister of Trade at one time. The first thing I did was to abolish all quotas, liberalise trade, and buy from anywhere. That is what the P.P.P. did. We cut out all the rackets, the bribes and the corruption that was going on. Why don't they do that? That is what is going to help to bring down the cost of living. Liberalise trade, or remove the consumption tax, shake up and reorganize the E.T.B. When the new manager, Mr. Low-A-Chee, was appointed we heard that there was going to be a big shake up but a strike was threatened on him. Congress Place must have said, "*Boy, you better cool off, cool down things*", so nothing happened.

Pay economic prices to the farmers, prices which will not only take into consideration the costs of production but which will also take into consideration this factor which was referred to, that is, making life attractive to the people in the countryside so that they will not drift to the city as is the general tendency in Third World countries.

Now, I would like to say something about the other evil which we have inherited from this Government. That is the unemployment situation. The Prime Minister said at a meeting the other night that the figure dropped

from 22.7 percent to 15 percent. Where did these figures come from? At one time we heard Kit Nascimento say that it is 15 percent. Mr. Salim, the Minister of Local Government, said that it is at least 15 percent.

When the Minister of Economic Development attended the unemployment seminar called by the T.U.C. there were no figures so far as the rate of unemployment was concerned. The Prime Minister was there, what figures did he give? None, but now elections are approaching, we are manufacturing them and drawing them out like swallows in the air, and we let them fly, 15 percent unemployment. The situation is very serious. We call on the P.N.C. Government to provide unemployment relief immediately and also emergency works.

Under the devaluation the capitalist of Guyana, the foreign capitalist mainly secured a tremendous windfall. How is it that the Government cannot use this windfall for the purpose of giving some relief to those people who are having a hard time? The Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago Dr. Eric Williams faced with a revolt in 1970 put on a special 5 percent tax on the companies and got \$10 million so as to create work to give to the unemployed in a short-term period.

We do not say that our whole programme should be based on relief works but, there must be a short term approach to this question as well as a long term approach. There are many infrastructural works. I do not mean digging a hole and filling it up as they had to do in America after the depression. There are many local authorities in the countryside even in the city where necessary works are to be performed but it is not done because there is not enough money. The Government tells us, "*grow more things.*" I have bought plants until I am tired. I have a big yard space. I heard on the radio if you do not have land get pots. I have land, I buy mango trees, and I buy orange trees, pineapple plants. The plants grow up to a size and they stop growing. The water in my yard is always higher than the one in the trench. It cannot get out. Why does the Government not stop – it has the power – Bookers and the Housing Scheme next to Bookers from pumping the water into the Cummings Canal? When the pump to drain the G.D.F. Compound was built why did they not integrate that with the whole area? One pump could have done the job. But, "*Grow more food, let us feed ourselves,*" this time the mango tree is not growing. Nothing is growing. This is where there are only preaching –

I am winding up now. The time has come to do more than preaching. Even they are changing their tune. Long ago the persons, the preachers for years were only exhorting people "*Do good, behave well, and do not steal.*" Even these people today, I have clippings here from the newspaper: "*No communism dangers to Caribbean.*" This is the headline in the *Graphic*. Here is Archie's article commenting on the Church Meeting, I think it was in Barbados and this is necessary to be quoted.

*Guyana Graphic, 3<sup>rd</sup> December, 1972:*

*"The Committee said that it believes the Gospel of Christ must be proclaimed enabling our people to realize the full worth through the redemptive work of Christ. This must now manifest itself in the Caribbean situation.*

*We therefore call on the Caribbean people to rise up today to become in their own situation the instrument of radical and creative change and to take the risks involved in answering this call."*

Sir, the Government is obviously not taking the crisis in our country today seriously. But one Minister had, perhaps without thinking about it, revealed the state of bankruptcy which faces this country today when he disclosed those alarming figures at the meeting of the Nurses Council from the Caribbean. Alarming, when out of 1,147 nurses who took the professional examination, only 267 passed.

This is an alarming state. It cost taxpayers money to train those people. Go into the hospital and see! A messenger working in my office was knocked down by a Government vehicle, which did not stop at a major road. Through inadequate care, medical and nursing care, his leg became gangrenous and had to be amputated. Poor people are dying like flies. Two on one bed, even surgical cases coming out of the operation! Do you doubt this? Two maternity cases on one small bed! A lot of people, whose legs do not have to be amputated, could be saved.

The country suffers in two ways, the cost to train these people who are failing, and the inadequate services which the people are getting, and look at the other alarming side. While 267 pass in the five-year period, 323 left the service. Gone like birds. Who are these people? Most of them are P.N.C. supporters. Even its supporters are losing confidence in this Government. Why do you think they are putting the 10 percent tax on airline tickets? This is not a revenue measure. This is a measure to prevent people from leaving. The brain drain is so terrible that they are using this as a device.

