

**DR. CHEDDI JAGAN**

**NATIONAL ASSEMBLY SPEECHES**

**VOLUME 4**

**The National Assembly of the  
First Parliament of Guyana  
May 1966 - July 1968**

Dr. Cheddi Jagan  
National Assembly Speeches Volume 4  
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.

Published by The Caribbean Press for the Government of Guyana.

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 978-1-907493-25-6



## 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

Address of Thanks for Constitutional Instruments: 26th May, 1966 .....	1
Death of Mr. Stephen Campbell: 26th May, 1966 .....	3
Motion - Death of Sir Eustace Woolford, O.B.E., Q.C.: 26th May, 1966 .....	4
Motion - Death of Mr. Charles Chan-A-Sue, M.P.: 27th July, 1966 .....	5
Inadequate Notice of Meetings of the National Assembly: 25th August, 1966 .....	6
Ministry of Economic Development (New) Establishment of Productivity Centre: 29th August, 1966 .....	7
Ferry Terminals: 29th August, 1966 .....	8
Special Visits and Representation at External Conferences .....	9
Ministry of Health, Subhead 10 – Drugs and Medical Appliances - \$120,000 .....	10
Presentation of Speaker’s Chair: 15th November, 1966 .....	11
Tribute to the Late Mr. James Isaac Ramphal .....	13
National Security (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill: 23rd November, 1966 .....	15
National Security (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill: 7th December, 1966 ...	27
Rent Restriction Ordinance: 9th December, 1966 .....	32
Guyana Defence Force Subhead 4 – rations - \$48,000 .....	35
Caribbean Free Trade Association Agreement: 29th December, 1966 .....	36
Gastro Enteritis Epidemic: 20th January, 1967 .....	45
Approval of Estimates of Expenditure: 30th January, 1967 .....	47
Estimates of Expenditure: 6th February, 1967 .....	59
Public and Police Service Commissions .....	60
Estimates of Expenditure: 7th February, 1967 .....	63
Head 12- Attorney General- Official Receiver .....	65
Head 13- Ministry of External Affairs .....	67
Head 13 – Ministry of External Affairs (cont.): 8th February, 1967 .....	68
Estimates of Expenditure: 9th February, 1967 .....	72
Estimates of Expenditure: 10th February, 1967 .....	75
Estimates of Expenditure: 14th February, 1967 .....	77
Ministry of Finance .....	80
Motion of Sympathy on Death of Sir Frank Worrell: 14th March, 1967 ....	81
On National Religious Holidays: 15th March, 1967 .....	82
On International Relations /Foreign Policy: 20th March, 1967 .....	84
Land Agreement with C.D.C.: 28th March, 1967 .....	97
Guyana Pandits’ Council (Incorporation) Bill: 31st March, 1967 .....	106
Emergency Sitting of the National Assembly: 24th April, 1967 .....	114
Expulsion of Undesirables (Amendment) Bill: 1967 .....	115
Guyana Pandit’s Council Bill (cont.): 27th April, 1967 .....	119
Loan to Guyana Electricity Corporation: 29th May, 1967 .....	121
Prorogation of Parliament .....	123
Consideration of Financial Paper: 28th August, 1967 .....	125

Customs and Excise – Revenue Protection .....	126
Ministry of Finance – Accountant General .....	127
Gratuities to Non-Pensionable Officers .....	128
Ministry of Information .....	129
Loans to Guyana Rice Marketing Board .....	131
Protest by Leader of the Opposition .....	132
Award of Honours: 30th August, 1967 .....	133
Motion on Recruitment to the Police Force: 5th October, 1967 .....	137
Approval of Estimates of Expenditure: 10th January, 1968 .....	143
Flood Disaster at Cane Grove: 13th May, 1968 .....	147
Registration of Citizens: 27th June, 1968 .....	152
Guyana–Venezuela Relations: 17th July, 1968 .....	155

**DR. CHEDDI JAGAN**  
**NATIONAL ASSEMBLY SPEECHES**  
**VOLUME 4**

**The National Assembly of the  
First Parliament of Guyana  
May 1966 - July 1968**



## Address of Thanks for Constitutional Instruments: 26<sup>th</sup> May, 1966

**Dr. Jagan:** Your Royal Highnesses, Mr. Speaker, the severing of the British colonial tie in Guyana, and the attainment of political independence are welcome features of the struggle of this country and its people for a better life. These features in today's context, do not, however, guarantee the realization of the better life we all seek. They merely represent a further stage, an advancement in the continuing struggle.

I wish to thank their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Kent, as representatives of Her Majesty the Queen, for their presence in this House to hand over the new Constitutional Instruments. But lest our position at this historic ceremony be misunderstood, it is necessary for me to observe that the people whom my party represents hold considerable reservations. The form of the Constitution being handed down at this time is one which perpetuates divisions in our society, and entrenches minority rule. The fundamental rights which the Constitution seeks to safeguard are, in a great measure nonexistent, and the Government has provided evidence in great abundance of its intention to render all safeguards nugatory. Detention without trial has plagued the country since July, 1964, when, by a Constitutional Amendment, the United Kingdom Government gave to Governor, acting without advice, powers to detain without trial.

This power was made to appear, by the world press and radio, to have been exercised by the Government, of which I was the Head. The powers were, in fact, arbitrarily exercised by the Governor, to the detriment of the members and supporters of the People's Progressive Party. Abuses of these powers, now transferred to the Government, and the extension of such State of Emergency, beyond the date of the attainment of Independence, have generated fear in our land and have frustrated the efforts of many of our people in their struggle for peace and security.

As the Leader of the Opposition, I have accepted invitations to consult with the Hon. Prime Minister, on the making of appointments to those important public offices, which form the pillars of Constitutional Government, but I regret to say that on no occasion, has there been any measure of agreement. The result is that those people, whom my party represents, are denied any participation in the governmental process. Consultation has amounted, in practice, to no more than intimation, on many occasions, of the names of persons whom the inflexible Government wished to prefer to high office in this Government.

Besides, political independence has been attained under the continuation and consolidation of foreign economic control and the maintenance of the colonial type of economy, based on primary production and extraction. This has already detracted from the living standards of the working peo-

ple. Debt burdens are already increasing with the resulting pressure on the economy. The annually recurring budgetary deficits will inevitably mean dependence on other Governments for budgetary support. In these circumstances, there is no prospect for real independence in external affairs and the protestations of the Government, of pursuing a neutral policy, are illusory.

The People's Progressive Party has been the victim of repeated constitutional manipulations designed to keep it out of office. We are nonetheless confident that, despite these manipulations, the People's Progressive Party can be triumphant at future elections, if these are fairly held. Parliamentary democracy has an important place in this country, and a heavy onus lies on all of us, but more particularly on the Government, to see that it works. The People's Progressive Party, the vanguard of Guyana's struggle for national liberation, is convinced that liberty is achieved only when it has been struggled for and won. It cannot be a gift of charity. For the people of Guyana, real freedom is still a prize to be won, and win it we will, and as a reunited free people.

## Death of Mr. Stephen Campbell: 26<sup>th</sup> May, 1966

**Dr. Jagan:** I rise to second the Motion moved by the Prime Minister on this, another sad occasion for this House. Like him, I knew Mr. Campbell for several years. While we both shared the same interest in the welfare of the Amerindian people and while we may have differed as to the methods which should be used to bring about the welfare of the Amerindian people, nevertheless I held him in my esteem and respect because of the deep convictions and the almost single-minded purpose and determination with which he pursued his goal, that is, the elevation and wellbeing of the Amerindian people.

As the Prime Minister said, on his deathbed he may have been happy at the thought that many of the things which he had been fighting for have been partially achieved. The regret is that he is not with us on this occasion in this House.

Hon. Members on this side of the House who knew him would like to express condolences to his family and those who are left to mourn his loss.

## Motion - Death of Sir Eustace Woolford, O.B.E., Q.C.: 26<sup>th</sup> May, 1966

**Dr. Jagan:** I wish to join the Hon. Prime Minister and to associate myself with his remarks on the occasion of the tragic death of Sir Eustace Woolford. I say tragic death because it has occurred just a few days before this ceremony in this Chamber. Sir Eustace was one of those individuals who braved the establishment of the old order. He fought violently, and it is still a pleasure to read the statements made by myself and others who were associated with me in that period when the first suspension of the Constitution took place in our land.

It is true that the passage of time mellows some of us: some of us get grey hair, some of us have falling hair, some of us become more conservative, and others continue in their revolutionary tradition. I support the Hon. Prime Minister in regretting the fact that one such as this great freedom fighter became more cautious and defended the establishment of the old order. However, that does not detract from the heroic struggle in which he participated during the first period of the national liberation in modern time. I feel that all of the young nationalists on the political scene should read and study carefully some of the writings by Sir Eustace, so that they may be better armed to face the future struggles in our country.

I would like to ask, in keeping with our feelings on this occasion that the House stands for one minute in silence in memory of one of our fallen heroes.

## **Motion - Death of Mr. Charles Chan-A-Sue, M.P.: 27<sup>th</sup> July, 1966**

**Dr. Jagan:** I rise to second this Motion on this rather tragic occasion in this House. The death of any person is an occasion for sadness, but when such a person is a Member of this Parliament, and then it becomes an occasion for double sadness.

We on this side of the House do not know too much of the deceased in terms of his political work, and the Government side, of which he was a Member, is obviously more knowledgeable on this score. But we are all very knowledgeable of the many activities in which he was engaged. A moment ago the acting Prime Minister indicated some of these, and, certainly, the list was indeed a very long one. It seems that in life those who have to undertake many duties find themselves undertaking still more, doing more than their share. I would say that Mr. Chan-A-Sue did perhaps much more than his share. No doubt, this was perhaps responsible for some of the strains and the illnesses from which he suffered.

However, his family can be proud of the fact that he had served well. The community can be satisfied about the fact that he has given of his time and of his energy for the welfare of the country. It is, however, a loss to this House that he has passed away at such a youthful age. However, he has been succeeded, in this House, by one who has been for some time associated with the working-class movement in this country and I have no doubt that this will be a good contribution to the working of this Parliament.

I should like to join with the acting Prime Minister, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House, to express our sympathy and to ask that our sentiments also be conveyed to the widow, children and relatives of Mr. Chan-A-Sue. Indeed, we should like to express our deep sense of loss at his passing at this very important time in the history of this country.

## Inadequate Notice of Meetings of the National Assembly: 25th August, 1966

**Dr. Jagan:** I should like to raise, in this Assembly, a matter regarding the privileges of Members of this House. I refer to the persistent and consistent late notice for summoning meetings of this Assembly. Notification for today's meeting reached me only on the evening of last Tuesday. When I approached some of my colleagues of this House, I found that some of them had not received their notice of the meeting until Wednesday. In fact, the Secretary of the P.P.P. parliamentary group, Mr. Luck, did not receive his papers until he came to the House this afternoon.

A Member of this House who resides in Berbice, Mr. Poonai, has not yet received his papers. We have also two Members who are living in remote areas in the country; one lives in the Berbice River; he is here accidentally and not because he had received any notice of this meeting; and another Member lives in the Moruka River who is not here today, no doubt, because of the fact that he has not received any notice of this meeting.

Only last week I had to speak to you, Sir, by telephone in connection with another meeting, namely, the meeting of the Committee of Selection, notice of which, according to the notification, was written on the 15<sup>th</sup> August for a meeting summoned for the 17<sup>th</sup> August. Clearly this is not good enough. As I pointed out, there are many Members of the Assembly who come from remote areas and some are practising at the Bar. As the Prime Minister would know, Judges and Magistrates are not always willing to give leave of absence to Barristers or to allow postponement of cases.

I would urge you, Sir, to request the Leader of the Government Business at all times to give adequate notice of these meetings so that the work of this Assembly can be carried out properly and so that the Members, at least those of the Opposition, can come here well prepared for whatever subject may be under discussion. I do hope that these lapses will not continue in the future.

**Ministry of Economic Development**  
**(New) Establishment of Productivity Centre: 29<sup>th</sup>**  
**August, 1966**

**Dr. Jagan:** I agree with the remarks made by the last Speaker. The Hon. Minister of Economic Development mentioned that the original request or suggestion came from the United Nations. I should like to inform him – he may not be aware of it – that the I.C.A. Consultant, Mr. Emerson, had discussed with the previous Government the question of setting up a Productivity Centre to be financed by the I.C.A. a long time ago. That is why I have asked whether there will be any duplication and whether the Productivity Centre should not be operated under the aegis of the Technical Institute.

We are not opposed to this Government doing anything that is necessary to improve efficiency or reduce cost, but we are very much concerned about the growing bureaucracy in this country, the proliferation of ministries and agencies. There is a tendency toward bureaucracy in this country from the bottom to the top. The top boys are always going on trips. I am not fully satisfied that this is necessary. I feel that since the Government is making a new venture, then the House should be given full details of the project.

I have mentioned the Americans, because I know that they would like to have something in this country to which they can refer as a little monument which they have built themselves. I am not opposed to the Americans building monuments, but I am very much concerned about the manner in which this Government is spending money. Here it is proposed to spend \$20,000 on this project. I would ask the Hon. Minister to withdraw this item, and bring it back at a later stage when he can give us detailed information.

## Ferry Terminals: 29<sup>th</sup> August, 1966

**Dr. Jagan:** You said that you intended to build ferry terminals and intended to build and recondition ships. These things were estimated for several years ago. Now, we are told that we are making savings.

There is no doubt about what the Minister of Finance had just said. The Minister, first of all, underestimates his expenditure. I do not know whether this will be a part of the gift which is being given by the British Government in the form of scrap iron. Let us know!

What I should like to know is simply this. Is the Government satisfied that works should be deferred? Is the Government policy to defer work which it anticipated at the beginning of this year? Is the work no longer necessary? Even if the Government wants to buy scrap iron, why is it that the work on the ferry terminals and the reconditioning and/or reconstruction of ships are being deferred? Will the Minister of Finance and the Minister in charge of this Head tell us why? The House should be told whether savings are made at the expense of the services which should be rendered to the population of this country, and at the expense of the people who should be holding, not acting appointments all the time, but substantive appointments.

## Special Visits and Representation at External Conferences

**Dr. Jagan:** It is very strange that the Minister of Finance, who is leader of the United Force, speaks with one voice in the Legislature and with another voice in his weekly organ, just as members of the youth arm of the P.N.C. spoke against the Budget at street-corners and kept quiet when they come into the Assembly.

Matters have deteriorated to such an extent that even the *Evening Post*, which is a staunch supporter of the Government – is talking about one of the trips, which is being taken, to look at the most modern aircraft in England, while decrepit aircraft, which cannot fly, and decrepit railways, which add to the taxpayers' burden, are purchased.

Reference is also made in an editorial in today's *Evening Post* to unemployment. I quote from it:

*“Twenty thousand breadwinners represent 100,000 persons; so that the figure of 20,793, quoted as being employed for a maximum of three months, only reveals one-fifth the tale of poverty and starvation.”*

When such people begin to grumble it is time for the Government to take note.

This Government is callous and continues to waste taxpayers' money, which *The Sun* calls “squander mania.” Then the Minister of Finance says “we have to have experience.” The Minister of Labour goes to the I.L.O. Conference. What for? What can he do? He cannot settle simple labour disputes that arise every day in this country. Right now we hear the Minister and the Prime Minister talking at cross purposes about representation for G.A.W.U. on the Sugar Commission. It is almost a year since the Commission was to be appointed, but the Ministers are so busy flying here and there that they do not even have the time to work out the terms of reference and to appoint a Commission.

## Ministry of Health, Subhead 10 – Drugs and Medical Appliances - \$120,000

**Dr. Jagan:** I should like to supplement what the last speaker has said. Over three months ago I was in the area and I found the dispenser of the district could not move around because the engine of his boat was out of order. I understand it is still this way. In Pomeroon, a health centre at Hackney has been closed down. I reported not so long ago that the one at Hansom Tree has also been closed down. I was there and I saw flags fluttering all over the place; the people were awaiting the arrival of a dispenser. There was no dispenser in the area. No dispenser has been going in the area behind Tapacuma for the last year.

The nurses and midwives used to visit Hog Island once per month. A dispenser used to visit one part of the island once weekly, and the other part of the island once fortnightly. All these visits have been cut out. What is the Government doing? People are dying! Do not tell us it has always been this way. There are services which they have been receiving during the regime of the last Government.

Let us say that the last Government did not do "*so-and-so*". You had seven years in the Opposition. You ought to have been able to say what is wrong with every area in this country. You should have made plans and proposals. We saw all the plans and proposals which were laid out in detail in the *Highways to Happiness*. But instead of now going forward, we see retrogression, and this is leading, as the last speaker said, to the deaths of the people. The people are being denied the very vital services. The people are reluctant to go to the hospitals because they feel that if they go they are going to "*get their death certificates*."

I have two questions which one Hon. Member gave me. I have not had them typed yet. The Prime Minister would not give me enough staff. A child went to the hospital. The doctor diagnosed that a tracheotomy was necessary. The next day the child died. No tracheotomy was done! When it comes to the health of the poor people, doctors are fleecing them in many parts of the country. We are not objecting to the Prime Minister having his good time, but please look after the poor people.

## Presentation of Speaker's Chair: 15<sup>th</sup> November, 1966

**Dr. Jagan:** I, too, would like to join the Hon. Prime Minister in expressing the thanks of this House, to the Government and people of India for this beautiful gift which we see displayed here today. I think one and all will agree that this gift makes a magnificent addition to this Chamber. The students of architecture will probably say that it fits in and blends in very nicely with the surroundings. And it also shows us the craftsmanship of the Indian people – their high skill in this direction.

When making the presentation this afternoon, the Assistant High Commissioner said that there was much in common between his country and our country. I would also like to underscore this point by referring, not mainly to the fact that there are so many Indians resident in Guyana, but to the fact that India has been one of the countries, indeed one of the very earliest of countries which not only aspired but fought for the ideals which we in Guyana aspire and fight for. India was the country which blazed the trail for freedom and independence and liberty. Many were the days of hardships and suffering. It was in the 1930s when certain British officials said that they did not foresee the day when India will achieve her Independence. We are glad that India achieved her Independence because in that achievement the seeds of the achievement of Independence for other countries were also sown. Therefore, we in this House, and out of this House, owe a debt of gratitude to the people who have suffered and who have made sacrifices in that country to obtain the freedom that they aspired for.

Another thing which we have in common with that country is the philosophy which its leaders have espoused, the philosophy of not only political independence but economic independence; a policy of nonalignment, of not being caught up with entanglements in the struggle for supremacy. Unfortunately, the cause of nonalignment has suffered a certain amount of setback on the front as a whole. But we have no doubt that this setback will be short-lived with the reactionary forces unable to contain those elements which fight not only for nonalignment on the international front but also for economic liberation and socialism.

Today, a battle is being fought in that country and one can see machinations of outside influences which make this struggle difficult. We have seen certain setbacks in other parts of the world which contribute to some of these difficulties. Nevertheless, we wish that country well, and so far as we are concerned we shall watch with interest and with sympathy the struggles of the people and the Government to achieve the objectives which they have long fought for, and for which tremendous sacrifices have been made.

Let us hope that this Speaker's Chair with its emblem, a balanced scale,

will really be symbolic of what the Indian Government and people hope will happen in this country for there are clear signs to the contrary; justice is becoming only a name here, the Parliament is becoming merely a rubber stamp, and the Speaker is becoming merely a creature of the Government. We would hope that Guyana, placed as it is, will really become symbolic of something new as our representatives in the United Nations and abroad are accustomed to saying in these days. Guyana can be said to be an amalgam of the world. We have people coming from three Continents of the Old World – Asia, Africa and Europe. Therefore, I think that if this Parliament functions in the way it is supposed to function, with the background that we have, and our geographical location in this continent, the people who inhabit our territory can certainly create – I would not say a weapon – a society which will be a guiding light to other countries including such countries which are similarly placed as India.

I, too, would like to join with the Hon. Prime Minister in thanking the Government and the people of India for this magnificent gift.

## Tribute to the Late Mr. James Isaac Ramphal

**Dr. Jagan:** Death is a moment of grief, loss and regret particularly to one's family and to one's friends. On occasions such as this, especially when a person has been in public life, the nation through its legislature attempts to make an assessment of the contribution that the person has made to society and to his country. Generally, one tends to be laudatory and, perhaps, that is in keeping with the spirit of the occasion. But the keeper says to the person who enters the gates of Heaven: "*Let me see the good and the bad.*" I would like, therefore, to point out what I regard as good and bad about Mr. Ramphal. There are two phases of Mr. Ramphal's life on which I would like to comment. The first is his role as a good Samaritan in the field of education, and the other one is not so good.

There is no doubt that in the field of education Mr. Ramphal has probably made a contribution second to none in this country, particularly in the earlier period of this country's history when education was something to which many could not hope to aspire. Therefore, school and institutions such as those founded by Mr. Ramphal certainly played a very great role in moulding the lives of many Guyanese who, today, play an important role in Guyanese society and Guyanese life.

Having said that, one must now look at the negative aspects of Mr. Ramphal's life. The second phase began some time in 1952, and culminated in the granting to him in 1956 of the title of O.B.E. In the early period of his life he served as a Labour Commissioner. It is known that in those days Guyanese and colonials in other territories like this had to go through difficult times. At that time the Public Service was dominated by Englishmen and pseudo-Englishmen with a colonial mentality. It is my view that Mr. Ramphal, a great fighter in his early years decided to conform to rather than oppose the dictates of the Colonial Office. When he was the Deputy Commissioner and the Commissioner of Labour of this country he carried out dutifully the order and instructions from the Colonial Office.

Like his predecessor, Mr. Rissell, Mr. Ramphal carried on a policy which is having repercussions even today – a policy which did not allow the issue, for instance, of union recognition to be decided democratically. Today we are hearing a lot of talk about democracy and freedom.

On the suspension of the Constitution in 1953, Mr. Ramphal became a nominated member of the Legislative Council at a time when the Prime Minister was calling those who participated in the Government loyal Kikuyus. I would say that, on balance, Mr. Ramphal has made a great contribution as a teacher and as an educator, but I regret to say that in his later years he virtually succumbed to the whims of the Colonial Office. He served the Colonial Office well, but against the national interests of this country. Therefore I, on behalf of my colleagues, cannot find reason to join

with the members of the Government in showering praise on such an individual. However, we recognise the deep loss which Mr. Ramphal's death must have been to his family and close friends. We join in expressing our sympathies, and we would like our expressions of sorrow to be conveyed to his widow and children.

## National Security (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill: 23<sup>rd</sup> November, 1966

**Dr. Jagan:** This is a black day in the history of Guyana. Perhaps I should have said, "*This is another black day*" for, more than a decade and a half ago we spent hours in this Chamber debating a similar measure, the Prohibition of Subversive Literature. The Motion was introduced by the nominated Member, Mr. Lionel Luckhoo. Today we have another nominated member, in the person of Mr. Ramphal, introducing another measure aimed at the destruction of liberty in Guyana.

Between these two tragic days many things have happened in our land. We heard, up and down the country, the shout for fundamental rights and liberties. I recall that when we were given our first chance to write a Constitution, when all the Members of the Assembly sat together to draft a Constitution for Guyana, every person, without exception, decided that there must be inserted in our Constitution a Fundamental Rights section. I had the Honour of introducing the Motion that there should be incorporated in our Constitution such a guarantee.

That section was indeed incorporated in our Constitution at the Conference in London in 1960 and it became a fundamental section of our Constitution. What happened subsequently?