Give us the statistics of how many people are leaving Guyana. We have the figures for passport fees. They have alarmingly increased. In the time of the P.P.P., it was very easy to go to England, anyone could have gone. Today, it is very difficult to go and they are going. The skilled people are going, those who have some capital are leaving, and this is the reality. They are perturbed, but they do not want to admit it.

Parasites are leaving Cuba, but here, your supporters have not got jobs or they see mounting inflation eating up their income. Mr. Semple in New Amsterdam, President of the Berbice Branch of the Public Service Association, says, dual authority operates in the Public Service, being pushed around by hacks and incompetents who get their appointments through Congress Place, or through the Prime Minister, or through Hamilton Green.

No country can develop without the development of the resources and keeping those resources, human resources. The whole educational system suffers from the same discrimination, and two weeks ago I was in Leguan.



A young lady passed five subjects at G.C.E., cannot get a job, but somebody who hasn't got qualification – no G.C.E. – gets the job. It must show up in the indifference, and soon, in the whole education system, Mr. Speaker would you tell the Hon. Prime Minister not to misinform the House.

The Prime Minister deals with all these matters in a very jocular manner, but I think he should stand up and take note of the alarming state of the country at the moment and he should be serious to see that things are done to have, first of all, a correct strategy, correct domestic and foreign policies, an end to discrimination, and an end to corruption. Steps should be taken, and when these things are done, people will have confidence, they will stay at home. Nothing is here to inspire them now. People will be prepared to earn less if they know they are making a contribution, if they are inspired by the leadership. We, on our part, are always attacked for non cooperation. We have stated over and over that once the Government takes the right course. It can depend on the support of the People's Progressive Party.

## Head 14 - Ministry of Foreign Affairs: 20<sup>th</sup> December, 1972

**Dr. Jagan:** During the Budget debate I referred to the very large increase in expenditure in this Head. Now we see that provision is sought to create the posting in Brussels, as the Minister said, to service the European Economic Community. We are also to have an Economic Adviser with the rank of Ambassador who will be posted in this Ministry.

I have had during the Budget debate to complain about the expense of the bureaucracy. Why is it that we have to spend so much money? I am not saying that we must not have a foreign service but, for the value that this country is getting, is it necessary to do all of these things, that is, to pad the Establishment with all these posts? Of course, the Minister will say that they are justified. I am not satisfied, considering all that is being done here in this country, that it is necessary to have all these postings.

Now let us take the Brussels representative. Day by day we hear that we are strengthening the Carifta Secretariat. At one time it was even noted that in some places there may be a sharing of diplomatic representation. I do not know if it was done elsewhere. This eventually broke down.

One would think that in the case of Brussels and the E.E.C. we are dealing with a regional matter. Regional, particularly so far as Guyana is concerned with respect to sugar. The same interest which we have in this regard affects other Caribbean countries.

As regards the Economic Adviser, we have a Ministry of Economic Development. We have also, under the Deputy Prime Minister, a Development Section. Why is it that, on a matter like this, people who are advisers cannot advise the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on economic matters? Surely, one economist under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs can be competent to deal with the wide range of matters in which economic planning and development are involved. And I would have thought that this was the kind of way we would deal with this matter rather than having experts in all various Ministries.

In a fully developed country with a lot of money, in a very big economy, perhaps this kind of bureaucratic arrangement would be justified. But Guyana is a poor country and surely it is not difficult, living as we are in a small area even in the capital here, to consult from time to time, to utilize these officers even if they have to go to trips abroad.

I should like to refer again to a matter which I raised on one occasion before. This Government claims to be nonaligned. It is adding to the number of Ministries that it has in the capitalist world and in the Third World, but we have not yet seen any posting in the socialist world. Why is it that the Government is reluctant- that is the word I can use because I have not seen any tangible recognition of this fact – why is it that it has not seen fit to

make a diplomatic posting? I do not mean the London man being a representative, accredited to the Soviet Union and perhaps to other socialist countries. I think if I may add a comment here, you have your own man, in any case, for that job.

This is one man you cannot bribe and your Prime Minister cannot bribe, the present High Commissioner in London - I am just referring to him so that he can be identified properly - he was a rabid anti-communist and even socialist. This position was stated explicitly. I think one member quoted a statement he made some years ago when he was opposed to the P.P.P. and when he was attacked by the present Prime Minister for the position he took.

Yet he is accredited by this Government and by the present Prime Minister who attacked him at that time. Clearly, if development is going to mean something the whole ambit of trade, aid, etc., the industrialization of Guyana, the transformation of basic primary industries, I say that a lot of this will depend on, and to use their words, meaningful relations with the socialist countries. This cannot be done on a perfunctory basis without somebody, and not only just one man, an office being established so that one can examine all kinds of possibilities which may be open to this country.