We had further talks about constitutional changes for an independent Guyana. In early 1962 these talks were held at Government House under the Chairmanship of the then Governor, Sir Ralph Gray. The three leaders of the main political parties were present. The leader of the P.N.C. declared the phraseology in our Constitution, particularly under Clause 6 of the Constitution. Let me read from the notes of a meeting held at Government House on March 22<sup>nd</sup>, 1962:

### "B – FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

i) *Mr. Burnham* wanted these to be generally declared and then particularized in enforceable provisions that would have to be construed liberally in the light of the general declaration. The provisions in the 1961 Constitution were acceptable but would require some minor amendments. e.g., article 6 (page 13) included a non-legal concept in the term democratic society and required the Court to apply to subjective tests which was undesirable...

iii) *Mr. D'Aguiar* advocated a declaration which was all-encompassing and should go beyond the 1961 provisions by including all such provisions as were embodied in Magna Carta. He mentioned particularly the right to leave and to return to the country, the right of parents to choose the type of education they

*wished for their children, and the unrestricted right to sue the Government.*

*iv) All considered some more effective provision for enforcement should be substituted for that in article 13.*

*v) All three Leaders undertook to prepare drafts of the provision they had in mind"*

Where there was a State of Emergency in the country, necessitated because of requirement of the Government to distribute fuel and other commodities of which there was a scarcity, Mr. D' Aguiar, at one of these meetings, suggested that these talks should be postponed since the atmosphere of an emergency was not conducive to holding such talks. In this view he had support of Mr. Burnham. We have seen where Mr. D' Aguiar challenged the 1961 Constitution and brought a case before the Supreme Court based on the constitutionality of the law passed by the P.P.P. Government relating to the National Development Savings Levy. These two Leaders were suggesting that what was written in our Constitution was not enough. They insisted, as all of us did, that these rights must not only be enshrined in our Constitution but that they must be enforceable in the courts, that there must be the right to review the courts and, as I said, one Leader contested one of the laws passed by the previous Government.

Perhaps one should go a little further back to the Subversive Literature Motion. The whole country was aroused by this measure. I would think that this measure, more than anything else helped the P.P.P. to secure a resounding victory in 1953. That Motion was passed in this very Chamber by an overwhelming majority. At that time, Mr. Burnham was Chairman of the People's Progressive Party. He led the fight against this measure. "*Why shouldn't Guianese*", he asked "*read what every Englishman can read in the streets of London and elsewhere?*" He said that the measure was inimical to the interest of the Guyanese people. Following that great victory in 1953, our Constitution was suspended.

The Attorney General and Minister of State regaled us with some quotations about communist subversion in India. He did not have to refer to India. If he had read the White Paper on the suspension of the Constitution he would have seen that reactionaries would resort to that kind of language in any part of the world in order to destroy freedom and liberty. Mr. Burnham and I journeyed to England, to India, to Egypt and all over the world to protest against the suspension of the Constitution. There was the famous fire plot. You will know about that, Sir. You also, had the great honour of being one of the leaders of the P.P.P. The P.P.P. was supposed, according to that White Paper, to have a fire plot to burn down the city of Georgetown. Of course, when Questions were asked in the House of Commons, it turned out that the police had evidence of the fire after the Constitution has been suspended.

But that was a little point which was overlooked by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I remember Mr. Burnham saying in London that, if the Government has any evidence let it bring it forth. He said the same thing about those who were detained – detained because they were plotting to burn down the city of Georgetown, plotting to set up a communist one-party State. Mr. Burnham, then a great advocate for the cause of freedom and liberty, not only exposed this bogus fire plot, but also as my colleague Mr. Rudy Luck said, advised detainees that they must not appear before another bogus affair, that is, the tribunal which was set up to hear the case of the detainees. He, himself, refused to obey Restriction Orders placed on him. He told them, "*Jail me if you wish.*" This was the fighter...

(**The Prime Minister:** I hope you wrote that down in your book.)

**Dr. Jagan:** When Nasrudeen and the elder Mr. Bowman were charged for sedition, the famous freedom fighter Pritt came down to defend them. He was a house guest of Mr. Burnham. Mr. Burnham was associated with the defence. Today, Mr. Burnham seeks powers to detain and restrict individuals at will without recourse to the courts. His Attorney- General, well paid to do his bidding, recites evidence from India and elsewhere. But Mr. Burnham knows that Pritt defended the people who were fighting against the Maharaja of Hyderabad, one of the wealthiest landlords of the world. Pritt defended Jomo Kenyatta and was sentenced to imprisonment. After his release he was banished to a remote part of Kenya and put under Restriction Orders. The Prime Minister, who was then leader of the P.P.P. protested against the wickedness of the British Government in Kenya, in Malaya and so on. But his Attorney – General now tells this House about communist terrorism in Malaya. The White Paper accused the Chairman of the P.P.P., now Prime Minister, of supporting the Mau Maus, and communist terrorism in Malaya. There is clearly a change in the Prime Minister.

(**Mr. Luck:** Convolution.)

**Dr. Jagan:** My Hon. Friend Mr. Kendall asked, "*What is the reason for the change*"? I am glad he asked that question because I think he should know. When we look at the Government side today, what do we see? We see Kendall, John Carter, and Lionel Luckhoo – people who were called loyal Kikuyus. For John Fernandes you could substitute Mr. Peter D' Aguiar. In 1953 they said in the streets that the masses were "*asses*" and the present Minister of Finance is operating on the basis of the same mentality.

The Prime Minister has changed because today he is in consort, not with the progressive forces in this country who are moving forward, but with the people who went to London to press the British to suspend our Constitution, and who accepted help from every reactionary quarter, in order to attain the position which he today holds.

The Attorney-General yesterday delved into some theories. As Socrates said, a little learning is a very bad thing. He tried to lecture to us about the role of the State; how the State must play a neutral part between the liberty of the individual and the interest of the public. Perhaps one should be charitable and say that the Minister of State learnt his law and his politics and his ideologies in a different school from mine. But the fact is that the State is an instrument of one of two classes. Let us accept that, any politician of worth knows that. The State is an instrument either of the feudal, the slave-owning class, or on the other hand the exploited class. It is no use telling us that this State is attempting to hold the balance equally between these two concepts, liberty on the one hand and security on the other.

Under the slogan of liberty they subverted our institutions. They made a mockery of the courts. Some of their men threatened magistrates; others invaded the chambers of judges while they were still sitting, they fomented disturbance; they broke the proclamation and they did all manner of things; they incited people to riot; they invoked the help not only of big business and reactionaries in this country, but also reactionaries of the world. We know that large sums of money came into this country during the 80 days strike in 1963 in order to maintain the strike. We know that this strike for liberty as we are told – was supported by big business which is always willing to help the workers to overthrow a Government which is working in favour of the masses. Sometime the workers are given land to encourage them to go on strike. The C.I.A. was very much in evidence in this matter.

Schlessinger, adviser and aide to President Kennedy, met Mr. Burnham, and this is what is written at page 668 of his book- I am referring to President John F. Kennedy at the White House –

*“The State Department at first thought we should make them try; then Rusk responsibly reversed this policy in a stiff letter to the British early in 1962. Thus far our policy had been based on the assumption that Forbes Burnham was, as the British described him, an opportunist, racist and demagogue intent only on personal power.*

*Then in May 1962 Burnham came to Washington. Burnham’s visit left the feeling, as supported to the President, that an independent British Guiana under Burnham (if Burnham will commit himself to a multi-racial policy) would cause us many fewer problems than an independent British Guiana under Jagan... And the way was open to bring it about, because Jagan’s parliamentary strength was larger than his popular strength; he had won 57 per cent of the seats on the basis of 42.7 per cent of the vote. An obvious solution would be to establish a system of proportional representation.”*

Today they glibly talk about democracy and freedom, but, in truth, whose interest are they seeking? Listen to Richard Ishmael, one of their principal supporters, speaking in the *Labour Advocate* of October 30, 1966. He says:

*“From last year with a new Government in office, we set out to bridge the gap, but immediately run up against the employers, many of whom felt that the good old days were back...”*

Then he goes on –

*“They have become more difficult and we anticipate there will be more industrial unrest until employers more voluntarily give workers their just rights and a fair share of profits.”*

Since when do employers voluntarily give to those whom they exploit? Be that as it may, the fact is that Ishmael has said- and let us underline the words – *“the good old days are back”*.

As evidence of this all we have to do is to look at what happened last year and this year in this country. The taxes which fell on the exploitation class in 1962 under the P.P.P. regime have either been repealed or drastically modified. Exchange control has been abolished. Now we read in the P.N.C. organ and in the daily press that exchange control must reintroduced after the capitalists and people like D’ Aguiar have taken their money out of the country.

A few days ago we read that the sugar planters have said that if workers go on unofficial strikes they will be denied the right to a bonus to which they are entitled and for which they have worked. When a hue and cry was raised about this, what did the sugar producers say? They said, *“This is nothing new. The rule was there since 1952”*. Of course it was there since 1952. Lionel Luckhoo was then introducing the Subversive Literature Motion in this Chamber and was signing away the rights of the workers of President of the M.P.C.A. That is how that vicious bit of agreement was made. Look at the wickedness of these people! May I just read from this circular which was sent out under the name of R.D. Persaud, Senior Field Secretary of the M.P.C.A. It states:

*“This clause was in the agreement since 1952 when Dr. Jagan was in the M.P.C.A.”*

Lies, big lies! Not only do they tell the people that, but like Hitler they want to falsify the history; they want to resort to big lies so that they can fool people, who, they think, have short memories.

This is another reason why they want to silence the Opposition and to intimidate the workers with this Bill, so that people would not see what they are doing. Again we ask the learned Attorney-General and Minister of State to tell us a little bit more about the social and economic history, not only the legal history, of the world. Then he will see why certain things happened and why the cards were dealt in a certain way at a certain time.

The answer to my Hon. Friend, Mr. Kendall is –

(Mr. Kendall: I ask you anything, man?)

**Dr. Jagan:** We can see signs of growing dissatisfaction. All over the place we see rising unemployment, increasing cost of living, lowered prices to farmers on every front – for rice, milk, and coffee, citrus. The latest dissatisfaction is this retrenchment just before Christmas. How much more callous can you become? The growing dissatisfaction is evidenced by the growing number of strikes in this country. There was an unprecedented number last year, which will be surpassed this year. Leading members of the Government are saying, “*Let us ban strikes.*” An individual is appointed to head a Commission and he recommends that anti-strike laws must be passed. Clearly any blind man can see that this Government is not carrying out the role of the State, as the Attorney-General said it was, that is, holding the scales evenly balanced between liberties on the one hand and security on the other. Certainly it is ruling in the interest of the ruling classes, the foreigners who dominate the economy of this country and their local lackeys, who speak glibly in the name of freedom and democracy when they are out of office, but when they are in office, seek to put the workers in chains.

At this stage I should like to draw an interesting parallel between our Bill and a similarly dubbed Bill in the United States. In 1950 the United States of America enacted what is called the Internal Security Act. Under this and a previous Act passed in 1940, called the Smith Act, McCarthyism was spawned and totalitarianism was launched on the good people of the United States of America.

**Dr. Jagan:** Before the coffee interval I was referring to the similarity between the National Security Bill and the U.S. National Security Act of 1950. I pointed out that that Act of the United States spawned McCarthyism which was to play havoc with the rights and liberties of the American people for quite a few years.

In an atmosphere of hysteria, a committee which called itself the Un-American Activities Committee used the weapon of smear, and individuals were subpoenaed to appear before that Committee. They were asked questions pertinent to their political beliefs: “*Have you any association with the Communist Party?*” If they refused to answer, invoking a Clause in the American Constitution, they were presumed to be guilty. If they replied in the negative, then the muck was raked, the whole history of the individual was brought into the open and any slight association was the cause of a charge of perjury and they were sent to prison.

In an atmosphere of hysteria there came upon the American scene a charge of conspiracy that the Truman and Roosevelt administration had conspired to give away and sell the rights of the American people to the Russians and thereafter, no one was safe. Of course this hysteria campaign was mounted even earlier. I mention this because the Attorney-General introduced this subject in his speech. In setting out his anti-communist

sentiments, he spoke about the necessity of the State to prevent this subversion of democratic institutions. This is what the Un-American Activities Committee, under McCarthy and his henchmen, was set up to do. This Committee was dubbed the "*Subversive Activities Committee*".

The Hon. Minister of Home Affairs said that Guyanese people had nothing to fear. The law makers in America also said that the people had nothing to fear but, having worked them up in this hysteria of anti-communism, the situation arose where no one was safe.

I should like to read from a book which describes what happened in an even earlier period after the First World War. This quotation is to be found in a book wherein we see where the Attorney-General in the United States, after refusing to submit FBI records to the Brookhart – Wheeler Committee, used very emotional language. I should like to read this section:

*"Daugherty noted that the Brookhart – Wheeler Committee had asked for the confidential files of the Bureau of Investigation. Exhibiting the tender regard for those files that has been characteristic almost every time the subject is mentioned, the former Attorney –General struck a patriotic pose and declared that he had refused to open the files. He had resigned first, he said, because the files contained abundant proof of the plans, purpose, and hellish design of the "Communist International". Some might have thought that it would be a good idea to bring such devilish machinations out into the broad light of day, to expose them – but not Daugherty. He preferred to tell his listeners about what those secret files contained. 'I would sound a warning note to every American tonight,' he thundered. 'The enemy is at the gate. He aims at nothing short of overthrow of the institutions which are your protection and mine against tyranny, whether exercised in the name of a monarchy or in the name of a mob'."*

This section deals with what is called the "*Indictment of a Senator*". Senator Wheeler, a freshman Senator from Montana, who exposed what is now known in the history of America as the famous "*Teapot Dome*" scandal. A high official in the Government, in the Republican administration, gave away rights to Navy oil reserves in Montana, and it comes out at the hearing, after it was exposed by Senator Wheeler, that this individual had given these oil rights away after he had received a loan of \$100,000. Of course, it was called a loan.

Let me read further quotations from this book because, under the hysteria of communism, anything goes. It is stated on pages 129, 130 and 131 as follows:

*"The Republican National Committee, taking up the theme first planted and tested in the press, tried to disparage any inquiry of Daugherty before it could get started by implicating Wheeler's term as United States Attorney in Montana. The Committee declared, that state 'became a hot bed of treason and sedition, the leaders in the seditious and treasonable movement being friends of Wheeler's.' This*

*propaganda and the desperation that inspired it were transparent. Wheeler and Brookhart, undeterred, drove full speed ahead with the Daugherty probe."*

*" 'We took testimony', Wheeler wrote in his autobiography, 'that Department of Justice agents had ransacked the offices of Senator Thaddeus H. Caraway and Robert M. La Follette and Representative Roy O. Woodruff, a progressive Michigan Republican'."*

*" 'My own office was rifled during the hearing on several occasions. Government – hired detectives hung around the Committee's offices constantly. Some of our witnesses were approached to find out what testimony they would give. Others were shadowed. J. Edgar Hoover, then assistant chief of Bureau of Investigation, sat next to Daugherty's defence counsels throughout the hearings'"*

It goes on:

*"Appearing before an Investigational Committee, top agent of the FBI Gaston B. Means described techniques for spying on U.S. Senators. He testified:*

*'Oh (you) search his . . . find out all the mail that comes in all the appearances, anything that he has got lying around. Find out in his home. Just like you would take the same principle that you pursue, Senator, when you make a criminal investigation. There is a servant working in this house. If she is a colored servant, go and get a colored detective woman to take her out; have this colored detective woman to entertain her, find out the exact plan of the house, everything they discuss at the table, the family, write it down, and make a report. And any information you find that is reported, if it is damaging, why of course it is used. If it is fine, why you cannot use it. It does not damage.' "*

The book goes on to show that a case was framed against Senator Wheeler who was then called a "Red" and this is how Cook in his book *The FBI Nobody knows* puts it:

*"Parenthetically, an obeisance in the general direction of sanity might be made here. If any lesson is needed on the dangers of categorizing idea, this is it. Senator Wheeler, this 'radical of radicals' in 1924, was to become in a short span of years the darling of the conservatives. They loved him when he helped lead the fight on Roosevelt's court-packing plan in 1937: they adored him when he balked at the third term: and when he opposed foreign entanglements on the eve of World War II, the enchantment of America Firsters know no bounds. Wheeler then, was hailed as a great American patriot, and Republicans even mumbled in their beards about the possibility of making him their candidate for the Presidency."*

In the hysteria against communism, a racial Senator later becoming a conservative was deemed a communist. In the 1930s Americans volunteered to fight against fascism in Spain. They would have been spared a great deal of tragedy and suffering had this force been defeated, but after Franco had won with the help of Mussolini and Hitler, all the Americans that had returned home were hounded.

The F.B.I. starting again in the 1940s with its anti-communist hysteria campaign indicted and persecuted these individuals. After a while no one was safe. Liberals and radicals were all dragged into the dragnet. At one time the F.B.I had a file – a card index system of 60,000 names. Hoover admitted in his book that, at that time there were only 12, 000 communists in America, but in the dragnet 60,000 names were investigated. At page 171 of the same book it is stated:

*“In 1941, the critics were the rabble – rousing communist, the goose – stepping bundsmen, their stooges and seemingly innocent fronts, and last but not the least, the pseudo liberals . . . By whom have these persons been set upon us? By persons whom we have trusted the most – by certain teachers in our public schools and institutions of higher learning, by certain writers, fattening upon the royalties paid by the American people while fostering class hatred and discontent, by some prattle-minded politicians, grabbing for votes with one hand while waving the flag of pseudo-liberalism with the others, and worst of all by some ministers of the Gospel who have loudly proclaimed the communist’s right to destroy America and its God-fearing way of life . . .”*

That was J. Edger Hoover speaking; in the dragnet were liberals, teachers in public schools, certain writers, Ministers of the Gospel and so on. I need not to go on to dwell on all of this, but suffice it to say that McCarthyism was finally launched on the American scene. Famous people, scientists such as the atom scientist, Dr. Oppenheimer, were hounded out of their jobs. Many say now that it was because of this witch-hunting that America is behind the Soviet Union in the rocket race to the moon. Actors, screen writers and directors were put on the Black List; they were hounded out of their jobs.

Later on, there came out this example of what happened. One of the writers wrote under a pseudonym. He was awarded an Oscar for a picture called, *“The Brave One”*. When he went to receive his prize – of course the McCarthyism era was over – it was disclosed that he was one of the Hollywood ten who were hounded out of their jobs. Also not only the U.S. administration but even in the United Nations, ‘New Dealers’, many of whom had served in the Roosevelt administration and held important posts, lost their jobs.

Professors, teachers at Universities, students and so were all hounded down.

I have here a little book called *Rumour, Fear and the Madness of Crowds* by

J. P. Chaplin. He was referring to the attack by McCarthy on the President of Harvard University and he wrote:

*“The ferocious attack on Dr. Pusey was ill-taken, even by many of the Senator’s longtime supporters. The uncalled-for assault drew especially strong criticism from Wisconsin newspapers, some of which had previously supported the Senator’s crusade. Harvard University and Dr. Pusey remained silent. The enraged Senator subsequently referred to the University as a “sanctuary” for communists.”*

Libraries were purged of books. A book called *Citizen from Paine* – he was an Englishman who fought with George Washington and others during the American Revolution. His biography, which was written by a communist, was taken out of the shelves of the City of New York’s library. The McCarthy Committee went on a tour of Europe and in all U.S.I.S. libraries certain books were purged. Look at the hysteria we are having in this country – the biggest subversion library was Mr. Luckhoo’s years ago.

President Truman, as well as known, was not a flaming radical. He was not even radical, but this is what we see at Page 174 of this book:

*“To make matters worse, there was a considerable body of opinion in the United States which assigned the blame for this tragic state of affairs on the State Department and the Executive branch. The ‘conspiracy theory’ so ably defended by McCarthy, extremely anti-‘New Dealer’, and the lunatic fringe, held that the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations had sold out the free world to the Soviet Union.”*

Another very apt quotation on that same point is to be found in a book which is called *Freedom is as Freedom Does* by Carlos Lamont. I will quote from page 75, referring to this same charge against President Truman and so forth:

*“. . . This is why he did not hesitate to tangle with the highest officials of the Republican Administration and to imply, by making speeches entitled “Twenty years of Treason.” about the Democratic Administration from 1932 through 1952 that most Democrats are traitors. In May 1954 McCarthy included in this slur the first year of the Eisenhower Administration by referring to ‘the evidence of treason that has been growing over the past twenty, twenty – one years’.”*

Even Eisenhower was, at that stage, to be deemed as subversive. What evidence is there that the Members on the other side of the House will not behave in the same way that McCarthy has behaved? What evidence is there to show that the second tribunal, which will be the creature of the Prime Minister, will not behave the same way as the UN American Subversive Activities Committee and tar right and left, leaving no one safe in

this country?

Let us look at the record of this Government. We have seen crass discrimination in employment practices and in other phases of public life. We have seen the use of violence against persons like Dr. Chandra – not a politician – of the Mahaica Hospital. We have seen a form of violence unleashed against Mr. Ivor Cendrecourt. We know these people who have told us that the rule of law will not be interfered with in this Bill. We have seen where the courts have freed an individual, and immediately after his release he was held and put in to detention. We have seen that this Government is making more and more use of informers. More money has been voted to pay people who are going to be a stool-pigeons, and these informers are increasing month after month.

My Hon. Colleague Mr. Wilson read a statement from this same book *The F.B.I. Nobody Knows*, and he showed how the F.B.I. dragnet worked against people. F.B.I. informers who were on the payroll lied and as a result of their lies many people were convicted.

In this book, under the Chapter headed "*Hoover, Palmer and the Red Raids*" the author states:

*"When the trap was sprung, some 10,000 victims by a later estimate of the Walsh committee – were swept up in the nationwide dragnet. The shocking actions of the 1918 draft raids were being repeated – on a larger and more vicious scale. The Times reporter, observing the first desperados picked up in New York, gave this skeptical judgment: 'They were a tame, unterroristic looking crowd, and their appearance bore out the statements of operatives that not a man had tried to put up a fight. Among the prisoners that came into headquarters later were twenty-five women, half of them apparently girls of high school age'."*

People have asked, "*Can a person like Mr. Nunes have committed the offences for which they claim he must be detained and now restricted?*" I ask this question because it is clear that the Government is out to silence the Opposition. The Government is today faced with discontent and dissatisfaction in its own ranks. One of its Members admitted to me only yesterday that we were a little fortunate because while we were in the Government our supporters could be given a piece of land and were happy, but the supporters of this Government want jobs and where can jobs be found? Where can they find the industries and the money?

I am winding up. Red herrings have been raised about the Tri-Continental Conference and about people wanting to introduce a foreign ideology into this country. When the Americans fought the War of Independence, it was said by the British, who fought against them, that the foreign ideology and the help from France were influencing the people into revolutionary action. The Tri-Continental Conference was a meeting of progressive people from all over the world, Tanzania, Ghana, India, Zambia, some of the

Afro – Asian states to which these Members give credit. What did they say at this Conference? From what we hear they were plotting subversion and revolution. Nothing was wrong with the American Revolution but if individuals like the Attorney-General were living at the time they would no doubt have been fighting with the British against the Americans.

At the Tri-Continental Conference they pledged themselves to aid all national liberation movements, all people who are fighting for freedom. They agreed not only to give aid to Vietnamese people but also to the Rhodesians. The people of these two countries were high up on the agenda for aid. They agreed to give help to the liberation movement which is fighting in Angola against the vicious Salazar regime.

The Minister says we are advocating armed violence. What do you think is happening in Vietnam? What do you think is happening in Angola? What do you think Tanzania, Ghana and all those other people have decided to do! To pass resolutions! Hon. Members have heard the Prime Minister say that armed force must be used to liberate the people of Rhodesia from the Fascist Ian Smith. What is the difference between that and the Resolution passed at the Tri-Continental Conference?

## National Security (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill: 7<sup>th</sup> December, 1966

**Dr. Jagan:** I, too, would like to oppose this Clause (22) because I believe it is putting a very dangerous provision on our Statute Books. What does the Government mean by "*any person who consorts with*"? This is a term with an elastic meaning.

My Hon. Friend referred a moment ago to guilt by association. You are well aware of the fact that during the early cold-war period, not only were political leaders haunted in the United States, but also many trade unionists. You know as a fact that, in the early 1950s there was brought into the United States an Amendment called the Taft-Hartley Act which was opposed by the A.F.L. and C.I.O. A great trade union leader, John L. Lewis, President of the Mine Workers' Union described this law as a scourge and pestilence that was meant to muzzle trade union movements. Workers could not go on strike. They had to give 60 days' notice before they could embark on a strike. Of course, this helped the employers because during the period of 60 days notification, they were able to prepare the ground either for breaking the strike, or intimidating strike leaders and so on.

But that was not all. There was the political aspect too. Macarthyism! People were subpoenaed for what they called un-American activities or subversive activities. The first question that was put to them was not whether they committed any acts but whether they were members of the Communist Party or if they had ever been associated with anyone who was a member. And many trade union leaders who refused to answer this question were virtually convicted because they invoked, I believe, the Fifth Amendment. This was guilt by association.

Then there were others who answered that they were not, and there was a muckraking into the whole history of these individuals. If a person knew a communist by some slight chance a long time ago, someone whom he has forgotten, this was used against him to get him out of the Public Service or the U.N. Many people lost their jobs, people who were closely associated with Roosevelt, one of the greatest leaders of the United States of America. We are coming to a similar sort of situation here where people may not have committed any overt acts but can be punished for consorting with any person who, without lawful authority has in his possession firearm, explosive or ammunition.

How do we know that all the agents and spies, who are going to be employed by the Government, will not "*frame up*" individuals? How do we know that firearms are not to be planted in people's yards? The Deputy Prime Minister, the Minister of Home Affairs, had firearms in his yard. Of course, he said he did not know anything about it. Under this Clause, not only could he have been prosecuted, but all the people who know him

could be dragged before the Courts. I am speaking about his close associates, not only his immediate family. This is not far-fetched.

My Hon. Friend, Mr. Wilson, in speaking on the Second Reading of the Bill, referred to a certain case where an F.B.I. agent actually received ammunition from the F.B.I. and gave it to certain people and incited them. I should like, with your permission, Sir, to read a quotation because it is very vital to what is happening here. The record of this Government, when it was in Opposition and since it has been in office, does not indicate that we and the people in Guyana can put our complete trust in them.

The case that I am going to quote does not concern communists. It concerned the Christian Front Sports Club in Brooklyn. The book to which I refer is *The F.B.I. Nobody Knows* and the passages are to be found on pages 253, 254, 255, 256 and 257. I quote:

*"...this second case broke on January 15, 1940, when F.B.I. agents, in carefully synchronised raids, swooped down on seventeen members of a Christian Front Sports Club in Brooklyn. The details, as given out at the time by the F.B.I. and the United States Attorney's office were of the shocking, sensational kind that automatically makes eight-column headlines."*

*"The trial opened in Brooklyn Federal Court in April, 1940. In early testimony, the prosecution added seemingly impressive details to its case. One F.B.I. agent testified that he had made recordings of conversations held by the plotters in the home of Denis Healy, the government informer who had helped to break the case. The recordings, the agent insisted, proved unintelligible, but he testified he had overheard Bishop brag that '175 policemen in New York were ready to join the revolution' and that the plotters had '300,000 men under arms in the United States'. A second F.B.I. agent testified that another of the plotters had suggested 'knocking off at least a dozen Congressmen'."*

*"The unravelling of the fantasy began with the exposure of Denis Healy. The government's star informer, it developed, had been rather well paid for informing. At first he had been put on the payroll at a salary of \$25 a week; later, as his information got better, he had been paid \$75 every two weeks. His wife, too, had been compensated. In all, it was admitted, the F.B.I. had paid out some \$1,300 to the Healys since the previous October 10 – compensation, it was explained, to reimburse them for time lost from their regular jobs and to pay them for expenses they had incurred in aiding the Government."*

This is now the important part –

*"These details suggested the possibility that the Healys might have informed for pay, but more damaging was Healy's admission that in his enthusiasm for the cause he had aided and pushed the plotters onward in their plot, helping to create*

*some of the evidence against them."*

We are told what happened when the case went to the jury:

*"When the case went to the jury in late June, 1940, the fate of only fourteen defendants remained to be decided. One defendant had committed suicide in his prison cell, and charges against two others had been dismissed by the trial judge for lack of proof."*

We have to be concerned about what is happening in our land today. Obviously, a great deal of hysteria is being generated in this country. By the Government, of course. On the one hand it is claimed, for foreign consumption, that everything is well in this country; there is peace; but on the other hand emergency regulations continue. People are under restriction, people are prevented from earning their livelihood. I have heard Mr. D'Aguiar equate the P.N.C.'s socialism with the P.P.P.'s communism. To him there is no difference at all.

There is a great deal of relevance in my quotation. Of course, there is relevance, because with such powers in the hands of Ministers such as D'Aguiar, under this Bill, it is very likely that these powers will be abused and that the large number of agents and informers who are being employed today will go to any lengths in order to incriminate and to put away those to whom they are politically opposed and to whose ideas they are opposed.

This is a very serious matter.

Under this Clause, one fears that the Government has the power not only to convict but to drag large numbers of persons before the courts and to harass them perpetually by constantly bringing them under this vague terminology "*consorting with someone*". It can put persons to a great deal of expense and inconvenience. Indeed, it can expose such persons to guilt by association which can ultimately lead to imprisonment for ten years, under this Clause.

In the United States of America, ten leaders of the Communist Party were once brought up for trial. They were not charged for committing any overt act but mainly for believing in a philosophy which preaches about the violent overthrow of the Government, which preaches the doctrine of the use of force. As I pointed out to Hon. Members of this House, it is not only the communists who subscribe to this doctrine, but there are others who subscribe to it. But when they subscribe to it they say that armed force and revolutionary violence can be used at a certain time, in a certain context, and so forth.

I must remind this House that the Prime Minister and the Government support the use of violence by the Africans in Rhodesia against the Smith regime. I am sure that the Government would have no objection to the Negroes using force in the United States, Negroes who are fighting for liberation in a different context, who are fighting for civil liberties, for the

right to vote and take their seats. I refer to this because a Hon. Minister said that he agreed with us but that he did not see the necessity for changing the law. Just like he agrees that Local Government elections should be held, but he does not bring forward the necessary legislation!

I am appealing to Hon. Members on the Government side. I know that if they had been on this side of the House, and we had sought to bring such a measure here, you would have heard, throughout the world, about dictatorship and so forth.

I remember that whenever we spoke about the appointment of judges in the Constitution, the Hon. Minister of Trade, Shipping and Civil Aviation (Mr. Kendall), Mr. John Carter and others used to say that the Prime Minister should not have the right to say anything on the appointment of judges. They felt that we would get a Constitution like the one in Ghana. They said that Nkrumah was locking up all his opponents under the Preventive Detention Act! This is what they were opposed to, and here they are talking about exposing individuals to imprisonment not for a term of six months or one year, but ten years.

This is nothing to joke about. It is amazing to see Hon. Members who, in conscience, would fight for freedom in Rhodesia, who would fight for the freedom of Negroes in America, today condemning what the freedom-fighters in those two countries advocate. They want to lock up people for ten years, and then they make a joke of it!

Ten years is a long time in the life of a person. Quite recently, we have heard that, in England, a man was pardoned by the House of Lords. What good will it do to pardon a man after he has been executed? This man was given an apparently fair trial under British jurisprudence. But under the Star Chamber methods that we have in this country today, one wonders what will be the faith of people who are found in the company of other persons. Clearly, the Government is using a sledgehammer to try to destroy an ant. The Government has already admitted that it has all the powers in this country and that it will use them. The Government has demonstrated that it can use these powers. It has said that it can control anything. The tree that you are planting is going to be cut down by your own hands.

I am sorry that Hon. Members are found laughing and joking when we are discussing such grave issues concerning the liberty of the individual.

I would suggest that if people are living in fear in our country, it will not help this country to move forward. Fear is a terrible weapon to use. This Government is today terrorizing people. The *New Nation* stated that people in top places in the Civil Service are sabotaging the Government.

People are talking today not only at the bottom level but also at the top level in this country. If the Government continues to enact legislation such as this Bill, then Guyanese may very well say, "Look, I had better find myself out of this country as quickly as I can." I am not talking about Rudy; I am talking about people who have a substantial stake in the country. They are becoming afraid that if the Government does not like them, then they can

be blamed, they can be penalized, they can be discriminated against. This is why about \$15 million has left the country.

What is the Government trying to achieve in this country? In our country today there is virtually economic stagnation. On Monday, a businessman in Water Street told me that at this time last year his counters were packed with human beings waiting to be attended to, but now there are not sufficient people for one row. This is a question of stagnation. Money has gone out of the country. Agriculture is in a state of depression. As a result of this, production is going to fall. The Government will soon bring on more taxation in order to balance the Budget. This is inevitable, and a lot of it is due to the fact that their own big-shot friends do not have confidence in them because of the measures they have been introducing. This Clause is an example.

Did not Mr. Jardim, the past President of the Chamber of Commerce, and one of the staunchest members of the United Force say that businessmen are not investing because they have no confidence in the Government? Did not Mr. D'Aguiar say, when we were in the Government, that help must be given to the Water Street merchants in Georgetown to rebuild? Where is the help? Why are their own supporters not rebuilding? Instead of rebuilding, they are taking their money out of this country.

It was said that the P.P.P. would have destroyed the freedom of the Guyanese people! But who has destroyed the freedom of the Guyanese people? I repeat that what is necessary in this country is to create an atmosphere of confidence, not only for supporters of the Government, but for supporters of the Opposition as well. You cannot run this country with half of the population opposed to you. You cannot run this country with half of the people who are in the productive sector opposed to you.

Today the Americans would be glad to get out of Vietnam where they are spending \$21 billion (U.S.) a year in fighting a stagnating war.

## Rent Restriction Ordinance: 9<sup>th</sup> December, 1966

**Dr. Jagan:** We get a bit tired hearing Government Ministers and back benchers ask: “*What has the previous Government done in seven years?*” One would have thought that during those seven years in the wilderness the previous Opposition would have had enough time to think not only of what was being done but what should be done.

First of all, I should like to refer to some of the things that were done. Before I do so, I think one has to look at this question of landlords and rent restrictions somewhat dialectically. It is not merely a question of law. During the regime of the last Government, landlords and people who attempted to exploit the working-class were held in check because they knew not only that the law was there, but that there was the administration – by executive and other methods – there were regulations, and there was always the threat of having new legislation. This is why, even though we may not have had a law put on our Statute Books, nevertheless, there was not the flourishing racket which is going on at the moment.

All around, from top to bottom, people are being squeezed mercilessly, even in the city of Georgetown where the Government’s own supporters are. We gave these people protection and there was not this kind of racket. Other forms of protection were given to this class of people – the peasants and workers. When we assumed Office, we found that although rents were controlled, the lands on which buildings were put up were not under control, except in a few places. What did we do? First, we extended the provisions of the rent restriction law to the whole country and we brought in the application of the law to include not only control of rentals but also building land, because a racket was run where the landlord used to squeeze the tenant in some way, particularly if the tenant was a multiple tenant. The tenant may be on the landlord’s land which may be rented for cultivation, for building houses, and so on. If the landlord did not squeeze the tenant in one place, he gave him notice to remove his house. In this case, something was actively done by the previous Government.

The previous Government extended the rent restriction law to the whole country. Prior to that it applied only to Georgetown, New Amsterdam, and I believe Bartica and Wismar, and then building land was brought within the provisions of the law. So the Minister must not say that nothing was done or if he knew about this he should not have omitted it in his historical review, because he certainly would not get a PhD Degree for that kind of thesis. As I said, landlords and other exploiters were kept in check, but now the landlords and exploiters are having a field day because they are seeing the dilemma of the Government and they know about the duality of the Government.

There is a lot of incompetence. On one hand, one arm of the Coalition is claiming that it represents the working class with a socialist ideology. The other arm of the Coalition is clearly helping its wealthy friends. It is equating socialism with communism, with the taking away of people's property and so on, including the landlords. So faced with this dilemma – two forces opposing each other in the Cabinet – there can be no positive action. We find today that poor people are being squeezed in this country. In the sugar estates, the people who have lands no longer have protection. They are being picked up. The employers are resurrecting ancient regulations which they made so that the people are denied what they are entitled to. I refer to production bonuses.

In the Rice Farmers (Security of Tenure) Ordinance provision was made for assessment committees to be established on which tenants had their representative. Tenure of office for some of these people has now expired. What has the Government done? The Government is bypassing the Rice Producers' Association and is putting landlords, in many cases, to represent tenants. This is what is happening. No wonder the landlords in the city of Georgetown are squeezing money out of the poor people. There are increases of 25%, 35% and 50% overnight.

The Minister spoke about increase in wages, but we know that the worker is faced with the increasing cost of living due to other factors besides rentals. The cost of foodstuff is increasing, and we cannot afford to pay this increase at the moment.

I should like to bring to the Government's attention another aspect of this question, and that is the question of building land. You cannot solve the housing problem unless you solve the land problem. A few years ago, during the time of the Interim Government, I think, there was a proposition by the then "*Interim Minister*" that the area next to Campbellville should have been bought by the Government, but the Interim Government said that if it did that, it would lose money. And nothing was done.

The people are complaining that they cannot move into their areas. I do not know what the Minister is doing about this. Lots used to be sold for less than \$2,000. This week, a gentleman told me that he is being asked to pay over \$5,000 for one house lot. I was at a wedding ceremony in the area and the people told me that the lots are so small that if two houses are built, you can virtually jump from one to the other. Of course, the Government has removed capital taxes so that its wealthy friends like Hari Prashad and D'Aguiar can get away with "*murder*". We have seen recently how the Demerara Tobacco Company sold 300,000 one-dollar shares at \$1.75 a share. They can get away with "*murder*" because their friends reduced Capital Gains from 45% to 15%.

You cannot expect the housing problem to be solved unless you have got cheap land. If a landlord or an individual has to buy land at such high prices, he would not build. This is obvious. Land is available all around here. For this reason, the Minister should immediately embark on a scheme

to acquire some of the lands from the sugar estates nearby, and parcel these lands to people at low prices. Let them go in for self-help and make up their own lots and I am sure that the lots will be better than what Prashad has given them at Prashad Nagar.

If the Government has any imagination, it will be able to solve the housing crisis also, for this country has a lot of timber, and a lot of unemployment. Let members of the Government go to their American friends who are willing to give aid in machinery. Let them go and tell them that they want some equipment and some food. Many people who were working with sawmills have no work. They have no houses to live in because they cannot afford to pay rent. Government can get all the lumber it wants. It should get the land from the sugar plantations and then it will be able to tackle this problem.

However, before doing that the Government should see to it that some attempt is made to control the price of land. I do not think this is a difficult proposition. As I said, Government Members had seven years when they were in the Opposition to examine this question. They have been in the Government for two years. On the last occasion we were advised by the Minister that was the last time he was going to have an extension of this Ordinance. Therefore, we urge the Minister not to make excuses or to cast the blame on the past Government, but to come here very soon with something tangible so that we can solve this very pressing problem. It is not fun to be badgered by landlords, not knowing where you are going to live, knowing that you may be put out in the streets.

This is a very serious human problem. Unfortunately, Ministers have got in the habit of riding high now – big limousines, big horses! They have lost contact with the people, and because of this, they cannot appreciate the peoples' problems. I would urge the Minister concerned to go and do some work, not only in his office, but down in the streets to see what the working men think and what they feel. We saw a sample of it not so long ago in this very compound! Mighty Joe Young! He was not fighting in the ring; he was fighting against the party for which he voted! This is not a matter for joking. I can assure the Minister that on this question, he will always get the support of this side of the House, just as with Ankoko and with other matters where working class interest is threatened, the Government will always get the backing of this side of the House.

The P.N.C. arm of the Government should pursue an independent policy. It should look back into its own manifesto. If it does not do so faced with the contradictions inherent in this Coalition it will do nothing for the working class. This is why there is virtual stagnation in the country today. Nobody knows what to do! Nobody is willing to make any decisions! We are drifting, and in the process of drifting the status quo is maintained. Whoever is riding high now feels more inclined to ride roughshod over the people.

## **Guyana Defence Force**

### **Subhead 4 – rations - \$48,000**

**Dr. Jagan:** I should like to appeal to Members of the Government to give us more information. I recall that when we were last discussing expenditure, particularly in relation to roads, Hon. Members on this side of the House attempted, by all kinds of devices, to obtain information from the Minister, but we were not very successful. Now it has blown up! We now hear how money is being spent without authorisation, how money is being squandered, and we hear that there are thefts and corruption. We were told about these things long ago. We warned about them, but the Government refuses to give details. It prefers to spend taxpayers' money as it likes and then to come to the Assembly and say how much it wants.

When members of the Government were in the Opposition they asked for full explanations. The Government must give us details. Where are the details? The last time, when this item of rations for the Defence Force came before the Assembly, we asked how this was calculated and whether the cost of rations had gone up. Is there a special rate for those who are serving in Ankoko? We have not been given the benefit of an answer. The Government has now come back for an additional sum of \$48,000 without any further explanation. This Assembly must be told. How is this sum calculated? If the Minister of Home Affairs does not wish to answer, then the Minister of Finance must tell us, because he must know about it before he puts it in the Estimates. He must have the details. The files must have been sent to him for him to know what additional sums were added before this amount of \$48,000 was listed here. We must be told what is the basis of this expenditure. Is it that the Government miscalculated? Are the soldiers eating more than they are supposed to eat, or are they receiving an extra allowance? Is it that extra forces are being trained and the Opposition does not know about it? We would like to be informed.

I think the Minister of Finance in defence of his own position, now that the thieves are talking out, should tell us what has happened so that not only the Opposition but the people of the country may know. The people deserve to know what is happening with their money for very soon, no doubt, more taxes will fall on them. I urge the Minister of Home Affairs and the Minister of Finance to give us this information.

I do not see that there can be anything secret about this expenditure. It may be that the Government does not wish to debate Ankoko, but let us be told how this expenditure which was originally estimated at \$140,000 has been increased by \$41,000 and now another sum of \$48,000 is required. The size of the Army has not been increased, from the time it was planned. We want to know whether there is a secret Army somewhere commanded by a special commander. We request this information with due respect.

## Caribbean Free Trade Association Agreement: 29<sup>th</sup> December, 1966

**Dr. Jagan:** The Government in moving the Motion for the Caribbean Free Trade Area Agreement was rather unconvincing in its arguments. The main point made was that small communities cannot hope to survive and that if they are to progress they must unite so that there can be a bigger market, and eventually a progressive freeing of trade. Now, this talk about unity is nothing new. It is as old as the hills. At first, unity in the Caribbean was to come at the political level and so the political Federation was born.

Now that the Federation is dead and buried, we are attempting to achieve unity at the economic level. It seems to me that the level which is aimed at, the Free Trade Area is certainly the lowest level, for at one time there was even talk of a Customs Union.

I recall in the early days, when this matter of political Federation came up in the late 1940s, there was strong opposition to it by the then British Guiana Government. The suggestion, however, was made that, perhaps, the Guiana Government would be prepared to consider a Customs Union. At that time the attitude of the West Indian leaders was that if you do not want political Federation, then there would be no Customs Union. It seems that, after a great deal of work and discussions, we have arrived at a level which, as I said, is the lowest form of economic unity.

We would like to make our position very clear. We say that unity is necessary, but not unity at any price. There are all kinds of unity. We have an example of unity on the Government benches, and we see where this unity is leading this country today. As we see it, this unity which is limited to three relatively small territories will hardly achieve anything, and the unity which is projected is unity at the trade level more or less in a vacuum without interfering with the social economic structure of these countries; so we have very mixed feelings on this whole question.

While we agree that unity is essential if progress is to be made, we realize that unity must be a qualitative type of unity where other structural changes will take place. What is projected here is a unity which we see will not lead to any progress or any forward movement. Indeed, it can be a retrogressive move, and can lead to further binding of the chains of the people of these territories.

First of all, let us deal with the question of a market, since one of the main arguments of the Government is that we need a larger market. The population of the three territories is nearly one million. My Hon. Colleague Mr. Luck has already given us the statistics as regards import and export trade. I will repeat the figures, not in dollars but in percentages, so that things will stand out more clearly and show that our imports from Barbados are a fraction of 1% of our total markets; from Antigua the figure was

much less. Our exports to Barbados were around 1.5% and to Antigua, again, a very small fraction of 1%. What then is the economic justification for this measure? Clearly, there does not seem to be any real justification for this. The question then is: Why has this been done?

As we see it, those who control or dominate the economy of these countries want it; besides that, the political leaders also want it – of course, each of them want it for different reasons. The foreign capitalists want it because it will give them an opportunity to have a better stranglehold of the economy of these countries without the bother of having to move and deal with each territory separately. I will develop that point a little later.

There is no doubt that imperialism, today, is facing a crisis. Our colleague in this House, the Hon. J. Henry Thomas, regaled this Assembly with a long discourse on the history of Free Trade and Customs Union, but what he did was an exercise which we knew so well when we were learning history. It was a question of a few dates and a few events picked out and thrown together; but I think that the Members of this House, at this stage of our lives, deserve something better. I will try to put this in proper perspective.

What do we find today? Capitalists of developed countries today have a growing economic surplus as a result of exploitation of the working classes in their own countries and as a result of the extraction of super-profits from the third world countries. They have to do something with this economic surplus, and there is need to find markets for the export of capital – not only capital, but also goods. We know that as Colonies we have been the traditional buyers of manufactured goods from these countries. But what is facing these countries today is that the market for their exported, manufactured goods is shrinking relatively. Look at the world picture as a whole, and we find that about one-third of the world's population is now living in the socialist orbit of the world. The other two-thirds of the population will be found in the developed and third world countries.

A large sector, I may say, is becoming closed to the export products of the capitalist world. The Socialist Bloc countries, with integrated economies, are becoming more and more dependent upon themselves. The "*third world*" countries are endeavouring to restructure their economies by manufacturing their own products. Thus we find the market is shrinking.

Let me illustrate by giving one figure. At the end of the last war, the United States was exporting 38 percent of the goods in world trade. That percentage has dropped today to 18 percent. If we look at it from the other side, that is, from the Socialist Bloc countries, they are not only producing for themselves what previously they imported, but they are exporting more and more and competing in the very markets which were served by capitalist countries. I understand that exports of the Soviet Union have increased almost thirteen fold over the prewar level.

All this talk, therefore, about Common Markets and Free Trade Areas has to be considered in the context of the necessity to find markets for sur-

plus capital and surplus goods which are now piling up and which are the headaches of capitalism. My Hon. Friend, Mr. Thomas, referred not only to the Common Market and to the Free Trade Area, but also took us back to the last century. One of my colleagues rightly pointed out that while one thing may have achieved a certain result at one time, it does not necessarily follow that the same ingredients, put together at a different time, under different circumstances, will produce the same results. He was not comparing like things and this is an important fact.

The Common Market in Europe has to be related to what was happening before that. My Hon. Friend referred to the attempt at achieving unity in Germany, Austria and Hungary. He gave us a history of Free Trade. Surely he knows that the first champion of Free Trade was Great Britain. Why was Great Britain the champion of Free Trade? Because the Industrial Revolution was born in Britain. Secondly, Britain was "*Mistress of the Seas*" and, therefore, no one could hope to compete against British manufacturers. Thus, there was the advocacy for Free Trade.

We know that during that period of conquests for markets and possessions, the world was divided up between the French, the Dutch, the Spanish, the British, and others. German capitalism became a big force towards the beginning of this century and so arose the struggle for living ground and the First World War.

There was a serious crisis of overproduction after the First World War, and this resulted in the great depression of 1929 -1930. Then the cycle in Germany took an upward swing with full employment and mass production. Then, again, there was a struggle for markets. This was the period of the Second World War. What happened in the interval between the two wars? A new giant appeared, the United States of America. In the latter part of the last century and in this century, the United States carved out her own sphere of influence under the Monroe Doctrine in the Western Hemisphere. "*This is ours,*" it said. "*Hands Off!*"

A time came, after the Second World War, when the whole of Europe was devastated. Her industries were lying dormant and prostrate. The United States became the most powerful industrial nation the world. After the First World War the United States began pushing for Free Trade. That is how there came into being these so-called "*Commonwealth Preference*" and "*French Communities*", closed areas surrounded by tariff walls. The former champion of Free Trade, Great Britain, could no longer survive in open competition, either with Germany or the United States of America. It was this that brought about the closed areas, "*most favoured nation*" status, Commonwealth Preference, French Community and so on.