Although the bureaucracy has significantly expanded for this Ministry this gap has not yet been filled. One must therefore question the whole motivation of the Government. We hear talk about ownership and control of resources. We hear lectures and figures given about how D.E.M.B.A. used to exploit this country. But the fact of the matter is that even if we own and control, of course, we do not do all of it, but even if we control alone, we are still being exploited if we continue to ship our raw materials from Guyana then the sooner this country can go on to produce aluminium and to produce the fabricated products from aluminium, we are not going to be growing significantly in business. The Minister asked how we will get to that point. We will get to it unlike the way the Prime Minister was trying to do in 1965 or 1966 when he was entertained- when he dined and wined- in Canada by the D.E.M.B.A. boys.

This is why I am referring to that. If we do not have a sound foreign policy, if we merely talk about ownership and control, I am saying that we are not going to achieve the objectives which are required today in Guyana to solve the problems of Guyana. We will be spending a lot of money to have a glorified Ministry, a big bureaucracy printing a lot of papers becoming a propaganda agency abroad for the Government without achieving the real objectives and that is, the development of Guyana. Foreign policy is clearly linked to this aspect not merely to become a public relations job for the Government and a means of recruiting proxy votes and overseas votes for which the P.N.C. has disgraced Guyana, for which a previous High Commissioner had to be removed from London because he was involved in this mess which soiled the name of this country.

## On resumption: Assembly in Committee of Supply

**Dr. Jagan:** I should like to make a few brief observations on this Scheme and perhaps what one might call a fiasco. Recently we heard taunts from the Government side when we were questioning sources of money for capital development that the P.P.P. was unable to raise money, and what the Government was able to do in one year the P.P.P. was not able to do in four years of their performance.

I recall Sir, that in those hectic years, 1962 to 1964, similarly we heard arguments that the P.P.P. had no friends but the T.U.C. had friends in court, and they would be able to do what the Government should have done to get money from their friends, and so the poor people of Guyana. At that time we did not have the slogan "*Feed, Clothe, and House Ourselves*". At that time the T.U.C. was going to solve the housing problems of the working class. Sir, the American Government made the money available through A.I.F.L.D. which we know is an institution working closely with the U.S. State Department and the C.I.A. Time has shown that this Scheme has failed, not only has it failed to achieve in the whole process. It seems that wherever the State Department and the C.I.A. go corruption always follows in its train. We see that so rampant in Vietnam.

It is a pity that neither the T.U.C. Housing Project nor the Government's Housing Project is really catering for the small man. Now the Government is to throw in over \$1 million to bail out this organization. The terms are obviously very generous, no interest, repayment in 15 to 20 years. Is the Government certain that it will be able to collect this money? Or is this to be part of State subsidy? After all, the P.N.C. then in the Opposition was part and parcel of this whole propaganda campaign.

No doubt it now has to bail out the society by throwing in taxpayer's money. I want to know from the Minister whether any action has been taken against those who have committed fraud in this outfit resigned in protest in a letter which was made public. Disclosures made to the public claimed that a lot of people were helping themselves, building their own property and what not. Did the Government carry out any investigation to bring those who are guilty to boot; the man who made these disclosures was the man who was pressured. This is how things work here in Guyana. People who want to ferret out corruption and all kinds of underhand things that are going on they are the ones who come under pressure. No wonder things have come to the sad state as they have come with this society and this Scheme.

Let us hope that we will not have the same failures with the other partner, that is, the P.N.C. which has now assumed power in Guyana. No doubt we will suffer the same fate on the day of judgment. The same way we are able to raise a lot of money from our dear friends in Washington, Government is able to do it. A lot of money is going down the drain too, Greenland Coop Society. Tell us how many shares you have in Greenland. When the

day of reckoning comes we are going to have other fiascos, because things which are put simply to short circuit certain normal developments in the country, in the short- term they will not succeed but in the long run, they are bound to fail.

## Ministry of Finance: 28<sup>th</sup> December, 1972

**Dr. Jagan:** Since the Hon. Member intervened perhaps I had better inform him to put the record straight. What the Minister signed was an application or some kind of permit that the Customs was waiting for, for ten rolls which were the balance of a shipment which came in June. The ten rolls will not be sufficient to tide the company over. The new newsprint application which the Minister approved will come some time in late January.

I personally spoke to the Managing Director of the *Guyana Graphic*, and to one of the directors of the *Evening Post*. I tried several times to get in touch with Mr. Wilkinson from Guyana Printers Ltd, but up to now I cannot get him. He is obviously hiding. The Minister is really misinforming the House.

The company obviously needs more newsprint right now but it cannot get it from the other newspapers because of the long arm of the Government, and that is why it is now applying for another permit to get a further supply from Trinidad. This application is now before the Minister. It is therefore not true to say that because the Minister facilitated the company to get these ten rolls the company did not try to get from the other companies operating in Guyana.