During the last war, the Americans pressed Great Britain to abolish the barriers to Free Trade, but the European countries knew that however much they needed American dollars and American help, if they were to agree to that, they would be finished; they could not hope to compete against American manufacturers in the world markets. But the pressure from America

did not stop. It took various forms such as the isolation of the Socialist Bloc and the spread of a myth that communism was a disease and a conspiracy and should, therefore, be isolated. These were Cold War barriers.

Let them neither buy from us nor we from them. That was one tactic. There were also increasing pressures for the scaling down of tariffs. We see that even today, in what is called the Chicken War in Europe, the United States is pressing European countries for a scaling down of tariffs on chicken which it wants to export to Europe.

Then came aid with strings. If you accept aid, you must do other things. You must allow other facilities, join military blocs like Nato and Seato, break up left-wing Governments which were created during the war out of the necessity of fighting Hitler. In order to obtain Marshall Aid, one of the conditions was that France, Italy and Belgium had to expel left-wing socialists and communists from the Governments. Aid with strings did not resolve difficulties and so devaluation of currency was forced on countries like Britain. We see such policies also being adopted in countries in Latin America and, more lately, in India, because once one has a tied economy to the imperialist setup, balance of payment deficit and budget deficits inevitably occur.

The result is that one has to devalue currency and we have seen many countries taking this step but not solving their problems. Of course, when a currency is devalued vis-à-vis American dollars, then those dollars become very valuable in the markets outside of the United States. They can then buy into industries like Ford, Vauxhall and so on, following this buying into the industries as a result of devaluation, there comes upon the scene the problem of survival between the foreign capitalists and the local capitalists. This accounts for the political behaviour as we see it today, in countries like France.

I should like to read one quotation from this Canadian magazine called *Dimension*, Volume 3, Number 3-4, March/April 1966. This article is entitled "*Europe and De Gaulle*" and it appears on page 46 of this magazine:

*"But the American cultural invasion of France is not as important as the economic invasion. American investment in France has risen at a remarkable rate during the last few years. A year ago, on March 8, 1965, Newsweek magazine did a cover story on U.S. investment in Europe. Speaking of France, Newsweek said, 'American companies have opened 500 new operations (in France) in the past two years'. French national pride is lacerated by the fact that U.S. firms now control almost the whole electronics industry, 90 percent of the production of synthetic rubber, 65 percent of petroleum distribution and 65 percent of farm machinery production. Even a few of the subcontractors for President De Gaulle's top-secret force de frappe are U.S. subsidiaries: 'Unless Europe reacts and gets organized', warns Louis Armand, the man who turned the French railroad system into the world's best, 'we are condemning ourselves to industrial colonization. Either we counterattack or we sign our vassalization warrant'."*

If size were the only factor for economic development, we must immediately ask ourselves why are there problems in India, in Brazil, and growing problems in Canada.

These countries are plagued with difficulties. In India hundreds of thousands of people face death by starvation. In Brazil, a large territory with a large population, there are immense difficulties of poverty, difficulties of inflation, and so on.

It is clear therefore that size alone is not the important thing, nor must we look at trade in isolation. If we think of trade in isolation from the other things which are necessary to be done for economic development, then we may find that we are merely handing on a platter to those who today dominate our economic lives an advantage which otherwise they would not have.

My Hon. Friend, Mr. Henry Thomas said that there is nothing to prevent the capitalist from coming here. If you do not have unity they can still come and dominate you. This is only half the truth. While it is true that they can come here, when you have a Free Trade area comprising three territories or more, then they can go in one place, set up there, and move their goods freely within the area. The decision will no longer be yours but theirs. Follow the genesis of development in underdeveloped countries.

We do not want to continue to be the importers of manufactured goods and the exporters of raw materials, foods and minerals. The way to change this is to begin to set up industries, either Government owned or according to the philosophy of this Government, private owned! In any case, tariff walls should be put up to give protection to these local industries. What would happen then? Those who were formerly selling to us by exporting their goods would be forced, if they want to retain the local market, to jump over the tariff wall, to go into the territory and set up an assembly plant or a branch factory. We have seen this taking place in Trinidad. We have seen this taking place in Guyana with British Paints Ltd.

In other words, with nationalism and socialism, it is possible – if you want – to force the investors to come to your country. Under the Free Trade Area Agreement they do not have to come to your country, they can go where conditions are most congenial to them such as low wages; low social security measures and surplus labour force so that they can get an abundant supply of cheap labour. All these factors influence them to make the decision where they should establish.

Another fact is that not only the foreign capitalists but even those internally will, after a while, measure their patriotism by the length of their pockets. This will cause an outflow of money from Guyana because there is no doubt that, from the capitalist point of view; Barbados and Antigua have more ideal conditions than Guyana. It is quite possible therefore that even the capitalists whom the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Economic Development and the Prime Minister are trying to encourage here will not be coming, and those who are here – their own friends – will try to migrate in search of bigger profits and a better political climate.

But that is not all. This puts the foreign capitalists at a great advantage over their local brethren, for who can compete against one giant combine with 28 manufacturing industries like Unilever. It is like a small retailer having to compete with a man who is a commission agent, a wholesaler and a retailer. The small retailer complains because the man sells below him. This is precisely what will happen under this arrangement.

In this country we have seen where they have throw out the local Christmas flowers which used to be sold and brought in cheap artificial flowers from outside. This is the first stage of capitalism. When the foreigners can no longer sell locally because of tariff walls, they come and establish their industries or their factories and destroy the local enterprises.

What did he say? He said that standards of living in the Caribbean were very low because the small man had to work with his bare hands to farm a few acres of land. Therefore, let us have intensified agriculture; mechanize it, and make bigger farms. What must be done with this big population? Establish industries in the small Caribbean Islands. What must be done with the surplus population, even after you have set up industries and intensified agriculture? Move the surplus population to British Honduras and Guyana. In other words, Guyana and British Honduras would become an agricultural appendage in an industrial Caribbean.

Let us face facts. There are two trends today in the world. In every country the rural population is always worse off, generally speaking, than in the other areas. Look at it from the world point of view. The third world countries are poorer than the industrialized ones. Where there is industrialisation, there is always a higher standard of living. The imperialists, professors from abroad, and politicians say that Guyana coupled with countries like British Honduras must become an agricultural appendage.

We here are not narrow nationalists, and we do not believe that we must try to solve our problems at the expense of other people. We believe that our nationalism must be tied up with the nationalism of others, but, while we seek unity with other Caribbean countries, we are not prepared to allow our territory to succumb to an inferior status or to see our people relegated to a lower standard of living.

My Hon. Friend referred to the unification of Australia, Germany, and so on. It is true that Austria, Bulgaria and Romania were all colonies of greater Germany, where standards of living were lower. The attempt to unify them was only a means of exploiting them further and to keep them in a position of subserviency. It does not follow that unity cannot produce other results, for we have seen where the same politico-economic colonies of greater Germany today has become highly industrialized, and they can now export complete plants and factories to third world countries such as ours. I refer to Hungary, Bulgaria and so on.

There is unity, and there is unity. You can have unity of the previous German type with the countries remaining as colonies or satellites, or we can have unity as we see developed in the Socialist Bloc of countries where

industrialization has taken place, the whole economy has been reconstructed, and the standard of living of the people has risen. Since that is so, then let us see where we are going.

First of all, the Hon. Minister of Trade and those who spoke for the Government side told us that this is only a small beginning. They said that we must not criticize Carifta because it is small: it is the beginning of something big, and any territory can apply for membership. I have here a Report from the Incorporated Commonwealth Chambers of Industry and Commerce of the Caribbean. These people came here too; they went all over the area and had discussions with every single Government as well as the various economic bodies.

What has been done? Instead of trying to bring all of these countries together, the Guyana Government has run riot! It has gone ahead. When one reads this Report one gets the impression that important stages have not yet been passed through. One reads here that the West Indies University in Jamaica have experts who are now beginning to study this problem of Caribbean unity and what it means in realistic terms. The Report is not yet available. If the Report is available, then it is not a complete Report. The Report to which I have referred was written on the 9<sup>th</sup> October. It was suggested that the aim should be to hold a Regional Conference of Heads of Governments, but prior to this Conference there should be a Conference at the lower level of economic experts and advisers. Why is this necessary? Let us look back at the Federation of the West Indies. At one time the cry was: "*Federation under any conditions; let us go ahead.*"

Sir, after the 1953 Commission was arranged and headed by Sir Sydney Cain, he wrote a Report on the fiscal and economic measures which had to be taken, and it was only then that the Caribbean leaders started to realize the implications of what they had gone into politically. They started to think and they had second thoughts. Today this Government is putting the cart before the horse. It should have followed the procedure which was outlined in the Report.

The first thing that should have been done in this matter was to get the experts to make a proper study of things. Let the experts from the Guyana University and the West Indies University examine this matter thoroughly. Bring the experts together first at a lower level, and then bring in the Heads of Governments. It is only then that we will avoid what befell the West Indies Federation.

In this Agreement we read that a Council has to be set up, and we also hear from the Government side that it will welcome a larger body. When I was passing through Antigua there was a lot of talk about the Antigua Oil Refinery. The view then was that Antigua does not want Trinidad to join Carifta because, if that happens, the protective market in Guyana for Antigua's oil would be lost.

We are told that there must be a unanimous agreement by the three members, Guyana, Barbados and Antigua, before any other territory can

join. I am not speaking about Cuba. Trinidad has a large trade, in terms of dollars, with this country but Trinidad's entry is not going to come about because we see the motivations already. One of the basic concepts of a Free Trade area, or a Customs Union, is to arrive eventually at some overall type of planning with specialization in each territory in things which it can produce most economically. But look at the ludicrous situation in which we now find ourselves. Trinidad has the basis for a big petrochemical industry with oil wells and oil refineries. The first deviator was Jamaica, which set up an oil refinery. Barbados followed then Antigua and now Guyana.

We must make up our minds about what we want. On the one hand we are told that what is wanted is a Free Trade area that we want to go in for specialization and so on. On the other hand we do not wish to accept the Phoenix Oil Company deal. We do not know what other deals will come.

The point is that there is no clear objective in this Agreement which will lead to the amelioration of the sufferings of the masses. Let me read from page 14 of this Report of the Incorporated Commonwealth Chambers of Industry and Commerce of the Caribbean. After a discussion in Trinidad with the Government of Trinidad and with economic leaders, this is what is written in one section of the Report:

*“Communist infiltration: It was felt that the danger of communist infiltration in the area should not be regarded lightly, and the earlier situation in Guyana was referred to. The delegation was asked to bear the problem in mind and to emphasize in their talks the importance of preserving the traditional system of free enterprise.”*

I repeat: We believe in unity, but unity under a set of circumstances which can lead to economic growth and to development not unity which will allow the foreign capitalists to have a commanding position in the economy of the country and which will allow them to strangle small native enterprises and community enterprises. That is why they talk about fighting communism; Government enterprises mean communism. It is clear that the objectives are not what are mentioned for public consumption.

The political leaders, of course, see other reasons for this limited non-sensical type of Agreement. Those who are sitting in the Government here feel that with the free movement of goods there will also be free movement of persons. Thus they will enhance their electoral strength. Those who are sitting in Barbados and Antigua know that they have a volcano below them and, when the fervour of flag-waving and emotionalism is over, there will come a time when people will begin to question programmes and policies.

Thus, the leaders in Barbados and Antigua see in Carifta a means of exporting their problem, not their goods. They have no goods to export. They will be exporting their headaches, while Guyana will be importing headaches. What should be our aim?

The aim of the Government in this country should be not to sign this Agreement, not to ratify it; to follow the steps of those who have been examining the situation; not to plunge precipitously when dealing with this question. The Prime Minister, in a speech yesterday, said he appreciated the role the academic men can play in this part of the world. Invite these men from Caribbean areas, from the United Nations, from the University of Guyana, to draw up a blueprint which will give an overall plan for the whole area, which will design a strategy for development and not only talk about Free Trade.

Trade alone does not result in development. Gunnar Myrdal, in dealing with poor countries, has said that so far as we are concerned we should be great protectionists; that while our goods must go into the territories of those who are great advocates for Free Trade, we must be protectionists to protect our industries. As I see it, what we are doing here is not protecting anything at all, but opening the floodgates for foreign domination.

Our dilemma on this question is real. We want unity, but we want unity of a special type. Lest it be misunderstood, if we vote against this Motion, - which we should normally do - that we are opposed to unity, we will not vote against it. But we cannot vote for this measure. First of all, the Government has treated this House and the Opposition very badly. It has not really gone in for any serious type of consultation. In fact, I suggested to you, Sir, that the Agreement should be put to a Select Committee of this Assembly, because we have not yet gone into the clauses of the Agreement, nor will this Assembly have an opportunity to make amendments to that Agreement.

For those reasons we cannot vote for this Motion, because there are many things which are obnoxious in the Agreement.

Indeed, one can say that the Council which will be set up will have so many overriding powers that it can actually interfere with the sovereignty of this country without the Parliament having anything to say about it. Therefore, in view of that, we would like our position to be very clear. We will therefore abstain, when the time comes, from voting on this important issue on which the Government has acted very uncavalierly in this House.

## Gastro Enteritis Epidemic: 20<sup>th</sup> January, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** Our young nation has been severely hit. I am now not talking in economic terms but in medical terms. Unfortunately, many have not only suffered but have lost their lives and, as we have been reading daily in the press, this killer gastro enteritis has taken a heavy toll of lives of young children. From one end of the country to the other, parents are today weeping. For the past two years we have been warning the Government about sanitation conditions in this country, in displaced centres, about the inadequacy of proper services, and we were told that the Opposition knows not what it is talking about. Instead of acting, for instance, in the displaced areas, on a Report which was produced by a Committee which credentials could not be questioned, we saw the spectacle of the Government appointing another Committee, and even that Committee's report was pigeonholed.

I recall that in the early days in the 1940s, in times of heavy rainfall, latrines and housing settlements were inundated with water and people suffered greatly. We warned the Government that a similar situation will develop in this country if it did not act quickly but, with its usual callousness, the Government said that we were only trying to scare the people. What is even more unfortunate is that this matter was not handled, as far as we can see, expeditiously, and even when there were known cases, we found that either proper treatment was not given or there were no medical practitioners to attend to the people. As a result, there are poor children dying from one end of the country to the other, even as far as the North - West District.

My information is that about 10,000 children have been affected and that the deaths, which are a little over 40 officially, would probably be found to be nearer 200. The Ministers may smirk but we know that, in this country, there are no proper means of diagnosing ills, there are no proper means of giving treatment and, as a result, people die. A few days ago a disclosure was made by one of the physicians in New Amsterdam and we read about the controversy in the press as to whether or not the physician had the right to come out and speak his mind in public. This is not the time to split hairs on rules. Had it not been for such an exposure by this brave doctor, perhaps the Government would have been still sleeping.

Let us hope that they have awaked from their sleep. If anything could have been said of the Government in a positive manner, it should have been in the field of health. Unfortunately, we have seen one calamity after another. We have seen one Minister after another being changed. People do not what changes of Ministers. What could be much better is a change of Government.

The time is coming when Members of the Government will not be able to show their faces in the streets. All their wild promises have evaporated

into thin air. Had the opportunity been given on this occasion to move a vote of *'no confidence'*, I think the public would have voted *'no confidence'* against this Government. We want to hear specifically from the Government today what is being done. We do not want to know what is being done in Georgetown, because even in Georgetown the people are dissatisfied. We want to know specifically, what is being done, from the North - West District to the Corentyne River; allay the fears of the people and give them proper advice. We want to know if drugs are available in sufficient quantities at any time, at the right places. We know that, in order to make the Budget balance, to make it appear that the finances of the country are in a glorious state, they have been cutting expenses...

## Approval of Estimates of Expenditure: 30<sup>th</sup> January, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** It is said that Rome ruled its Empire with bread and circuses. Guyana's Coalition Government has been attempting to do the same. I remember a public broadcast in 1961 in which the three political leaders participated. A great deal of bread was promised by the two Opposition leaders at the time. Mr. D'Aguiar said that if his Party won the elections, hundreds of millions of dollars would flow in the country; the streets would be filled with milk and honey. Not to be outdone Mr. Burnham spoke about free milk, free cassava and free plantains.

What do we find today now that these Honourable gentlemen adorn the seats of Government? We have circuses, yes. There was the Independence Conference in London. There was the Queen's visit to Guyana, and, more recently, there were the Independence celebrations. But Guyanese, having had the circuses, are now asking, "Where is the bread?" Clearly, there is no bread to be seen. Instead of the bread there are a lot of rosy promises. The Minister of Finance, by the juggling of statistics, presents a rosy picture to the populace, but this rosy picture cannot hide the realities of everyday living. Thus the Government had to resort to the appointment of a Minister of Information, virtually a Minister of Propaganda.

There is a lot to be explained away. If one were to take stock at this midterm one would come to the conclusion that very little has been achieved. I should like to read a quotation from the Daily Chronicle of November 27, 1955. I read from page 214 of my book *The West on Trial*:

*"Two years have gone by and we are no better off than we were before the political debacle. We have had more houses built, we have had a few self-aided schemes, a little of this and a little of that but the population is increasing faster than ever, unemployment is increasing and the cost-of-living continues to rise. We submit to marking time politically, and even here we expect the time has come for some closure to that, but must we submit to marking time where the economic development of the country is concerned? Must we continue to live as we are living or should we say existing? Let there be an end to this nonsense."*

If the Daily Chronicle were today in the hands it was at that time, it would no doubt write a similar commentary using perhaps the exact words to describe this Government's record in mid-passage.

What did the Members on the Government side say about this Budget? Some of them are realizing that there was a lot of gloss, a lot of padding, and they came forth on the defensive to say that independent countries must tax. Some of them even went to the extent of saying there is nothing

wrong about taxation and that every Government has the right to tax. We do not question the Government's right to tax. What we do question is the fact that the Government is putting pressure on the masses. What is being done with the money that is being collected from the masses of the people of this country? These are the arguments that we on this side are putting forward. Some Members of the Government have said that there is progress, there is increased wellbeing. What is the measure of this? The Minister of Finance tells us about national income increasing. He says that, over the last two years, the figure has increased by 18%. I think something needs to be said about national income statistics. First of all, national income figures by themselves do not indicate progress or indeed wellbeing for; first, it depends on what one is measuring. Are we measuring real production, income earned in real production, or were we measuring income earned in services or infrastructure development? These are fundamental questions that we must ask.

It is a known fact that our method of measuring national income statistics is based on the western method, and that is to compute everything. But it is also a known fact that in highly developed countries like the United States and England – wherever the standard of living is high – there is always a high measure of services – more restaurants, more laundries, etc. Therefore, necessarily, the national income measured by those yardsticks appears to be very high. What is more important is the distribution of the national income. A Government must aim not only at increasing the national income but also at redistributing the national income in favour of the poor. Certainly, here is where the Government has failed miserably. One only has to look around and see what is happening today. National income can increase and yet the position of the working class can deteriorate. Statistics in Mexico in the early sixties, where a similar method of economic development has been adopted as in Guyana, have shown that even though national income has increased, the increase has gone to the upper and middle brackets whereas the lower income people have had a fall in their standard of living.

My Hon. Friend Mr. Chandisingh gave some figures when he spoke to show that average figures of national income do not tell the story, do not give the real facts and can hide a lot of untruths. He cited some figures – perhaps I can do the same – to show how ludicrous one can get in quoting averages so far as national income is concerned. One million people may be earning \$100 million national income. On one hand, 100,000 of them may be earning half of the national income - \$50 million – which means an average of \$500 per head. On the other hand, 900,000 at the bottom may also be earning half of the national income, and their income per head will be \$56 only.

It is a known fact that in most western countries the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer, and also in each capitalist-dominated country, the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer.

This is what is happening in our country. We find that in wealthy countries like the United States 13% of the people at the top earn as much 64% of the people at the bottom. Averages, therefore, in such circumstances, mean very little. Ninety per cent of the export income of Venezuela, which has a high per capita national income, come from oil and that product employs less than 5% of the population. So the Minister of Finance must not fool the people of this country by juggling the figures around to make it appear that the Guyanese people are doing well. Surely, there are some who are doing well, but who are they?

The Hon. Minister has admitted in his Budget statement that Personal Emoluments now account for 44% of the expenditure under the Current Estimates as compared with 41% in Trinidad. When the Gorsuch Commission came here in 1958 it said that our figure was already too high compared with most countries which were in the vicinity of 33%. But now it has increased from 33% to 44%, one of the highest in the world. Clearly, this is an indication of the general overall policies of the Government: the building up of a big bureaucracy, fat salaries, fat allowances and padding up the list. We now read of two administrations: one conducted by the Public Service Commission and one conducted at Congress House. No wonder nothing is being done because no one knows which one of the two is the boss. Of course, when the hammer drops, it is Congress House which is running the show. This results in inefficiency, corruption and stealing all over the place.

But this is not only example where the rich are getting richer. In the first Budget which was presented by this Government, that is the Budget for 1965, we saw the handouts to the wealthy classes. Some of the tax proposals were either abolished or drastically modified. These are the same proposals which the Prime Minister said in 1962 and 1963 he was not in disagreement with. We are yet to see the giveaway agreement with Reynolds Metals Company. This House is yet to be favoured with that.

What about the poor? If you are going to tax the poor, let them get it back. For example, take matches; the poor people will be called upon to pay an increase of 72c per gross boxes of matches. The Government is going to collect 25c, and 47c out of the 72c will be going into the pockets of the manufacturers and the merchants. If the poor man is going to be taxed, the Government should collect all of it and give him back in many other services – in increased pensions and so on- that he deserves. But this cannot be done because of the complexion of the Government today. They created the impression that they are helping the people. Even today three-wheeled carts were parked outside, the people were demonstrating because their licenses have gone up from \$100 to \$200 per year...Has the Minister of Finance carried out an investigation to find out what is the net income of these people? If he had done that he would have found out that these people are earning less than the \$4 a day minimum wage. Yet these poor people have to pay more taxes, and the wealthy classes are given reduc-

tions.

We were told by these people who are in the Government that cigarettes are a poor man's comfort. But what is happening today? Compare the poor and the rich. The poor will be called upon to pay an increase of 3c per packet of cigarettes whereas the wealthy will be called upon to pay an increase of 2c per packet. If a packet of cigarettes costs 50c, then 3c is equivalent to a 50% increase. The other day I went in a shop and the shopkeeper told me that the poor man is not called upon to pay 3c per packet because on many occasions he cannot afford to buy a packet so, he buys one or two at a time. If he buys one he pays 3c. That is an increase of one cent on each cigarette, and that means he has to pay an increase of 10c on a packet of cigarettes. If he buys two at a time he pays 5c; this means he pays an increase of 5c on a packet. This is why we cannot believe the Minister when he talks about the cost of living being increased by 1%.

Last year the Hon. Minister of Finance said that the cost of living will go up by a little less than 1%. But we saw what has happened. The Hon. Mr. Chandisingh gave the figures. Official statistics! He showed that the average for the last two years was 4% as against 1¼ % average for the seven years that the P.P.P. was in office. Last year articles such as exercise books, yachting shoes, khaki drill and some forms of food were taxed. This year, a whole range of articles have increased between 5% and 10%. There are many items which come under the cost of living index, and at the end of the year we will see what the position is.

Today, it is clear that Guyanese are having circuses, but not bread. Instead of giving them bread, they are now talking about gaoling the sharks. But how can they goal the sharks! The sharks are their friends; the sharks are the people who put them there, and the sharks are the people who are running the Government. Clearly, this Government is in a dilemma. There are two irreconcilable forces in the Government. One represents big businesses and the other is supposed to represent the working class. The eventual outcome of this combination is that Mr. D'Aguiar and the United Force are running the fiscal and economic policies of the Government in favour of big businesses while Mr. Burnham is packing the bureaucracy with his boys. That is why he took over the establishment from his dear friend Peter a few days ago and thus the juggling of Ministers and juggling of figures.

Today, we are seeing the fruits of this contradiction between a big business party and a so-called "workers" party. As long as this coalition continues, as long as the Prime Minister is wedded to the proposition of living in a big house, as long as the Minister of Finance is wedded to the proposition of serving capitalism, the Government will always be run in the interest of big business and not the working class.

Let us see the dilemma in which they have found themselves as a result of these contradictions. They are now talking of the "Buy Local Campaign". The "Buy Local Campaign", they say, is to help improve the balance-of-pay-

ments position. I have the statistics here. The balance-of-payments was in a plus position favourable to this country in the years 1961, 1962 and 1963. Last year it jumped to a minus \$36 million. Foreign aid, gifts from their friends to the tune of \$9.3 million, helped them to reduce the deficit to \$26 ½ million. But this year it has gone up further; we do not know the figures yet, but we have seen the trends. Let the Hon. Minister of Finance give us the figures. They now resort to the tactics of “*buy local*”. Of course, we know that this is mainly a means of imposing taxation on the poor people. Let us assume for a moment that they succeed in this campaign of buying local in order to close the growing gap in balance of payments. Then what?

Since the greatest proportion of the Government revenue comes from Customs duties, if the Government stops imports by “*buying local*”, it may improve its balance of payments position, but it may be entering into another difficulty so far as budget deficits are concerned. We saw how the Government manoeuvred last year in order to make the Budget balance. The first year, 1965, it received a gift from the British Government and it converted what was to be capital expenditure to something else. In 1962 the Independence gift was \$4.8 million. The Government used the gift and collected arrears of income tax to balance the Budget in 1965. You collected it because your wealthy friends refused to pay when we were in the Government. Last year they refused to employ thousands of people – people were retrenched just before Christmas.

This Government has refused to grant loans to students, and they had to demonstrate outside the Public Buildings. Besides that the Government again had to take gifts to balance its Budget. The Government is on the horns of a dilemma at the moment. It may encourage “*buy-local*” in order to avoid purchasing imports, but if it succeeds in its balance-of-payment position, it will still be faced with budgetary problems – budgetary problems are going to plague this Government from now onwards.

Look at what the Government is doing! The Government is forced not only to retrench workers, but to reduce incentives on real production. I use the word “*real*” because I am talking about the “*grassroots production*” in the country. I am talking about agriculture. The Hon. Minister of Finance said that the increase in production was sharp. But he compared what took place in 1966 with 1964. Be that as it may, the fact is that he admitted the increase in production was mainly in the bauxite-alumina industry. Where are the incentives for the small man?

Mr. Moorner Khan gave figures of production from 1961 – tentative figures which he got from the Agricultural Department last year. What does this mean? It means either that production is at a standstill, or it is going backwards. The Minister of Finance has stated in a White Paper that drainage and irrigation is costing a lot of money; also the Government Marketing Division is costing a lot. Altogether, he said, the Government is losing about \$14 million a year. Let us get rid of the losses, we are told. The Hon. Ramkarran was not allowed to conclude his speech, but he gave figures

from the Estimates to show what the subsidies are costing this Government. There was a cut last year on rice subsidies and duty-free gasoline subsidies. Subsidies have been cut in other categories of the agricultural sector. The incentives which the previous Government gave to help bring about the diversification of crops, which everyone says is necessary, have been tampered with. This Government has reduced the incentive bonus given to the farmers to encourage them to produce more.

I repeat that the Government is sitting on the horns of a dilemma. If this Government is facing budgetary difficulties, why has it based its philosophy on taxing the poor and not the rich? On the one hand there is the retrenchment of workers, and on the other there is a cut in subsidies as well as in the incentive bonus. This is, again, a vicious circle, for when there is a drop in basic production in the country several other sectors will be affected. When the rice farmer, or provision farmer, or citrus farmer, has no money in his hands he cannot buy things from the shops and that will also affect imports. This means that Government revenues will be affected.

As a result of the falling price for rice and the lower income to the producer, together with increased cost of production, the whole economy has been affected, from the small businessman to the big businessman in Water Street. It is true that the cost of imports has gone up, but what kind of imports do we have? There is taking place in the country today a qualitative change in imports. There is a bigger middle class, which the Government is encouraging. More cars have been sold in the last two years than perhaps over the past five years. But ask Bookers, Sandbach Parker and Sprostons how many tractors and reapers have been sold over the last two years.

It is clear that the Government is like a dog chasing its tail. It is going around in a vicious circle and there will be no way out of this. Production will fall as the cost of producing rice is rising and prices are falling. We do not wish to go into the price of rice, because we have heard much about rice already, but to give one figure. Grade C paddy from the Mahaicony-Abary area will be bought by the company for \$3.70 per bag, Grade D for \$2.90. Over 60 per cent of the paddy bought by the mills in that area is Grade C or a lower grade. This means that farmers will not be able to produce at the price paid. This means they will abandon rice cultivation.

The price of citrus has gone down. Farmers in the Pomeroun and in the North - West District have to sell oranges at 50 cents per hundred and plantains are sold at 2 and 3 cents per pound. The Produce Depot has been grading them. During the P.P.P. regime boats from Trinidad used to come here to get plantains at 6 and 7 cents per pound. What remained after these sales was sold to the Produce Depot at 7 cents per pound. Coffee was 48 cents per pound during the P.P.P. regime. Today it is 32 cents per pound. The price of milk has dropped by 12 cents per gallon.

How is the Government going to increase production? What this nonsense about a "*Buy Local Campaign*", when costs are going up for the farmer,

the cost of agricultural implements, fertilizers and seeds? And now taxes are to be increased. As the farmer finds that it does not pay him to produce he will stop producing. He will become a subsistence farmer and will merely produce to subsist. Where will be his purchasing power to buy the goods which are necessary? How will the goods, on which Government depends for its revenue, be imported?

If production is not increasing, then when money comes into the country in the form of handouts for political reasons there is bound to be an inflationary trend. It will mean that too much money will be chasing too few goods. This means that the Government will have to continue to depend on bringing goods from outside but, as it continues to do that, despite the talk about "*Buy Local*", its balance-of-payment problems will become more acute year by year.

Let us study any country which has started out before us, whether in Latin America, in Asia, or wherever else, and we will find the same pattern – inflation, increasing balance of payment problems and last, but not least, deflation of the currency. I warn Hon. Members that after a while our dollar will not purchase what it can buy today. That is why, in spite of the fact that Members of the Government talk so much about confidence and present this rosy picture, the businessmen do not share this confidence. They are pumping money out of the country because they know that this spiral, on which the country has embarked, this vicious circle is bound to lead to a lowering of the value of their dollar.

While we are talking about gaoling the racketeers, the friends of the Government open the floodgates. When we were in the Government we not only brought forward a system of taxation – Property Tax, Gift Tax, Capital Gains Tax and so on – to prevent evasion, but we also brought in exchange control to prevent the flow of money out of the country. The Government may talk for public consumption. While the minority, but dominant arm of the Coalition, runs the fiscal and economic policies, the majority, but recessive arm, has to put out propaganda. It is in charge of the Propaganda Department to allay the fears and suspicious of citizens. The big shots can keep their money here and invest it locally, but they know better and send it out. Meanwhile, the ordinary man is told, "*Hold on. Things are going to get better tomorrow.*" It is in the cards, as night follows day, that the situation will get worse.

Let us look at one of the most important factors which is growing and rising like a kite, the debt burden. According to Government's own figures, the debt burden in 1960 was \$6 million. This in 1966 has increased to \$14 ½ million. This is not what we should worry about; we must worry about the percentage increase, for the increase was from 12 per cent of the revenue in 1960 to 16 per cent in 1966.

If Hon. Members have not yet seen it, let me refer them to the Report of the Cambridge economist, Kenneth Berrill. What did Berrill say in 1958? He issued a warning that if the Government had a big Development Pro-

gramme dependent mainly on foreign borrowing at a high rate of interest – the figure in the programme he was talking about was \$200 million – then by the early 1970s the debt charges would be over 30 per cent of the revenue. In other words, nearly one-third of the revenue will have to go towards paying debts. Today it is only half of that – 16%. This is the projection.

Now the Government's Development Programme is roughly in the scale of what was then \$200 million for four years and the content of this Programme is almost wholly based on borrowings; very little will come from surplus of revenue. The rate of borrowing, aside from the "soft" loans – we hear that \$21 million is borrowed locally – is on terms which are even much higher than 6 per cent. There is, first of all, the double-your-money in nine years which allows persons like the Minister of Finance (Mr. D'Aguiar) and his friends to get rich quickly. And the Government's big business friends have been able to convert into 7% debentures their Compulsory Savings. Under the P.P.P. regime, they were getting half of the rate of interest.

What is likely to happen in another few years is that the position is likely to be worse than what Berrill contemplated in 1958. The Government cannot be complacent about this. And the Guyanese people must be concerned about what is now developing in this country. To tell them how much expenditure has increased does not mean anything. It is not how much we spend but what we spend it on. Is it going to produce wealth, or is it merely; going to produce jobs which do not mature quickly and which do not bring back the capital invested?

After two years of the Interim Government, when many showpieces were built and a lot of promises were made about a road on the East Coast, about hospitals and everything else, the Hon. Member Mr. Raatgever said – and I quote from page 215 of *The West on Trial*:

*"So far as I have seen – and I have gone around quite fairly – there have been no developmental works done in this colony'. He said that he had seen more houses built, but they were just 'show pieces'; that he had gone over Georgetown and seen uninhabitable and slum areas standing in the same position and condition as they were during the last five or six years. 'I think', said Raatgever, 'that is a disgrace'."*

If Mr. Raatgever was alive today he would probably issue the same comment. India was forced to devalue her currency but this did not solve her problems. Today hundreds of thousands of people in that country face starvation. I should like to read a statement from the *Bank of Baroda Weekly Review* dated October 28, 1966:

*"The question is not so much whether India should depend on external assistance but rather to what extent and how long it should continue to do so. In view*

*of the uncertain prospects of foreign aid, it would be rational to reduce dependence on external assistance to the barest minimum and not base our dream of economic development on the vagaries of foreign aid. The dependence on foreign aid also opens the possibility of making our political or economic policies vulnerable to overseas pressures. The mounting debt servicing burden as a result of past liabilities would rob foreign aid of much of its usefulness as very soon, if we continue at the present rate, we would be borrowing only to meet the previous repayment obligations."*

India, a relatively new country which has got its Independence, is now about to follow the pattern in Latin American countries, of borrowing money mainly to pay debts falling due. Every now and then Presidents and Ministers of Finance have to go to Washington, make their salaams and ask for extension of time or for another loan to pay up one loan which has fallen due.

The Members of this Government are depending on foreign aid. They talk about living within their means. But where is the example of this? It certainly is not coming from the top. They are setting the standards of luxuries to poor starving people because they feel that "Uncle Sam" will always come and bail them out, but even "Uncle Sam" is having problems. A few weeks ago I read in a *Time* magazine that Sergeant Shriver, who is in charge of the anti-poverty campaign in America, said that just as they were about to put the milk bottle in the patient's mouth, they found that the bottle had no milk because all the milk now has to go to Vietnam. It is being drained away in a savage and merciless war. The U.F. painted a rosy picture in its Highways to Happiness - \$900 million in six years. Where is the money now? The P.N.C. was not far from that. Now it says \$300 million, \$900 million in the public and private sectors in six years. That was what the U.F. said. Let me add it up. The P.N.C. said that it was not unrealistic to expect an expenditure of \$130 million a year. It amounts to the same thing. If you do not want to listen to me, at least listen to what your capitalist friends are saying. This is a statement issued by the Bank of Baroda:

*"The dependence on foreign aid also opens the possibility of making our political or economic policies vulnerable to overseas pressures."*

A few days ago the Prime Minister of India said that if getting food to feed starving people means obeying the dictates of the United States namely, that they must not trade with Cuba or China, then they will have to do without the food. But our country is obviously under pressures, budget-wise, trade-wise and taxation-wise. Markets have been abandoned.

The Prime Minister said that the American intervention and barbarous war in Vietnam is justified. He said that Dominican intervention was wrong. But when he went to Washington and saw all the figures, he said that everything is all right, that the intervention was justified. This is why we see

this country being tied hand and foot to foreign policy dictated by the United States of America. It is impossible to have a reactionary foreign policy and a sound domestic policy. It is quite possible to be a De Gaulle and have a reactionary domestic policy and a progressive foreign policy, but not vice versa. As long as this Government pursues these policies, it cannot get out of this vicious circle to which I have been referring.

The P.N.C. has a duty and an obligation to the working class who voted for it. The U.F. also has a duty to the working class, the white-collared workers in the city, and the Amerindian population in the Interior who voted for it. But it has abandoned them in favour of big businesses. That is why Richmond and other like him had to go.

The thing to do if a country is to develop is to mobilize the masses. You have to get down to the core of the problem. In a country like Guyana, many types of infrastructure work can be done by the people. The Minister of Education admitted today that less money is put for building schools because the people are willing to build schools under self-help. Roads can be built on a self-help basis. Bridges can be built. Drains can be dug. Canals can be dug. Perhaps the Hon. Members would not like to be told. I know some of them have closed minds, but they should be told nevertheless.

Let us compare two giants – India and China. They are both large in population. India had far more foreign aid than China, but China has made much more economic progress than India. This is because China mobilized the millions of idle people for building what is called social capital. What is happening here? We are bringing big machines to make roads, and other things, these big machines are displacing workers. We know that increased productivity is essential, but not increased productivity at the expense of unemployment. Surely, the two things have to go hand in hand. Where there is much unemployment, there must necessarily be an attempt first to mobilize and then to develop social capital. You must use whatever little foreign exchange you have, whether you got it in the form of loans or gifts, to build factories. My Hon. Friend Dr. Ramsahoye said that you must use it to erect a fertilizer factory so that you can convert some of our sandy soils in the savannahs to produce basic wealth for the country.

The Government has not given us statistics, but a lot of aid is coming in the form of goods and services. We understand that \$4 out of every \$5 from the loan for the Atkinson-Mackenzie Road will have to be utilized for buying goods and services from the United States of America. Most of the capital investment over the last two years has been in the bauxite industry and not in agriculture or the manufacturing industry.

Here are the figures from the Statistical Department – extractive industry 30% in 1965, the whole amount of expenditure in the private sector. In 1966 it went to 42 per cent. Let us compare extractive industry with manufacturing and electricity. It was 5 per cent of the total expenditure in 1965 and 8 per cent in 1966. That is why, in spite of this talk about money com-

ing into the country and about big expenditure, many people cannot see where the money is going. A lot of money is coming to this country in the form of road, equipment, police jeeps, lorries, draglines – big million dollar draglines – calcine plant, but the people cannot see the actual money. That is why the business people are complaining. The only thing that has helped business last year is the increasing sale of consumer durable goods such as motor cars, etc. What this Government should do is to revamp its Development Programme, if it wants to get out of this great dilemma in which the country is being placed.

I feel that the Government should mobilize the masses; find out some means of reconciling things, so that in the same way as we are achieving a great number of skilled people we will be able to burst open our Interior. And whatever scarce money the Government gets from loans or grants from wherever it gets it, it could be put in the productive sector – productive in the sense of agriculture and industry; not extractive industry. Extractive industry alone is not basis for generating wealth. Extracting our gold, diamonds, manganese and bauxite and taking them out of this country under conditions which are really nothing but robbery – robbery from the people of this country – cannot help us. Therefore we urge that the quicker this Coalition Government comes to an end and the P.N.C. begins to implement what in its manifesto, the better it will be for this country.

We propose also that the Government should reduce the bureaucracy which it has built up. I am sure that if the pruning knife was introduced the Government could make a saving of several million of dollars by reducing the figure from 44 per cent to about 32 per cent so far as staff is concerned. Let this Government reimpose to the full extent the tax measures introduced by the P.P.P. Government in 1962. The working man would not feel it so hard, if he knew that he alone was not being called upon to bear the tax burden. Scrap the Reynolds deal. This Parliament has not approved this Agreement with Reynolds, and the Government should scrap it. Let the experts go into the matter again; put Mr. D' Andrade, Mr. Selman and Mr. Stoll on the job, and set up a subcommittee to examine this matter.

(I will not be much longer.) Reintroduce to the full extent the subsidies and incentives given to the real producers of this country, the farmers. Encourage some of the unemployed people to work on the land rather than going about choking and robbing others and making a general nuisance of themselves. Mobilize them to go in for agriculture on a cooperative basis. Do not worry about Mr. D' Aguiar saying that it would be communism or Russian tactics. I know that the former Minister of Economic Affairs believed in this sort of thing.

Mr. Sydney King said that cooperatives must be the basis of breaking the backbone of the Water Street sharks. And we have to fight against the landlords too. The Government must mobilize the unemployed people and take them into the Interior or wherever there is suitable agricultural land to work. The Government should establish factories, and follow what is

set out in the P.N.C.'s manifesto. It is no use waiting on the capitalists to establish factories here. The Government should restrict the importation of nonessential goods as the previous Government did when it wanted to stop the importation of Nescafe. Last but not least, the Government should establish price controls and re-establish mandatory control which had been abolished.

I should now like to quote from the P.N.C. Manifesto. Page 2 states:

*"In the P.N.C. manifesto (1964) New Road, the people were told – 'Independence though emotionally satisfying, is not an end in itself. To be worthwhile, it must be an instrument for building a cohesive nation, liberating the people from the economic yoke imposed by the foreigner and establishing a prosperous, self-reliant and free society...Some other Guyanese are militant and noisy in their demand for Independence from Britain, but consciously would immediately pawn Guyana, the moment after Independence, to some other foreign power. Such persons are colonial charlatans or at best, infants, the witting or unwitting tools and agents of new masters. Theirs is the concept of new servitude not Independence'."*

The Prime Minister in the Legislature on January 11, 1963 said:

*"If all we are going to do in this country after we have got Independence is to pass a few bits of legislation and to embark upon a few reforms within the framework of the existing economic and social order, we are wasting our time, and the uneasiness of the masses will certainly catch up with us, and will certainly remove us from the political scene."*

All we can say about that is Amen.

## Estimates of Expenditure: 6<sup>th</sup> February, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** Sub-Head 2 - \$68,000. This amount has increased quite significantly. In 1964 the Actual Expenditure was \$35,181. In 1967 it is going to be \$68,000 which is nearly double the 1964 figure. Clearly, the United Force was quite right when it wrote about squander mania in its paper. A short while ago we were discussing Sub-Head 1, item (7) – Provision for remuneration of the Speaker, Members of the Cabinet and Members of the National Assembly. That figure jumped from \$175,099 in 1964 to \$318,576 in 1967.

Now, we are told, a little while ago, that, because there are more Ministers, Junior Ministers and so on, entertainment allowances have to be paid, and this is the reason for the increase. However, on the question of travelling expenses and subsistence allowance, I should like to find out why there is this doubling of the figure in 1967. Ministers of the previous Government travelled internally, and Ministers of the present Government do so now, though it is true that there are more travels abroad by this Government. Is this for internal travelling alone? This is all the more reason for alarm. We would like to know why there is this significant increase.

The Hon. Minister from his Chair said that more Members are coming to the meetings here. But in the last Government there were two Houses, a Lower House and an Upper House. The total number of Members was almost the same as now, and, therefore, there should be no necessity for this increase. Is it that Ministers are drawing more allowances than salary every month?

## Public and Police Service Commissions

**Dr. Jagan:** I should like to raise a matter. At the last sitting of this Assembly the Minister of Education (Mrs. Gaskin) made a statement which I should like to get some clarification on at this time. This pertains to certain individuals who have qualified but whose degrees, apparently, are not recognised.

Now, I took this matter up with the Chairman, and also the Secretary of the Public Service Commission, and as the Chairman rightly said, no appointments could be made through the Public Service Commission, although there are many vacancies, unless the Commission was able to ascertain the relative merits of these Degrees. I refer to persons who went on scholarships to the Soviet Union, and who have returned. Some of them studied agronomy, engineering, economics, planning and so on.

I understand that the university which these students attended has a very intensive course of training leading to what is called the Undergraduate degree. That degree is equivalent to what is called a Master's degree in the United Kingdom and the United States of America. The course of study is really five years instead of four, and that is why I was quite surprised when the Minister said – if I heard her correctly – that the curriculum appeared to be something which was totally inadequate.

I recall that one of these students offered to take a written and/or oral examination in order to prove his competence and his knowledge. But the Government refused this. He had produced his certificates on subjects such as economics, planning and banking which he studied. This information has been passed on to the Public Service Commission. One of these students – I saw the letter – was admitted to the London School of Economics to study for a postgraduate degree. Another student who has qualified in engineering has been accepted by McGill University to study for a doctoral degree. The student who offered to take a written and/or oral examination has been accepted by Sussex University to study for a doctoral degree.

Clearly, there is no question of merits as far as these universities, which are of high repute, are concerned. They would not have taken these students for postgraduate degrees unless they had examined their ability in detail. These students have the qualifications and they have studied for the required length of time because, in the west, for a student to offer himself for a doctoral degree, he must pass his Bachelor of Science degree and his Bachelor of Arts degree, and then go on to his Master's degree. This is the normal course. If he has to go from the Bachelor's to the Doctorate, it would take him a much longer period.

The United Kingdom has Honours degrees which are equivalent to Masters' degrees in the United States of America. This is why they go on from

the Master's degree to the Doctorate degree. It is not that we do not need these qualified people. The Minister of Works and Hydraulics needs engineers. The Minister of Agriculture needs agronomists. The former Minister of Economic Development repeatedly told us that more people with experience and knowledge are needed.

You may say that you do not agree with their type of planning. But an economist does not make the decisions; he only puts the things to you. The politicians have to make the decisions. However, you can at least get competent people. I am only repeating what the former Minister of Economic Development said. I am saying that the Government clearly refused to employ persons who have degrees from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia or wherever they went to study. The Government must not beat around the bush and keep people frustrated. This is what has been happening for more than a year. The people applied, waited, and received no word.

We heard that the Minister has examined the curriculum. I should like to hear more about it. I am not happy about it. I am not an educationist, but I have examined, with Fred Sookdeo, the list of subjects that he has had to study, and I am satisfied that compared with western countries, these students are competent to work in the Public Service of this country. If the Ministry is not satisfied with the examinations, it should find out from people who are more competent to judge. It should write to Sussex University, London School of Economics and McGill University because they would not have accepted these students unless they examined them in detail. The Public Service should also be given a free hand.

The Prime Minister said that he is not aware that the Head of the Public Service Commission has tendered his resignation. We may not believe everything we read in the *Evening Post* but there is a lot of dissatisfaction and discontent. Not about the question of resignation. This is why we want the Government to answer categorically whether it has issued instructions to the Public Service Commission not to appoint any one of these people, and if this decision is political, technical or personal.

Normally I listen with a great deal of respect to the Minister of Education but, with due deference to the lady, on this occasion she has not spoken very much. First of all, the Public Service Commission has made it very clear to me that it is awaiting an assessment of these degrees from the Ministry of Education. I do not know of any one of these students, who have returned here, who wants a job as a teacher. Perhaps, because they cannot enter the Public Service in the fields for which they are qualified, they apply to become teachers. Perhaps that is one of the difficulties of most of these technical people. That is why I told the Head of the Public Service Commission that the Commission should make its own assessment instead of waiting on the Ministry of Education; the Commission is a Constitutional body.

With regard to the question of students from Guyana going to lesser

known universities in Moscow, the Hon. Minister of Education seems to despise people who come from the rice fields. But let her know that the people who come from the rice fields or wherever they came from must first have a preparatory knowledge before they can enter the Lumumba University, the Moscow University, or some of the big universities in Russia. Let the Minister get her Ministry to secure the curriculum of studies, and then she will know that she must not speak with such generalization.