The other companies are afraid. This is the whole problem, because pressures have been put on them.

**Head 66 - agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.**

**Head 67 - Accountant General**

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, I refer to Subheads 10, 18 and 20 because they seem to be related. They deal with expenses for Conferences held in Guyana or abroad and expenses for Official Missions and Visitors to Guyana. This country is spending a fantastic sum under this Subhead. Let us compare the position with the year 1964. I have the estimate here and I was just getting out the figures. Where we now have the sum of \$45,000 to be voted under Subhead 10 for Expenses of Commission, Committees and Conferences held in Guyana it was \$13,000 in 1964.

Subhead 18, Special Visits and Representatives at External Conferences, has a provision of \$475, 000. In 1964 the vote was \$92,000 and may I remind the Government that the P.P.P. used to be criticized for wasting taxpayer's money. This year the sum is \$475, 000. Perhaps the Minister will tell us the reason for the increase from \$200,000 last year to \$475, 000 this year.

The provision for Expenses of Official Mission and Visitors to Guyana, Subhead 20, was around \$5,000 in 1964. Now it is \$20,000. This is how

money is being wasted and squandered and this is why little things cannot be done to help the poor people, the small man.

I am sorry that I have to keep referring to things like beds in hospitals. Why can't some of this money be spent for those things? The backbenchers who have to deal with the people should question these amounts and really see to it that some stop is put to this extravagance.

You must begin to question whether some of these are not in the nature of joy rides. These monies which are paid now to Ministers and others have caused expenditure to increase so much I assume that this is the reason. Perhaps the Minister will be good enough to tell us what is the *per diem* allowances paid to Ministers when they go abroad to Conferences.

I should like to make another observation, that is, that the general inflationary trend in Guyana is obviously creating difficulties not only for the ordinary working man but for the people who are in receipt of pensions.

If we look at the total amount being expended we will see that pensions and gratuities have increased from \$3.3 million in 1964 to a little less than \$3.7 million in 1973. That is less than 10 percent increase. But when we compare other things like personal emoluments there is an increase from \$28 million to \$72 million. The percentage increase is far more. I just refer to that as one example.

In other words, I am making a plea for the Government to do something about this whole question of rates for pensioners, generally, because people who entered the service many years ago and contracted to work for a long number of years expected that when they retire, they will have a certain amount of money which will maintain them at a certain standard of living for which they had got accustomed. We know today the value of the Guyana dollar is worthless and so I would ask the Government to give this matter some consideration. There must be a pro rata increase. The bureaucracy is increasing by 200 percent, 300 and 400 percent. You must have social services and pensions increasing at the same rate. This is how one would say that the poor man is becoming the real man, but otherwise, the rich will get richer and the gap will widen as it is already widening in this country.

## Subhead 5 - Rice Rehabilitation Programme

**Dr. Jagan:** I presume this is for the silos. This is not rice rehabilitation. This is a rice white elephant. Go to the Essequibo, you will see that the one constructed at Anna Regina, having thirty-two bins, only eight are occupied. The present rice production which has gone through the mill at Anna Regina is less than when the Tapakuma Scheme went into operation.

One of the arguments for the Tapakuma Scheme was that it will bring more areas into rice cultivation and thus for that area to provide a minimum support for that mill. The mill was losing money because it was badly sited, it was too big. It was built under the McDavid regime. That area is producing less rice. The mill is getting less than it got even before Tapakuma.

The big silo at Anna Regina has eight out of thirty- two bins filled. And another silo is going up at Somerset and Berks What they are going to do with that one is another question. This brings us to an important point made by my colleague, the last speaker. He said something far more fundamental has to be done. This was critical from the very beginning.

All the Americans and all their experts, their varieties, their silos, were all criticized, and now that criticism has proved to be valid. The Rice Producers' Association was said to be anti Government, all kinds of things. Its grants were cut off from the Rice Marketing Board; its Members who were in the majority on the Rice Marketing were reduced to a minority of three. This is why, because they were speaking the truth. This is the reward they got. The reward is now being seen and, as I said, fewer paddies go to the Anna Regina mill than in the days before the Tapakuma Scheme.

All the lands in the back, even the lands at Dartmouth. All is idle and out of cultivation. I was there last weekend and this information was given to me.

The figure was 200,000 when the minimum throughput for that mill to break even is 300,000. These were the figures when the Tapakuma Scheme was implemented to bring more land and more paddy to help to pay the loans of the C.D.C.

This is a serious matter and I think we should stop wasting our money on that silo immediately. Whatever money we have already paid for the iron and junk, let it remain there and stop wasting more money. One is going up at Somerset and Berks. Save the money and spend it to rehabilitate the industry.