The other point raised is that students attending universities in the Soviet Union do not want to take their doctorates there and they prefer to go to imperialist countries which we criticize. (I did that because you would have said something else if I had sent them to other countries.) When it was decided to send students abroad – not only to the Soviet Union, but to other countries where we could get places for our students – it was our intention to get the students to come back here and work. Our desire was not to make them perpetual students. We told the authorities that as soon as the students graduated they should be sent home to serve their country. That is the reason why they came back to Guyana. It is not that they could not stay in the Soviet Union. These students are now going to Canada and the United Kingdom because this Government refuses to employ them.

We hear a lot of nonsense about this Government encouraging Guyanese and West Indian students to come here. People are coming here from all over the place to work, and they are receiving fabulous salaries while we have people in this country that can do the work. This Government does not know what it is doing. It is following the lead of the United States on this question. I warn members of the Government that this is the same kind of witch-hunting which led to a great atomic scientist, Oppenheimer, being removed from the United States scientific work. We see today the disastrous consequences this has led to. In addition, the United States is behind in the race to the moon, but is trying to catch up by exposing people to danger. That is the kind of thing the United States is doing now.

Scientists today do not have to make political decisions for Governments, Economists and engineers are working under others who are their superiors. Therefore Governments can take advantage of their competence and benefit from the training they have received. Mr. D'Aguiar does not understand. He understands one science only and that is to change money in order to make one amount grow into a larger sum.

I say again that no country can develop without academic freedom and freedom in accepting people on the basis of merit. If the Government does not follow this yardstick we shall have more and more stalling of the Government's machine. The United Nations team, which came here to look into the Public Service, asked my delegation what was the reason for the lethargy in the Public Service. The answer is clear; round pegs in square holes; the Government does not wish to employ people with competence.

## Estimates of Expenditure: 7<sup>th</sup> February, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** With reference to the same Sub-Head and Sub Head 2, also under Other Charges, one notes that the total expenses for Transport and Travelling amount to nearly \$49,000. This is quite a substantial increase from what was obtained in 1964 when a sum of about \$10,000 was spent. I wonder whether the Prime Minister will give this House an explanation as to why it is necessary to expend so much for transport and travelling in the Prime Minister's Office. It seems to be an extraordinary increase.

Then it is clear that these Community Development Workers are not persons who are necessarily working in the Public Service and in the public interest. They are really Party organizers who are employed to do Party work mainly. I have a letter from a gentleman in the Pomeroun, and I will read it for the benefit of Members of this House:

*"Dear Leader,*

*For Community Development on Essequibo Coast District there is a Community Development Officer, a Junior Officer, responsible to the Senior Officer. The same system is placed here for Pomeroun District. At one time the Junior Officer as I stated above was called a V.P., but I have been reliably informed that this was changed, but it seems as if they of themselves don't know what they are.*

*These junior officers in Pomeroun River District and Essequibo Coast District are the Chief Organisers of the P.N.C. That is what they are. I have been reliably informed that they were appointed to serve in that capacity.*

*I beg to refer to yesterday, 21<sup>st</sup> January, 1967. I went to see the Administrative Officer on business and I had the opportunity to meet the said Junior Officer concerning the Essequibo Coast District speaking to Congress Place through the Agriculture Department's phone, making comments on his report – his monthly report rather. I refer to the Junior Officer of Pomeroun District using public facilities and his time for organizing P.N.C. support. I feel that the Community Officer concerned should see to it that this junior officer does whole-time work and uses no public convenience for P.N.C. organizing. The P.N.C. pays an Organizer and so prepares bread for another."*

It is clear that this is a means by which persons are being appointed to do Party work – Party hacks are being employed at public expense to do party work.

I do not understand how the Minister of Finance could approve of this since he belongs to a different political party. We have not yet been given any explanation concerning Sub-Head 10, Clerical Assistants, District Offices. Who are the clerical assistants? Are they people recruited for the Public Service through the Public Service Commission to serve under the

Community Development Workers? We do not know and we should like some information as to what this is all about.

With reference to Sub-Head 1 – Food Programme - \$20,000, I would like to ask the Hon. Prime Minister whether he is satisfied that the Food Programmes are being supervised properly? I refer to all of the Food Programme Schemes. Cane Grove has a long history. When Plantation Cane Grove was owned by Bookers, I believe it was turned over to the people. The estate property was sold to the Government for \$1, and the developed coconut cultivation, which was producing a great deal of income, was sold for \$60,000. This estate was abandoned because the land was very infertile. During the past few years this area was handed over to the people who were formerly estate workers. The area formerly planted in cane was planted in rice; yields were low because of the poor toxic soil, and the coconut estate was administered by the Government. At the time the revenue from the coconut estate was used to subsidise the maintenance, drainage and irrigation charges of the estate as a whole.

Now, we find that a change has taken place. The coconut estate has been given to a new group of people who are recruited from outside the area and organized as a cooperative. We understand that food is being provided for these people. Our understanding of the Food Programme was that it was to be used for developing new settlements. People were asked to go in the Berbice River, or in the Pomeroon River, or beyond the Base and clear jungles and food was allocated to them. That was done in the early days when their crops were only planted and not yet ready to be reaped.

I, therefore, cannot understand how the Government could have taken this decision to take away the coconut estate from the residents of Cane Grove, and to provide food for the people who are now there. I have been trying to find out where the food is coming from. I understand that it is not coming from the UN Food Programme. Is it coming from Sub-Head 1? Does the Government feel that providing food to these people is justifiable? As I have said before, this estate was fully developed. It was not a project which the people had organized and for which food would be given normally. I should like to get some information from the Government on this matter. So far my investigation has borne no fruit.

## Head 12- Attorney General- Official Receiver

**Dr. Jagan:** I am afraid that the Government is treating this House and the people of this country with a great amount of discourtesy. Last year the Minister categorically stated that elections would be held. He was so much in a hurry to hold elections that he wanted to use the old voters' list. We protested to the Leader of the House who had to countermand him and say that the elections should take place after the revision of the Voters' List. If the Minister had been doing his home work, we would have made some progress in this matter. He is a teacher, but he does not know anything about this matter. Never in the history of this country has so little been done by so many.

In the good old days the Governor, the Chief Secretary, and the Deputy Governors, who were District Commissioners all over the country, did the work. Today we have fourteen or fifteen Ministers, and several Junior Ministers doing the work. A Minister is responsible for Local Government only. Last year he stated categorically that there would be elections, but today he cannot tell us when the elections will take place. Is this an attempt to get people to have confidence in this Government? You cannot treat people in this manner. We would sympathize with the Minister if he would take us into his confidence.

Last year, I assume that certain preparatory work was done, but it would appear that this year things had to be undone because the work was not properly done. I am sure that the Members of the Opposition will sympathize with the Minister in such circumstances. He cannot use such terms as "*in due course*", and when pressed by members he says "*soon*".

Mr. Wilson raised the question of decolonization. Since the introduction of Independence we have had a lot of Ministers – many more persons than when we had things centralized under Permanent Secretaries and so on. There is now a change in the whole system, and we want to know whether Government is considering the dismantling of the whole structure. Is the Government, for instance, going to dismantle the Local Government Board? Will there be Local Government Elections? There has been no universal attempt to command the confidence of the people. The Government says that it is doing community development work, but it is merely paying Party hacks a lot of money for doing nothing.

I reiterate that results must come from the bottom, and you must have the confidence of the people at the bottom. Therefore the quicker these elections are held the better it will be for all concerned. They will learn from their own mistakes. It is surprising how quickly people can learn from their mistakes. In all seriousness, the Minister should tell us how soon he proposes to hold those elections. He must tell us whether he is having difficulties, or whether he is studying the matter at the moment. He must

also tell us whether he has any plans for dismantling the Local Government Board and changing the old system of District Commissioners with a view to centralizing things. He must tell us whether he is having Local Authorities under the Marshall Plan.

## Head 13- Ministry of External Affairs

**Dr. Jagan:** We are dealing with the expenditure of a great deal of money, over a million dollars. We do not necessarily object to the expenditure of money, but two things we want to know: first, whether we are getting value for money spent; secondly, what are these people doing. What kind of policies are they advocating? Some countries go in for very lavish expenditure in order to create a favourable but false impression. Our Government seems to be following that line.

There is, therefore, much to query in this very large expenditure of a poor country's resources. We see large amounts set aside for house allowances and entertainment allowances. Recently we saw large amounts set aside for the purchase of motor cars and so on. Clearly the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister, even though they may not want to admit it, know the parlous state of our finances.

Therefore, due care must be taken and attention given to the way money is expended in this Department. What do we need Information Officers for ... in these places? When the last Government was contemplating to set up offices, it had in mind three offices to be modestly staffed but we have seen that these have grown and my colleague the Hon. Member Mr. Luck, has raised a specific point.

What are these people doing? What stand do they take? Are they to be merely glorified beggars living sumptuously for the purpose of creating an appearance? We must have a debate in this House to indicate to the country at large what lines of policy will be pursued. We read in the newspapers that an invitation has been extended by the O.A.S. to the Guyana Government. We read that Caribbean countries are attending and that Guyana may be attending ... Guyana will be attending and Guyana is likely to become a member along with the other countries.

## Head 13 – Ministry of External Affairs (cont.): 8<sup>th</sup> February, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** Yesterday I raised the question of the number of persons stationed at the overseas offices and also the question of the overall policy. If we look at the Estimates we find provision is made for three Counsellors, eleven Assistant Secretaries, and eight Administrative Assistants. I presume that some of these persons are to be posted at these offices abroad with the Counsellors, advising the Heads of Mission and the principal officers being the Principal Assistant Secretaries and eight Administrative Assistants.

Aside from that, we see under Sub-Head 1 (17), as listed under the Explanatory Notes, a very large staff, particularly at the London Office. I should like the Prime Minister to say why the London Office has more staff than the New York Office. In New York there is not only the General Assembly to service but also there are various committees of the United Nations which meet from time to time. Some of these are very important. One would think that the London Office and the New York Office would have comparable staff. If anything, the New York Office should have the bigger staff.

I do not know if the London Office is so heavily staffed because it is doing the work not only for Guyana but for Barbados also. I should like to know how much compensation is given to this Government by the Barbados Government for this arrangement. I understand that the London Office serves both Guyana and Barbados. I should like to know if that is the reason for this heavy staff shown here.

I should like to ask another question on Sub-Head 16, Expenses of the Guyana Boundaries Commissions. I do not know how many Boundaries Commissions there are but I thought there was only one, and that is the one dealing with the Venezuela border question. However, since most of the persons who are serving on these Commissions are Government Officers, I wonder why it is necessary to include this very heavy sum of \$30,000 under this Sub-Head.

As regards policy, I mentioned yesterday that this House has not been favoured with a debate on the question of Government's foreign policy. I think the Government should prepare a White Paper setting out its objectives and the line it is taking on various questions. Would it be signing itself with any particular bloc, or with nonaligned countries of Afro-Asia? Would it be joining a military bloc such as the Organisation of American States? I said yesterday that it does appear that Guyana will be represented at the coming conference which, I believe, is to be held in Buenos Aires. I do not know if the intention of attending is merely to explore, or whether the exploratory work has already been done and the Government has made up its mind to join the O.A.S.

Whatever may be the position, we on this side of the House would like

to state our position on this question very clearly. The O.A.S...

I recall on one occasion when the Hon. Member Mr. Nunes was speaking on education, one Minister said in reply to him that the points he raised in detail should have been reserved for the Committee stage.

Second Reading speeches cannot adequately cope with the thousand and one points which are to be raised. Members are limited to half an hour.

Following the point made by my colleague I should like to deal with this question from the other point of view. I think the community must be concerned first, that the cost of administration of the Police Department is rising. As we have just seen it has risen from \$41/2 million in 1964 to \$6 million in 1967 and the cost of maintaining the Prisons has risen from \$681,000 in 1964 to over \$1 million in 1967. This clearly indicates that the maintenance of law and order is costing much more to the community and one cannot help but come to the conclusion that there is some correlation between this rising expenditure and the insecurity bred from unemployment and underemployment. There is increasing incidence of crime.

My colleague dealt with the aspect of prevention of this crime wave. In other words, instead of jailing the people when they commit crimes, the Government should do something to prevent the crime wave.

I should like to deal with another aspect of this matter. This is in relation to the rehabilitation of prisoners because we all know that there are many who continually go to prison. They serve a term, come out and go back in again. I believe that a large proportion of those who make up the prison population are those who have been in prison many times.

I raise this matter because the question of prison reform is very vital and important in our community. Employment is increasing; there are large numbers of children coming out of schools. If we do not do anything to provide prisoners with employment when they come out of prison, then, clearly, they are going to commit crimes again and, indeed, more serious crimes. Even if the Crime Prevention Department becomes more vigilant, these people will devise more ways and means to evade the law and to achieve their ends to get something to eat.

I have said over and over again that it is perhaps easier for people in the countryside to earn a living. They can grow foods and catch fish but the persons in the cities who have to pay house rents and food bills - especially with rising prices - are really faced with grave problems. They either starve or steal and, inevitably, they steal, especially when there are children and relatives to upkeep, when ex-wives want alimony and maintenance and affiliation fees are to be paid. So there is this vicious circle.

Some time ago we were told that a Prison Officer or the Head of Prisons was preparing a Prison Earning Scheme - a penny a day scheme - and I recall mentioning, either last year or the year before, that the proposal was ludicrous and inadequate. We have a great deal of resources in this country: timber resources, fish resources, and, indeed, a lot of infrastructure work needs to be done in the Interior - Government buildings, Govern-

ment roads and so on.

I know that there is a dilemma facing the Government because if it employs prison labour for infrastructural work, the T.U.C. or the trade unions will come along and say: "*what about the people who are unemployed?*" The Government, therefore, faces a dilemma in this respect but some arrangement should be worked out. I am particularly talking about productive schemes, dairying, growing of crops around the Mazaruni Prison. There is a lot of land there and much can be produced there.

I know from personal experience that prisoners waste a lot of time scrubbing and polishing floors and keeping the yards and the grounds clean like a golf course. This may be quite nice when people come to visit, especially people from overseas, but it really does not solve the problems. Prisoners can spend maybe one day or two days a week towards keeping the place clean and well scrubbed and they can be put to learn something four or five days a week. They can do something productive from which they can earn one-third or half of the net amount. Surely, if these things are managed properly, they can become profitable.

There is no reason why the Government cannot employ good managers, Prison Officers who have been trained in management and who have some technical knowledge in either dairying or farming. Separate accounts can be kept and the prisoners who are working can be given some portion of the profits that are made. In this way, they will be earning if not \$4 per day at least \$1 per day so that when they come out they will have a lump sum which will enable them to become useful citizens. In the meantime they would have learnt a trade – I do not mean handicraft, I mean some agricultural or industrial know-how and the financial means to start a new life. Now they are given \$15 or \$20 and, when they are let loose, they prey on society eventually and the prison population increases.

I am going to ask a question in this respect: what is the prison population today? The Minister should know it. If we take this amount here which is over \$1 million and divide it by the prison population, we will see how much it costs to maintain one prisoner. It will probably be more than what the Government has to pay as the minimum wage. This was so some years ago. The prison cost per head of population was more than the minimum wage that the Government was paying. It would be interesting to find out what is the position today. Perhaps the Minister can reveal the statistics and we can work this out.

I urge the Government to tell us what it has done because it said that this matter was being examined. I want to know whether it has done anything or whether it proposes to do something to rehabilitate prisoners in future.

Would the Minister explain?

In Sub-Head No. 17 there is \$1,000. Only \$1,000 is provided for Prison Industries. But in the 1966 Approved Estimates, the sum of \$21,500 was listed – Sub-Head No. 21.

I should like to ask the Minister to give some information about these earning schemes because, from my perusal of these Estimates, I see that very little is being done.

I am merely referring to them to make my point. If I do not refer to them the Minister would not see the point I am making.

I notice that there is a Sub-Head here – Removal of Administrative Headquarters from Orinduik to Kurukabarry. I understand that this decision has been taken without consultation with the people concerned in the area and that there is great opposition to this change. I wonder whether the Minister knows anything about this or whether his predecessor will give reasons for this change. Why is it that the people involved in these areas were not consulted? It seems to me that in a matter like this one would want to do something for the general convenience of the people concerned. I do not know what is the explanation for this. Perhaps there is some valid explanation.

## Estimates of Expenditure: 9<sup>th</sup> February, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** Successful agriculture depends on several factors. So far we have heard about demonstration plots. We have heard the Minister talking about credit, but we have not heard very much about providing seeds to the farmers. In the Botanical Gardens a great deal of work was done in this field, but I notice that the Prime Minister has taken over quite a bit of this land which was formerly used for this purpose.

I notice that the Prime Minister's Residence is now including a portion of land formerly used for this purpose, but I am not querying that at the moment. I am referring to the nursery station on the Essequibo Coast. I believe it is sited at Henrietta, near to Anna Regina. Nurseries provide a very important facility to the people of this country in as much as they produce new strains and hybrids at very low cost. These provide bigger crops and better yields in a shorter period of time.

We understand that the nursery at Henrietta is to be closed down. About 10 persons were given full time employment there. I understand that the Government intends to employ them only for 90 days during the year and that works out at nine days per individual per year. One would think that complementary to the "*Buy Local*" campaign, the Government would be doing much more in this field to encourage development and diversification of agriculture. This would mean that greater emphasis would be placed on demonstration plots. I am not speaking about big stations like the station at Mon Repos but "*demonstration farms*". I would have thought that more and more nurseries would have been planted, because there is an ever-increasing demand for seedlings of one kind or another.

Wherever I go in the country areas I hear farmers complaining that they make requests for plants of all kinds and cannot get them or have to wait for long periods before they receive them. I am speaking about citrus, coconuts and such things. Rice is a separate issue. I am not dealing with that at the moment, but with all the other plants which Government was selling at one time. Will the Minister tell us why the nursery at Henrietta is to be closed? I understand that people have been notified of this.

The Minister gave an answer to my question concerning the nurseries that were transferred to Anna Regina and Charity, but I wish to ask him to reconsider this matter. There are many small farmers who cultivate rice on the Essequibo Coast, and with the drop in the price of rice, the position of these farmers will become worse. It is necessary to get these farmers to produce some other agricultural product, in addition to rice, even if it is for their own consumption. I think it is wrong to remove the nursery from Henrietta to Charity because Charity is at a point where there is already a bit of mixed farming. Mixed farming is to be encouraged on the Coast and Henrietta is midway to the Essequibo Coast.

Another point which I should like to raise is the question of subsidy. The Ministers of the Government have forgotten what they said in the past about helping the farmers to diversify agriculture. They have abandoned the whole question of maintaining adequate prices to farmers. Now, the Agricultural Department is short-staffed, and we need more than one Agricultural Economist. The Government must ascertain how much it will cost to produce a pound of plantain, a pound of cassava, a pound of coffee and so on. The Government must know these things. Whatever the Government wants to produce, it must first work out the cost and then fix a minimum guaranteed price on the basis of these studies. Otherwise, what is likely to happen? If the Government is shutting out imports, then it will have to make up the deficit by increasing local production. The costs of things are increasing. Fertilizers cost more today. If the farmer finds that it will cost him more to produce things and the cost of what he produces is going down, then he will not produce things for the market. He will be forced to become a subsistence farmer.

Last year the Government refused to buy oranges in the Pomeroun. Again this year the Government refused to buy oranges at a certain stage, and when the oranges were bought the Government paid a low price and asked the farmers to put them in crates instead of in bags. As a result of insisting on this new method of marketing and crating, the farmers had to sell oranges to hucksters at 50c per hundred. I want to ask the Minister of Trade and Industry and the Minister of Trade whether they think it will pay the farmers to sell their oranges at 50c per hundred? How are they going to encourage agriculture in this country? I ask the Government to do something to assist the farmers, having decided that a certain standard of living must be maintained in this country.

In Georgetown Government workers are getting the fixed minimum wage of \$4 a day. Certain industrial workers are getting either \$3.50 or \$3.52 a day. The saw mill and the quarry workers are getting fixed wages. Surely the Government must have in mind what should be paid to a farmer. The Government must know what should be given to the farmer for a working day in monetary terms. Unless this is done, and unless the Agricultural Economist puts a figure based on giving the farmer a decent standard of living, then I am afraid that any effort to increase production will fail.

The system of giving guaranteed minimum prices was not started during the regime of the P.P.P. It was started by Governor Lethem during the war days when it was not possible to get enough imported goods into the country and production had to be stepped up in order to feed the people.

This Government in its "*Buy Local Campaign*" is confusing itself by trying to substitute local produce for imported goods. If the government wants to make it a reality, then it should follow the Churchillian method. I want to know whether the Government proposes to give a minimum guaranteed price to the farmers. Does the Government propose to give the farmers a price for his produce which will provide him with a decent standard

of living and a livelihood, in view of the high cost of fertilizers and so on?

A former Minister of Agriculture on this side of the House referred to the fact that we have not yet touched land development. We have been allotted seven days to debate the Estimates, but the view has been expressed that we are spending too much time on this Head. May I suggest that we be allowed to spend as much time on any Head as is reasonable? If there is no time left to debate Heads on the seventh day, then the Speaker can put the remaining Heads to the House without discussion.

## Estimates of Expenditure: 10th February, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** In view of what the Minister said, I should like to raise some queries. We were told a little while ago that the cost of construction of roads is in the vicinity of \$150,000 per mile, and when the final surface is put on it will bring it up to \$182,000. I think he gave us a figure of roughly half a million dollars as the figure given by the experts who came here during the period of the Interim Government. I should like to know whether the Minister has taken into consideration the fact that, in that Report, the overall cost of \$500,000 per square mile included deviation for compensation for properties and so on. It is admirable that we have been able to reduce the cost, but I remember when the Corentyne Road was to be built, original specifications were laid, and while the road was under construction, the specifications were changed. The work was to be done cheaper.

After a few years we found that the road was completely destroyed. When we pursued this question with the Colonial Office, we were told that unless it was done according to the specifications put down by the experts, no money would be loaned to us.

I know the figure was very high – about \$32 million – but the Colonial Office took the point that if there were to be any changes in the recommendations, then they would not be lending any money to the previous Government or, I assume, to any other Government to undertake the work. We went ahead with the research, and we had a lot of experience on the East Coast Road. We also had experience in road construction on the East Bank. Maybe the road technology has changed, and we would like to know all about it. We have confidence in the local Guyanese engineers and in the Guyanese staff, but we would like to know whether there have been any changes. If there have been changes, is the Government fully satisfied that the changes are in the interest of the long-term stability of the road and not only short term, and that we are getting value for our money. Compare \$150,000 and \$182,000 against \$500,000.

The Minister did not mention that during the P.P.P. regime the Government built a good bit of road on the East Coast from the Maintenance vote. It showed that the previous Government was building good roads at nominal cost. The work was properly supervised; there was less fraud and so on. I can bring pictures of the Essequibo Road to show that it is in the same condition. (If Mr. D'Aguiar was the Minister when the Russian flour came here, no doubt he would have been a millionaire today. He would have been robbing the people and getting rich.) I merely want to get certain information from the Hon. Minister so that we will know definitely where we are going.

I am not going to query the recommendation of the experts, but it seems to me that it is a question of the opinion of one expert against that of an-

other. However, what I would like to know is whether there has been any change in the specifications, what these changes are, and who recommended the changes?

Surely, the Hon. Minister must have read the Report by Kirpatrick and Wilson. He must have been advised that this is a better way, and he should have been able to evaluate what was the difference between the two systems. He should tell us what is the comparative difference between the two systems of road making? Perhaps the second set of experts on whom he is now relying are more adequately qualified in this respect because of their wide experience in other countries. We assume that Kirpatrick and Wilson are also people of wide experiences and have had experiences in other countries.

I recall that the Hon. Minister of Finance mentioned in this House that \$1.5 million was illegally spent. We asked questions about this matter, but no answers were given. Up to now the Hon. Minister has refused to give us a reasonable answer. Two of his chief officers are at his side; I am sure that his Permanent Secretary can give him information.

## Estimates of Expenditure: 14<sup>th</sup> February, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** The Hon. Minister of Finance is always making comparisons which are favourable to him by using one year with another, or one year with four years ago and so on. I should like to raise the point which he outlined in his speech. He admitted that public debt charges increased from \$5 million in 1960 to \$14 ½ million in 1967. What was more alarming was that the percentage of expenditure jumped from 12 per cent to 16 per cent. This is something which we have to worry about. I am not so much concerned with the high rate of interest and so on. Obviously all this talk about confidence is just hogwash, because if you give people a lot of money, generous conditions and an opportunity to double their money in nine, ten or eleven years, they will naturally put their money there.

I should like to deal with the issue from another point of view. It is not only a question of how much money you get but what is being done with the money. The Budget which we have before us is a consolidated budget for capital and recurrent expenditure. We made the point that year by year the debt charges will become a larger percentage of the Budget. Year by year we see the trend. I should like to warn the Minister if he has not read Berrill's report. The Minister says, "*to hell with Berrill's Report*", but I would advise him to read it because Berrill was not thinking in his Report of interest rates which accrued at the rate of doubling one's money in nine years. Berrill's rate was six per cent compound interest which doubles in 12 years. The present Minister of Finance is going even beyond Berrill. We have cause to worry because Berrill in his statistical study premised a \$200 million programme based on six per cent interest, heavy borrowing from outside sources and burdensome debt charges. In other words, with a negligible contribution from our own surplus, by the 1970s, our debt charge will amount to about thirty per cent of our budgetary expenditure.

The Minister may be fortunate in that at the present time, because of a carry-over of what has been happening in the past, he is able to collect revenue, but one has to look at the future, at what is likely to happen to agriculture as a result of Government's fiscal policies, with less money for subsidies, less money, proportionately, for bonuses and so forth, which may cause a fall in production or a stagnation in production with fixed charges increasing and the debt burden increasing.

We must remember that we have not a \$200 million programme but a \$300 million programme, a bigger programme than Berrill anticipated. What then is likely to happen in the 1970s when these loans begin to mature? The Minister has admitted that personal emoluments in the Budget account for 44 per cent of the expenditure. If in 1970 you are going to have debt charges going up to 30 per cent, this means that we will have roughly about 70 per cent, or 74 per cent, of the revenues of the country going to

fixed charges, salaries and paying the public debt. What will the Minister have for expenditure such as education, health, social services and so on? Of course, some may say that we are arguing statistically and things are going to change. But where are the indications that the change will take place? We don't see it in the field of production. The Government is taking care of sea defences, the airport, roads, and public buildings and depending a little bit on the increased extraction of bauxite and mineral resources. That is like digging up our gold, diamonds, or whatever this may be and taking it out of the country.

This is a productive sector in which the Government is failing dismally and in a short while the country will be heavily mortgaged. I do not know who is financing the short term loans at the moment. I do not know whether the Chase Manhattan Bank is doing it. Where is the amount of \$15 million that is required on short term to carry on the development and recurrent programme, coming from? Clearly the Government is deep in financial difficulties and no doubt the Chase Manhattan Bank is financing its friends, while the country is being mortgaged and the position worsens year by year.

We would like the members of the Government to tell us seriously how they expect to get out of this rut. Very little is being done for agriculture. Very little is being done for industrialization. Tell us how many schemes have been embarked on, what fundamental plans the Government has. None. The question of borrowing at a high rate is one thing, but the question of allocation of what you have borrowed is a question on which the Government has failed.

The money borrowed is going for development of infrastructure and social overheads, which is going to have a long maturity time. The input is there but the output is negligible. The time will come when these loans are due to mature. I understand they are to be paid every three years, or we may have to pay before they mature as people have a right to withdraw. Perhaps they will not withdraw before the maturity date because they receive a small percentage if they don't. Perhaps they will not withdraw before nine years. Whichever Party forms the Government when the maturity date arrives will be faced with enormous difficulties. One can see the great problems which will confront this country for losses are occurring in every direction – at the Rice Marketing Board, at the Rice Development Company. We have a Motion before us for increasing the overdraft from \$5 million to \$20 for those two institutions. The Town Council is increasing its overdraft. The Government is living on overdrafts of \$15 million together with another \$2 million.

Clearly the country is in a bad way. Money withdrawn by these bodies – the Government, the Town Council, the Rice Development Company, and the Rice Marketing Board – deprives agriculture and private enterprises of funds. Even with the philosophy which the Members of the Government would like to have propounded they will find themselves in hot water. We

therefore warn the Government not only to talk in this big manner that it can raise money internally and externally, but to come forward and tell the Guyanese public that it is offering high rates of interest, that it is squandering a lot of money and that this country will run into trouble.

## Ministry of Finance

**Dr. Jagan:** Aside from the number of architects listed in the Estimates, are these posts filled? Several architects are now in private practice. One used to be in the Public Works Department, but he has left the country; one went away, but he has returned to the country. Only a few days ago we were told how wonderful the engineers at the Public works Department were in building roads. In times past it was necessary to get engineers from abroad to look after drainage and irrigation schemes like the Black Bush Polder and the Tapacuma Scheme which were done by foreign engineering firms. However, because of the experience gained by our own engineers working alongside the overseas engineers we were able to provide all the plans and specifications for the Mahaica/Mahaicony/Abary Scheme, which the Government has abandoned. All of these engineering works have been done by local engineers who have gained experience in the process of time working alongside foreign engineers.

I should like the Government, if it has not yet signed a contract with a firm of architects, to put out a competitive contract. Let everybody take part in the competition – even the architects at the Public Works Department should be permitted to take part in the competition. After that is done the Government can get qualified engineers to do the work. There is a possibility that you have officers in the Department who can do the work. Let us have the designs first, and the drawings afterwards.

## Motion of Sympathy on Death of Sir Frank Worrell: 14<sup>th</sup> March, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** I rise on behalf of this side of the House to second the Motion, moved by the Hon. Prime Minister. I wish to endorse the remarks which he has made. I wish to say that it is not always that one uses the word "*great*", but the word "*great*" can certainly be used in the context of paying tribute to the late Sir Frank Worrell. He was not only a great cricketer, excellent in the field of cricket, but those of us who knew him, however briefly, understood that he was a great human being.

I have had the good fortune of having conversations with him on more than one occasion. The last one I had with him was on the occasion when we were travelling from Jamaica to Barbados. I was sitting next to him. I can attest to his deep concern about Caribbean unity not mainly in the field of sport, but in other fields which could result, as he said, in the economic and social wellbeing of the people of the whole area.

His death at the age of 42 is certainly a loss that will be felt throughout the region, and in fact, beyond the region for he made a mark not only in the Caribbean but wherever he went as leader of the West Indian Cricket Team. I am sure that his family will regret his loss at such an early age and I wish not only to second the Motion moved by the Prime Minister but to suggest in addition that Members of this Assembly stand for a minute in respect to his memory.

## On National Religious Holidays: 15<sup>th</sup> March, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** I do not wish to prolong this debate, but I rise mainly to second the Motion moved by my Hon. Friend.

In the maze of the discussion on this question an important point has been forgotten and that is this: In the past, Hindus and Muslims enjoyed three days each as holidays. One point of view which was expressed was that it was not good for the country to have Hindus and Muslims who are civil servants or policemen to be on holiday on days when others are working; in other words, that they should have more holidays than other Guyanese. This was a valid point.

Another point was made in favour of making Hindu and Muslim holidays national holidays, in that it would allow non-Hindus and non-Muslims to have feeling of national consciousness in terms of whatever Hinduism and Islam have contributed to Guyanese culture and, in the same way that Hindus and Muslims would celebrate Christian holidays, Christians would celebrate Hindu and Muslim holidays. It is seen, therefore, that the concept behind the idea of making Hindu and Muslim festive or religious occasions national holidays was quite sound. What is wrong is that the Government, having decided on good grounds to make those occasions national holidays, has reduced the number from three to two.

The Government ought to be very careful that no charge is levelled against it and that there is no discrimination as far as religious matters are concerned. I am not saying that the Government willingly wants to discriminate. I am not charging this but I am saying that there should be no ground left for the charge to be levelled at it. What I am saying is that if the Government is going to abuse what was not law but what was convention, what was practice, then the charge which is now being levelled at the Government will certainly stick, whatever the motivation of the Government.

On what grounds can the Government justify the reduction of holidays which were enjoyed previously? If the new Minister of Health and Housing is now saying that one was national and the other one was not national; is the Government now saying that it will allow two national holidays and one which will not be a national holiday but which will still be a holiday by convention? I heard the Minister of Information (Mr. Bissember) saying that there will still be religious holidays according to custom but what I am asking is this; will the Government allow Hindus and Muslims leave of absence from their jobs, with pay, on those days? This is the question.

There was a great deal of heat just now about this question but a great deal of silence when the question was put in a very narrow context. Clearly, the Government should have found some way to incorporate these holidays. It is not a question of what I believe in. (The Prime Minister accuses others of hypocrisy but he is the biggest hypocrite of all when it comes to

these matters.) However, I should like to say that it is not my beliefs which are in question. I am talking about a question which is national in character and on which people have very strong views. Therefore, if the Government wants to have peace, if it wants to have harmony and goodwill, then certainly this question should not be the subject of controversy. There are many ideological questions on which we have a lot of heat to generate.

My point is that the Government should not deny what was already a privilege – if one wants to call it that – or a right established in this country. It is clear that the Government is now denying the Hindus and Muslims something which they enjoyed before and this is very serious in a country such as ours. I urge the Government to refer this matter to a Select Committee not only so that representations can be considered more fully, but so that ways and means may be explored in order that a solution acceptable to Hindus and Muslims may be found.

## On International Relations /Foreign Policy: 20<sup>th</sup> March, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** The Hon. Prime Minister this afternoon, in a very lengthy speech, has enunciated general principles and treated us with a great deal of detail, but anyone listening very closely and who has observed the course of events in our country in the last two years could not fail to come to the conclusion that action does not conform with pronouncement. Indeed, one could get lost in all the details which were presented to us by the Prime Minister. Of course, this is a good debating point of view. The fact is that we heard about certain fundamental questions pertaining to the question of peace and the question of exploitation of man by man, the principles which the Prime Minister enunciated, but we have not heard very much about crucial issues in Vietnam. We have not heard anything about such issues as the intervention in Vietnam and, to come nearer home, the intervention in a place like the Dominican Republic.

On the other hand, there were some general statements: the world is made up of two blocs – two super States or two powerful blocs. Anyone can make such a **quantitative** assessment, but we have not been treated by the Prime Minister with a **qualitative** analysis of the difference in the position on international affairs between these two blocs, particularly relating to what he calls “*self-interest*”. What is the interest of countries like Guyana, sinking deeper and deeper into an economic and social morass? He alluded to the development decade – the development decade of 1960 – 1970 which is aimed at arresting the widening gap between the poor countries and the rich countries. We have heard no serious analysis of these important issues which make for foreign policy and foreign affairs.

It is not that the Prime Minister is not aware of these issues. I will quote from an article which he wrote several years ago in a publication called *Thunder* when he was the Chairman of the P.P.P., when he and I were touring India. This quotation is also quoted in my book *The West on Trial* on page 424; at a certain period when the Prime Minister and I visited India in 1954 he said:

*“Friends in India (and elsewhere) should remember that though the British lion is weak and imperialism is on its deathbed, it is aided by the young eagle from the USA. So long as these people rule the world, the independence and freedom which you won with so much bloodshed and suffering, is in jeopardy.”*

We are treated with no qualitative analysis of the position in the realm of foreign affairs, of two super blocs, but we are merely told to accept their existence. The Prime Minister says that Guyana is “*nonaligned*”. We could prove from this side of the House that this is not so. The Prime Minister

made another observation, namely, that we associated ourselves with the nonaligned countries, the third world countries, and the third world countries take a nonaligned position between the two super powers.

We contend again that there has been no qualitative analysis of what has been happening in the third world because the third world is not a homogeneous entity. The third world has, as we see so clearly in Africa, is two groups of states, two groups of nations, the Monrovia bloc and the Casablanca bloc, and even though they may be linked together in a so-called third world, they hold distinct and opposite ideological positions and this in turn is reflected in their foreign relations and foreign affairs.

Therefore, when the Prime Minister tells us that we are associated, generally speaking, with the third world countries, with the nonaligned countries, this is all well and good for propaganda purposes but the fact is that the bulk of these countries in the third world, the twenty American republics, for instance, can by no stretch of imagination be said to be nonaligned because we know they are all satellites of US foreign policy. We know, for instance, that most of the states that belong to the French community do not share the views of the third world nonaligned countries. So that for the Prime Minister to say that we are not associated with the two blocs, we are associated with the third world countries and are therefore nonaligned, is mainly to turn things upside down and is meant to fool the people who are not informed.

The Prime Minister can make a statement that it is the foreign policy of Guyana to support the Rhodesian struggle against the fascist Smith regime, in a third world country. The Prime Minister can tell us, hand over heart, that this Government is opposed to the fascist Government of Portugal in its treatment of the liberation fighters in Angola and Mozambique, but what about Vietnam? What about the Dominican Republic? Does the Prime Minister not see any ideological connection between the two?

The Prime Minister has not mentioned these crucial issues relating to the whole question of war and peace, relating to the question of sovereignty and intervention in the affairs of a sovereign nation, relating to the question of progress and prosperity and the end of exploitation of man by man.

Speaking for the gallery is not going to get us very far. We must, as the Prime Minister said, and to use his exact words, "*keep our sights clear*". He said there was an agreement between the Government and the Opposition on the general principle of foreign policy. While this is so on the enunciated views, as put in electoral campaigns and at street corners by one side of the Government, we contend that there is no fulfilment of those stated objectives. We submit that this Government is a creation of US foreign policy and today is a creature of US foreign policy. Therefore, we will not, we cannot, support this Motion before the House.

The Prime Minister said in his opening remarks that foreign policy is based on philosophy and on ideals, and also on self interest. If we are to

keep our sights clear then we must note the clear distinction between ideology and self interest. We must note that there need not be any contradiction between nationalism and internationalism and, indeed, that there can be a dualism between pronouncements and performance, a very valid dualism which can have meaning for a country.

What are the philosophical ideals which motivates this Government today? We are at a loss to understand what it is. During the electoral campaign the P.N.C. said it was socialist. The United Force said socialism and communism are practically the same and its belief rested on capitalism, albeit what is called "*people's capitalism*" and "*economic dynamism*."

Now that this amalgam – this coalition – has taken place, what is the result for foreign policy? It is neither fish nor chicken. It is neither socialist nor capitalist. If one were to give it a term one would say '*puppetry*.' I said that this Government is a creature of US foreign policy, and it is against this background that one has to examine the details.

Incidentally, over the last month there developed in the United States of America a tremendous exposé of the Central Intelligence Agency. The C.I.A. subverted churches, students, youth movements such as the World Assembly of Youth to which our delegates go from time to time, trade unions (the one mentioned with particular reference to us was the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees through the International Affairs Department under the Public Service International), agricultural organisations, research organizations, the International Labour Institute headed by a so-called socialist, Norman Thomas. I wish to quote from the *Thunder* of 12<sup>th</sup> March, 1967:

*"The most conspicuous was the revelation that the American Federation of States, County and Municipal Employees had, in effect, turned its International Affairs Department over to the C.I.A. in 1962 and 1963 to use as a case for strikes and other activities aimed at overthrowing Dr. Cheddi Jagan's Marxist regime in British Guiana."*

My colleagues who are making international policy today should read this issue of the *Thunder*.

We have seen the kind of ideologies that are being spread by what someone termed as an "*invisible Government*" – the C.I.A. With respect to our domestic and foreign policies, we ought to be told clearly where we stand so that we will know whether we will make progress, whether we will achieve the objectives set out by the Prime Minister for the peace and well being of humanity. In a very monumental work, Professor R.D. Fleming of Syracuse University, in a two-volume study entitled "*The Cold War and its Origins*" wrote in relation to the Truman Doctrine on page 436. This is what he had to say:

*"On March 6, 1947, President Truman made a speech at Baylor University on*

foreign economic policy which was a virtual declaration of irreconcilable conflict against both communism and democratic socialism. He explained that freedom was more important than peace and that freedom of worship and speech were dependent on freedom of enterprise. Something 'deeper than a desire to protect the profits of ownership' was involved.

Freedom of enterprise was limited when governments conducted foreign trade or when the government planned the economy. In the latter case 'Governments make all the important choices and he (the trader) adjusts himself to them as best he can.' "

This, said the President: "...was the pattern of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries" and "unless we act, and act decisively, it will be the pattern of the next century...if this trend is not reversed the Government of the United States will be under pressure, sooner or later, to use these same devices to fight for markets and for raw materials." It would find itself in the business of "telling every trader what he could buy or sell, and how much, and when, and where." This was "not the American way" and "not the way of peace." The implication was plain that state trading (in the USSR and its satellites) and government control of trade (in Britain and much of West Europe) led to war.

This was serious enough, but even more ominous were the assumptions that "the whole world should adopt the American system" and that "the American system could survive in America only if it became a world system."

Today, two fronts are engaged in the struggle – east and west, are engaged in the struggle between two ideologies, capitalism and socialism. On the second front there is so-called national liberation of the people in the Colonies, people like us who recently came out of colonialism. Let me say that the two struggles are not isolated; the second is a part of the first. May I just say that before Truman declared his doctrine in 1947, Churchill, in 1946, went to Fulton, Missouri, and declared that in the interest of civilization and humanity, the English-speaking world should get together to fight against the hordes coming from the East.

We contend that in order to make foreign policy intelligently we must understand the origins and trends of foreign affair. We submit that this Government takes mainly an opportunistic approach to the question of foreign affairs, opportunistic not in the sense of doing what is in the interest of Guyana, but doing what is in the interest of staying in power. If we must correlate the events in this country over the last two years and the methods pursued in gaining power with what followed, particularly in this hemisphere in the last two decades, we cannot help coming to the conclusion that our Government has come to what someone calls the "theory of fatalism".

Even if you perceive that the dominant power in this hemisphere is wrong, that its foreign policy is inimical to your interest, you cannot fight it; therefore, you must fall asleep. This motivates the whole thinking of the Government. The power struggles between the two blocs – the super blocs

and the struggle of countries like Guyana which are trying to become socially and economically free – are definitely correlated.

I took pains to quote from Professor Fleming's work to illustrate the dominating ideology of US foreign policy. This, of course, is an extenuation of the Monroe Doctrine in a different historical period when the struggle was not against the same ideology. When Monroe fought against European powers in their attempt to dominate Latin America, it was American expansion vis-a-vis European imperialism, but in the postwar era the Truman doctrine initiated the struggle of capitalism against socialism. I will paraphrase the words of Truman:

*"Ideological freedom and democracy are synonymous with the free enterprise systems."*

In terms of political theory, political economy and political action there are the key words – *"the whole world should adopt the American system. The American system would survive in America only if it became a world system."* We say that as a result of this doctrine, the Cold War was launched. The key to the policy behind the Cold War in that period was that communism should be contained, by instruments, by the signing of treaties, by the establishment of military bases in foreign countries – N.A.T.O. and the North Atlantic States including Portugal and after Franco Spain. Democracy had now been put upon its head.

During the war, democracy meant capitalism plus communism fighting against fascism, but now it is capitalism plus fascism fighting against communism. We had the Baghdad Pact which provided the link in the Middle East between the European countries and South East Asia under S.E.A.T.O. The South American countries were involved in the O.A.S., formed in 1948. It was said that the Latin American countries were threatened by communism from without and from within. Are you going to tell us now that we must carry out a big study about the O.A.S.? Dr. Eric Williams, the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, will undertake a long study of the O.A.S. and then go and join. You will get a lot of historical material written about these things, but these are the bare facts for anyone who wants to go deeply into the history of this organization.

Truman was not alone in the formulation of this policy. The arch-imperialist, Sir Winston Churchill, was his close associate. When India demanded its freedom he declared:

*"I was not appointed as Her Majesty's first Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire."*

While the treaties and the military bases were holding back communism, an iron ring was being formed around the world to hold back national liberation. Europe, Britain, France, Indo-China, Malaya, Indonesia

and the Netherlands were involved. After the war those colonials who had to give their lives and help primarily in chasing the Japanese out were attacked. The fight against communism to liberate the so-called satellites of Eastern Europe and the going back to resume occupation with a colonial force in colonial territories were not isolated events. Indeed, it was during the same era that the Constitution was suspended in British Guiana. Jomo Kenyatta was imprisoned at the time, and so on.

Let us get our sights clear and see whether the action taken for national liberation will improve the economic and social well being of the poor people whose conditions are getting worse, as admitted by U. Thant and others. Let us admit, as Truman has said very clearly and categorically, that democracy and freedom mean the free enterprise system. Our Government agrees with this philosophy and with this economic doctrine. If this is so, does this account for its foreign policy? One would say, reading the *Sun*, the organ of the United Force, or listening to the speeches of certain Members in the past, that this is indeed their policy. If one observes what has been done by way of fiscal and economic policies in this country, one would say that this is indeed so. But when one hears our Prime Minister, one hears a tale of a different kind. He says that this Government is a socialist Government; it has a nonaligned foreign policy. Where is the nonalignment? Nonalignment implies two things: not only the concept of sitting and examining; it does not only mean that we will sit and listen and then make up our minds. It presupposes that within this colonialism there were certain conditions which must be adhered to. There should be no military intervention in the affairs of a country; a country should not allow its territory to be used as a military base; it should accept aid and trade from all countries with the object of changing the economic structure which is inherent, - the economic structure of a primary producer, the economic structure of a one-crop economy we find all around us in Latin America, the economic structure of sending out raw material at low prices and buying manufactured goods in return at higher prices.

This is the concept also of nonalignment and for someone to say that it simply means that we will sit and listen and then we will decide how to make the concept and science of political economy into children's games. We see in Africa a great upheaval, a continent in birth so to speak, two streams of thought, the Monrovia group and the Casablanca group. We saw a few days ago where Julius Nyerere, President of Tanzania, nationalised the plantations, the insurance companies, foreign trade. This is the result of no military treaties with anyone. This is nonalignment.

We see not only these two strands, but we see recent events in Africa and Asia, where people like Ben Bella, Nkrumah, Sukarno, Mrs. Bandaranaike, the exponents of nonalignment, the champions, the leaders are removed. The American system will survive in America only if it becomes a world system. There are counter revolutionary efforts in two directions, not only to remove progressive leaders, but in some of these terri-

tories, to remove those puppets that have become unpopular and replace them by military right-wing dictators, as we have seen in Africa. We cannot understand how it is that some military dictators are taking over, not from progressive but from reactionary leaders. It is because the puppets cannot produce the popular backing necessary in the long run.

We submit that an examination of the events in this country will show by our associations, by the fiscal and economic policies we have pursued, that we are moons away from this concept of nonalignment. The first thing the Prime Minister referred to was the Agreement signed with the United States. What he did not speak of was the fine writing, such as the writing we see in insurance policies; and that is, that the United States has the right to establish military bases, land military planes, build any installations and fly over the country at any time. It is not a long step from this to joining the O.A.S.

We hear a lot about Caribbean unity, yet Cuba, right in the hemisphere, right in the Caribbean, was not invited to our Independence celebrations. Formosa was invited and the excuse was that it is a member of the Security Council. Of course, Russia and Yugoslavia were invited. The United States says *"let us make peace with these two and let us keep Cuba and China off the scene"*. This is the logic.

The Venezuela border question, another aspect of our foreign policy is now blowing up in our face. It was a question that was closed, yet we now signed the Geneva Agreement. Don't take my word for it, but read the Release by the Venezuela Ministry of Information which says, *"There is validity in our claim."* Look, the Governments have set up a Commission to examine the question. This is not intervention in our affairs like the marines landing in the Dominican Republic or Vietnam. This is indirect intervention or the threat of indirect intervention. The British intervention was called *"indirect rule"* in Africa. It was, nevertheless, as direct as anything else and so we have to look at this other bit of chicanery and see where our so-called *"foreign policy"* is leading us.

*"Aid and trade"* is one of the main causes for backwardness of poor countries. Today, aside from the question of foreign ownership of the means of production, exchange and distribution, it is a fact that there is unequal international trading. There are poor countries which are selling their products at lower and lower prices and have to pay higher and higher prices for their imported goods. What about trying to reverse this process? What about trying to sell dear and buy cheap for a change?

The leaders of this Government who said they would get \$10 a bag more in the international market for rice, who said they did not need Cuba, are now getting \$10 a bag less. Commodities were bought in this country fairly cheaply. Now the Government has put them under severe restriction quotas. At public meetings I generally refer to this instrument – a Canadian Parker pen. It cost \$21; it fell now and broke. Hon. Members will see that one end is blue and one is green. It was not possible to get a green barrel.

Now it is \$2 for this. My friend referred to “*Chinese Parker*” - \$1.50 for a whole pen.

I heard people in this country saying: “*you know, Burnham is tied to Washington and Japan is tied to Moscow, and we don’t want to be tied to either.*” We have heard some people saying that it is no use jumping out of the arms of one and jumping into the arms of the other. We do not want to become satellites of anybody, but, clearly in this equation there is a qualitative difference either in the associations, the policies, the economics or the political or ideological strings which have connected us with our “*mother countries*” even when we were colonies. Now that we are not colonies, we are made to maintain the economic straitjacket.

When we were in the Government, these people on the Government Benches used to say “*Coolie*” Government. Now that they are in the Government, they are saying that agriculture will be the backbone of this country for a long time. They said that we were only thinking about drainage and irrigation and agriculture. But we were not only thinking about agriculture, we were going ahead with industries. We made the law for the I.D.C. to promote, encourage and undertake the establishment of industries. On 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 1966, the I.D.C. law was amended, and the key word “*undertake*” was deleted. These are the people who talked so much about industries.

In our time, there were no feasibility studies, but at least we did something about them. There were surveys, but they said: “*Change the law.*” Why? Freedom and democracy are synonymous with the free enterprise system! Government must not go into business. Truman doctrine! Where is the evidence of nonalignment? It is a known fact that the Russian delegation was here during the Independence Celebrations. They said: “*we would like to establish diplomatic representation with Guyana.*” If Guyana is nonaligned, it will be better to have the Russian embassy here so that you can negotiate with them for aid and for trade which you cannot sell now, and aid which you cannot get from the Americans to industrialise your country. It does not follow that you cannot afford to set up a reciprocal embassy in Moscow because you do not have an embassy in Germany, but you have the German Ambassador here. Where is the nonaligned foreign policy?

The other day, a paper which supports one of the parties – the P.N.C. – had an article about conditions attached to Canadian aid. But what about the conditions attached to American aid? What about the facts? Let the former Minister of Economic Development speak, if he dares, of the American philosophy which does not even encourage the setting up of cooperatives in this country. The members of the Government have been putting in been put in power by the Americans so they cannot criticize them. They dare not! At one time the Prime Minister said that it was wrong for intervention to take place in the Dominican Republic. But during the last trip to the United States, when he was wined and dined and taken around — he

said: "I have seen the facts. My eyes are opened. Now we can see that the intervention was justified."

I repeat that one cannot divorce the Monroe Doctrine from the Truman Doctrine, or indeed, from the Johnson Doctrine. (Yes, Johnson is a criminal to be tried by the World Tribunal to be set up by the great philosopher, Bertrand Russell... I am sure this one will not be subverted by the C.I.A. like the International Commission of Jurists.) The Johnson Doctrine which is an extension of the Truman Doctrine states, that: "*Not only will we see that our system becomes the world system, but we will intervene directly if necessary.*" No wonder our Ambassador to the U.N. was perturbed the other day. He said that the *New York Times* was not very helpful when he landed there. The *New York Times* which exposed the C.I.A. plot in the overthrow of the P.P.P. Government is one of the most influential papers and it is highly respected and circulated in the U.N. headquarters.

The image of this Government must be that it is nonaligned on the issues of Rhodesia and Angola. But this is a fraud because if that were so, there would have been a consistent approach similar to Rhodesia and Angola. We, on this side of the House join with the Government in saying that the fascist Smith regime should be overthrown by force. We join with it as we did the Tri-continental Conference.

I will now come to the next point. The Prime Minister said: "*let us not worry ourselves with all these international problems. Let us try to solve our problems.*" You cannot divorce yourself from the world today. Wendell Willie wrote a book called "*One World. Today*"; we are closer to that than when he wrote it. There is going to be no improvement in the deteriorating conditions here. The cost of living is increasing, prices of farmers' products – rice, plantains, ground provisions, coffee, and milk – are going down, and workers are struggling day after day. One U.F. organ said that there is an epidemic of strikes. Another U.F. organ said that a strike fever is hitting the country. This is only an expression of growing dissatisfaction among the people.

We know that there is an ideological war between the east and west. We have the United States, Great Britain, France and Canada on one side. But in the little war which is going on – big capitalism eating little capitalism – there is the necessity for national survival. France has dismantled the whole of the N.A.T.O. apparatus. France recognised Communist China long ago and she trades with Communist China. The United States is still fighting the Cold War.

Farmers in Canada are suffering greatly, unemployment is increasing. Of course there is the Vietnam War to stimulate prosperity, a little injection. This year farmers lined up their tractors on the public highways. Whether it is conservative or liberal, the wheat markets in Cuba, China and the Soviet Union are all important to the wellbeing of the Canadian people's self-interest. What do they do? They do not go into the O.A.S. because this is a military alliance, part of the Cold War apparatus. But our

Prime Minister who knows this is going to investigate it! While Canada was voting with America at the United Nations a few years ago, this last time it abstained on the question of entry of People's China in the United Nations. This was again a movement based on Canada's national self-interest.

Our former Minister of Economic Development (Mr. Thomas) went to Taiwan. Everyone is talking about People's China becoming a super power in the world, meaning a power which has the ability to send intercontinental missiles. They are all seeing that but our Government does not even want to go and explore what is happening over there and to find out what is their key to success. This is a Government which says that it is non-aligned and not taking sides.

Clearly, we cannot support this Motion and I urge the Government, in the interest of the Guyanese people, to reverse its foreign policy for this cannot achieve the three objectives which were cited by the Prime Minister: the objective of world peace, the objective of the end of exploitation of man by man and the economic wellbeing of the Guyanese people and, indeed, the people of the world.

All we have to do is to look around and see what is happening to some of these poor countries. India is next door to China. China is making progress and India is virtually at the door of starvation. What is the reason for this? Apart from the internal politics and the economic and fiscal policies which are influenced, to a very great extent by certain wings of the Congress Party, by big businessmen like the Birlas and the Tatas, there is a fantastic load which a country like India had to carry from the very start when Pakistan became a Member of S.E.A.T.O. and the Cold War. India had to spend 50 to 60 per cent of her Budget on defence.

Latin American countries have had to spend nearly two billion dollars a year, which they could ill afford, because of this same concept of fighting communism. A political consequence which has arisen out of this is that this kind of military mania is helping the military vis-à-vis the politicians in Latin America. It has strengthened the military because the whole apparatus of the State is keyed up to militarism. Not too long ago an American writing an article for the *Saturday Evening Post* said that before the Mutual Security Act of 1947 and its successor, the O.A.S. of 1948, there were only three dictatorships in Latin America: Nicaragua, Dominican Republic and Argentina. Today almost every South American country is a dictatorship or one kind or another. This has been a consequence of the policy adumbrated under the Truman Doctrine and by the O.A.S., and also in view of the fact that these regimes cannot be stable because the economic and fiscal policies they pursue cannot produce economic prosperity and economic growth. Popular will cannot therefore be expressed.

For many years we have fought against colonialism and the fight in this country has been long and bitter. We must not pragmatically try to go through the fight against colonialism with all the same heartaches and pains.

Let us learn from our neighbours in Latin America. They were free from colonialism only to have super imposed upon them British, Italian and German neo-colonialism, which are now supplanted by American neo-colonialism.

I have on several occasions in this House mentioned that at the best time of the postwar era; the economic growth in Latin American countries was 2.4 per cent per capita. Today it is not a question of an increase; it is virtually zero. These countries have been embraced by the west, but they cannot solve their social and economic problems. We on this side of the House say that this Government must, with meaning, translate what it says into practice. Let us trade with both east and west; accept aid from the east and from the west; do not allow our country to be used as a military base, or our borders to be used by a foreign power to dominate another country, as the Prime Minister puts it, while issues are being fought in the United Nations.

We say when the British, French and Israeli attacked Egypt that 62 nations at the United Nations said it was wrong. There would have been great slaughter if the aggression had continued. A slaughter of a greater degree is now taking place in countries like Vietnam. Why are we silent on this? Are we afraid to talk? When are we going to get a proper policy from the Government? Four out of every five dollars on the Atkinson-Mackenzie Road will have to be spent in the USA; on personnel, equipment and material, and some members of this Government have the gall to talk about Canadian aid with strings! How are we going to get out of this trap?

Fortunately, there is a thaw taking place in the Cold War in the United States. Let us hope that some of that cold wind will blow over the heads of our Ministers in Guyana. One of them should be sent to Portugal because he will never change. People, from their own experience, are speaking out today in the schools and in the universities of America and asking for a change in the foreign policy of the USA. Let us add our voice, however small it may be, for this will affect us in the end.

Writing about this same ideological thaw which is taking place in the USA, Herbert Apthekar, in an article called '*Recent Developments*', said that in the USA there are talks about the wind of change in academic circles, student circles and so on. He referred to something which has some relevance to us. He quoted Professor W.K. Midlin and W.M. Cave:

*"The transition of Uzbekistan from an overwhelmingly agrarian, technologically undeveloped society to the rapidly industrializing one with dynamic programmes for change must be classified as a major achievement of the Soviet system. To gain some perspective on the enormity of this accomplishment, one need look no further than those countries contiguous to the Uzbek Republic: Afghanistan and Iran. While they cannot be compared uncritically with Uzbek society, both have a great deal in common with Uzbekistan, particularly with regard to religious ideology, ethnic composition and cultural history. Yet, for the most part,*

*they remain comparatively backward societies with a high percentage of illiteracy and a persistent philosophical orientation toward the past. Conventional explanations (such as lack of economic investment and technical assistance, etc.) do not suffice, for both Iran and Afghanistan have been the recipients of huge sums of foreign capital. Still, pastoral economies and traditional social structures persist."*

Iran was formerly called Persia, and that was one of the first victims of the Cold War. The Government was overthrown when it nationalised the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company. An original investment of five million pounds took out millions of pounds. Nationalization of an enterprise is not within the concept of the Truman doctrine. Re-orientation of the economy of the country is not permissible in such foreign countries. You have these two things side by side: one society abandoning the doctrine and going ahead, and another society continually looking to the past and remaining stagnant.

As nationalists and patriots we are concerned about our country. We will support what the Government does if it is good. For instance, we said openly that we would support the Government's "*Buy Local Campaign*". Of course, the Government's "*Buy Local Campaign*" is nothing more than our import substitution policy which was adumbrated in the Kaldor Budget.

It is a rose by a different name. We cannot be expected to support hypocrisy. It may be that the Government is ignorant of what is going on. I do not think this is so. There are many persons with brains on that side. Guyanese are perhaps among the most politically conscious people in the third world countries.

If it is not due to ignorance, then it is clearly due to scheming and opportunism. But opportunism cannot help even the short-sighted leaders of our country in the long run because history is littered with the bones of puppets – Chang-Kai-Shek, Sygham Rhee, Nuri-es-Said in Iraq, Menderez in Turkey, Jimenez in Venezuela. Jimenez was the leader whose example Dulles said we should follow. He ran his country with an iron hand for ten years after the overthrow of the Galligos – Bettancourt Government, another victim of the cold war in the 1930s.

We cannot support politics which are based on opportunism, on pragmatism or what goes under the name of pragmatism today. We therefore will not, as we have done on certain occasions, abstain. This was not done, as the Prime Minister so crudely stated, because of cowardice, but because we have positions and because we know the force of propaganda. "*Yes*" or "*no*" does not always provide an answer to a question. On this occasion, however, we are categorical in our opposition to the foreign policy as enunciated by the Government. Rather than setting up offices, even the few that we have, and spending large sums of money, which we cannot afford, to produce nothing – because, in effect, this is what our foreign offices are doing – go cap in hand to the C.I.A. and let them offer you all the assist-

ance! We don't have to pay for that. We can ill afford these expensive luxuries to do nothing.

If our Ambassadors in the U.N., in London, in Washington were selling British Guiana – I would say “*Yankee*” Guyana, if you prefer. Thousands of hard earned dollars are now being used to prop up a foreign service, which in our context today is meaningless. So the Government might as well do as Switzerland does. Don't worry with embassies and foreign representation: Stay at home!

I believe in a vibrant foreign policy, based on anti-imperialism. That is why Felix was there in New York to adumbrate this position, but the Government rolled his head. We ask the Government in the interest of the Guyanese people, either to have a foreign policy which is dynamic, which is meaningful, or to abandon the farce of our showpieces such as “*To Sir with Love*”. “*Sir*” is a good showpiece, I admit that, but showpieces don't build countries, as Arthur Lewis or anybody else will tell you. Get down to seeking a broad consensus in this country! Find out what the members of the Opposition want! Let us debate it. Let Guyanese debate it freely and frankly at all levels in our society, from the university down to the classroom and then let us decide, if necessary even by referendum, what road we should take. Then we will see Guyana moving forward. Until then we are opposed to this Motion and to the nonsense that goes under the name of Guyana's foreign policy.

## Land Agreement with C.D.C.: 28<sup>th</sup> March, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** The former Minister of Economic Development (Mr. Thomas) said that it was unfortunate that this Agreement was signed when we were a colony and he more or less suggested that it was also unfortunate that we are now independent. I would think that it would have been better to say that it is a tragedy that a country which now claims to be independent and sovereign should rubber-stamp and put the seal of colonialism on an Agreement which was signed in the colonial era.

If the Hon. Member had put it this way I would have said: "*here is a Guyanese patriot whom we must bail.*" But what did he say? He said that he and the Minister of Finance (Mr. D'Aguiar) negotiated with and begged the British Government and the C.D.C. to accept these terms. We were told all along that there were great differences of opinion between the former Minister of Economic Development and the Minister of Finance, but when it comes out in the wash, it seems as if they are all conspiring to sell away the rights of the Guyanese people.

Let us put things in a proper context. We have seen so much poverty, backwardness and degradation in the so-called third world countries – particularly in Latin America, Central America and South America – that we would have thought that Guyanese who are now in charge of the affairs of this country would have taken great care to see that we did not tread the same road. In conference with my Latin American friends I used to say: "*You know we are a little more fortunate than you are. All your lands are monopolized by absentee owners*", in Latin America this is known as "*Latin funds*"; three-quarters of the land in South America are concentrated in the hands of just a few per cent of the people.

In Guyana, while our coastland was monopolized by the sugar companies and a few big sharks on the Essequibo Coast, by and large, the bulk of our land was in the hands of the Crown, now in the hands of the Government. But now we hear gratuitously, from the lips of the former Minister, that the C.D.C. was not even anxious to take the lands but the Government virtually forced it to take them. This is a disgrace of the worst order. Let me just go back, as a matter of reference, to show the kind of development these people are talking about; they are always building castles in the air. It will be recalled that the Interim Government was also telling us that the C.D.C. was going in for prefabricated housing schemes not only for Guyana but for export throughout the West Indies. We were also told that dalli would be used for making veneer and plywood.

I asked the Hon. Minister of Communications to look up from his *Time* magazine when the Hon. Minister of Finance was speaking, because I know that the Minister of Communications had taken part in an investigation which revealed that Guyana did not have sufficient dalli to produce veneer

and plywood. He was, I believe, a member of the Committee that investigated the matter, but today we are still building castles in the air. This is the formula by which this Government is working constantly. It tells the people to hold on until tomorrow, but tomorrow never comes.

As regards our timber resources, this is one of the great assets that we have in this country. We have minerals also, but our minerals are monopolized by certain people. The Harvey Aluminium Company was interested in mining bauxite and setting up an alumina plant here. The company made investigations all over the country in an effort to find suitable land for mining bauxite. The company wanted to secure an area of land on the left bank of the Demerara River for this purpose. However, Demba had the land and, eventually, they decided to build a bridge across the Demerara River to start mining bauxite over there. In the circumstances, the other company decided to leave the country and to set up its alumina plant in the Virgin Islands because of the monopolization of our resources by Demba.

This Government signed an Agreement with the Reynolds Metal Company – an Agreement which we have not yet seen in this House – for a 75 year lease for nearly a quarter of a million acres of land, again, tying up the bulk of our bauxite resources. Timber is the second most valuable resource that we have. It is estimated that 75% of our country is in forest.

Let me put this matter in its proper perspective. In 1961 I went to North America to see the Canadian Government and the American Government, and this is the way in which I put our problems to them. First of all, I told Diefenbaker: we are producing sugar, rice, timber and coffee, can you buy some more from us? The reply was: *“No, we cannot buy any more.”* I said: *“we have forests in Guyana, can you establish a Paper Pulp Factory in Guyana?”* The reply was: *“No we cannot do that because pulp and paper factories are sitting idle in North America.”* I said: *“will you be willing to establish a smelter in Guyana?”* The reply was: *“no, smelters are lying idle in North America.”* I said: *“will you please tell us what you will buy, so that we can start producing what you require? We do not want to start producing things merely to find that in five years’ time the prices will have dropped.”* The reply was: *“sorry, we do not buy on the basis of bilateral agreements of that kind; we buy in open markets based on multilateral trade.”* The same answers were given to me in Washington.

I will now turn to the deal which I was negotiating with the Cuban Government. When I visited Cuba, I found that they were using sugar waste and turning it into paper. They had one of the first factories of the kind. I was told that the paper was not suitable for a multiplicity of jobs because it was not strong enough, and to meet 60 per cent of Cuban requirements of paper which was imported, it would be necessary to combine wood pulp with bagasse pulp to make the kind of paper needed. The Cuban Government was therefore interested in getting wood pulp from Guyana.

At first the Cuban Government talked about a lease. Subsequently the Cuban Government said that it did not want a lease because a lease smacked of colonialism. That is what the Minister of Industry told me. He said: *“we*

*are prepared to loan you an initial amount of \$10 million in the form of equipment and supplies. You will set up a Government-owned factory. You will send us wood pulp, telephone poles and sleepers that we need, and you will pay us in these commodities for the factory which we have loaned you the money to build."* When this very admirable proposition was put to the Government of Guyana, it was decided to look around to find land to enable us to put up this factory. What did we find? There was no land available. The whole of the Bartica Triangle was taken up by the C.D.C., the Willems Timber Company, De Freitas, Charlestown Saw Mills, Toolsie Persaud Ltd., etc. Millions and millions of acres of land were tied up and not utilized. At one stage the Conservator of Forests brought a map and showed me the position of things.

### [Adjournment]

Before the tea adjournment I was speaking about the concentration of our forest lands in relatively few hands and the difficulty which the P.P.P. Government experienced in securing timber land for the purpose of establishing a timber project which would have utilized a great deal of our mixed forests to the advantage not only of employment, but also of enhancing the national income. I was about to point out the difficulties which the Government experienced. A large block of land was tied up by what was called the Colombian Corporation. We wanted to resume possession of that land because for over five years the Corporation was sitting on the land doing nothing, but it was impossible to get hold of it.

When we looked at the map, the only land that was available was land deep in the Interior beyond the river front, to get at which it was necessary to build a 40-mile road. I remember the Conservator of Forests telling me that rather than embarking on the project of building a 40-mile road to get at land in the very rear, which was not well drained, it would be far better to make an arrangement with the C.D.C. That was the view of the Conservator of Forests.

But I knew that this was a dead end because the C.D.C. is a British Government undertaking, it is a Corporation established by the British Government and we know that the British Government, in so far as Guyanese affairs were concerned, was acting, if not in consultation then in close collaboration with the United States of America. It was very unlikely that the C.D.C. would have entered into any project with the Government of Guyana which meant an aid-and-trade deal involving the Cuban Government; therefore, this proposition did not materialize.

I merely pointed out this one factor to show the dangers of what is now being contemplated. Not only have the bulk of our forests, particularly the rich Bartica triangle area already been taken up, but now this Government is seeking to give to the C.D.C. according to this Agreement, all forest concessions in the Northwest and Essequibo districts, the latter district com-

monly known as the Pomeroods. Only a few days ago I was visiting the lower Essequibo region, Caria Caria and surrounding areas. What did I find? I found that the small man who is earning a livelihood by cutting a few logs here and there is now being deprived of even that livelihood.

A man who has been in the logging business for several years has now been told that he cannot get a lease for land. He is being pushed around. Small persons who used to get permission to cut 25, 50 or 100 logs have been told now that they cannot cut logs. I am to make representation on their behalf. Not one man but several people in Caria Caria and other areas have made this complaint.

The Colombian Corporation which was given a lease for an extensive area of land did not do anything about it. The land was taken away and now I understand that it has again been given to Colombian Corporation. All the small people are now at the mercy of the big ones. It is an old cry in the timber industry that the small men – Mr. Bowman knows about this and he should get up and speak – have always been at the mercy of the big men who are holders of the land where they cannot enter to cut logs unless they are prepared to pay what is equivalent to a sort of retainer.

We know that in the Pomerood and in the Northwest the poor Amerindians particularly have been earning their livelihood in this manner. They go about the various areas cutting logs and selling them to sawmill owners and even to people who have contracts to sell dalli for export to Surinam. I repeat that it is a disgrace for this Government to hand these lands to C.D.C. which already owns or controls extensive areas of our forests. They bought Manaka from the former Sills Sawmills, which I understand is made up of a very large area of our forests. They bought from Bookers another area Winiperu, in the Bartica triangle area.

Now, in addition to not working up these areas satisfactorily, they are talking of new concessions in the whole of the Northwest and the Pomerood areas. Clearly, this is to create a condition in our country which is tantamount to what existed in Latin America. Even the United States Government is talking about land reform in Latin America today as a means of alleviating the problems of the people. But here we are with large areas of land in the hands of the Government which is not trying to retain it, give it to the people or develop it as occasion may demand, but tying it up, in huge areas, in the hands of a foreign company.

The former Minister of Economic Development told us that we have no alternative, that this company is not making much money and since we have been committed to this debt, we have to make the best possible terms even if we have to give away our lands. The former Minister as an accountant is only accustomed to looking at the balance sheet, but he must look beyond that. If he had looked beyond that he would have seen that this company lost so much or did not make much profit because of diverse reasons. The Government therefore should not squeeze the rice farmers on the one hand and the Guyanese people on the other hand by tying up all

our resources in the hands of the C.D.C.

In the first place the C.D.C. paid \$800,000 to Sills for its Manaka concessions. Members of the C.D.C. flew over the place and said: *"My god! The jungle is full of greenheart."* But when they went on foot, after they paid the \$3/4 million, they found that there was not so much greenheart. They paid another fantastic sum to Bookers, for the sawmill in Georgetown, for one at Stampa, and for the Winiperu concession. They closed down the one at Stampa. Then they sold the one which was supposed to be obsolete to Toolsie Persaud who is now virtually a millionaire.

Why is it they are losing money? They are losing money because they fly over the country, see timber and call it greenheart, and then pay out money like wild for it. They brought personnel here, Steel Bros., to run the C.D.C. Steel Bros. was appointed as managing agent with a fantastic salary structure. I was in the Sawmill Workers Union at the time and I know the history of all of this. We could not get them to pay decent wages and when we asked them to show us the books to see why they were losing money, they refused to show us because we would have seen the fat salaries they were getting.

Let us come to the rice situation. We did not borrow money. Immediately after the war Burma was threatened, the Far East was threatened. After the Japanese were chased out it was said that the Far East was threatened by communist infiltration and subversion and Guyana was thought of as a place to grow rice. At first, the C.D.C. wanted to grow rice on a plantation basis here. Mr. Deroop Mahraj will remember this. It wanted a concession to be exempted from the provisions of the Rice Marketing Board but even the Colonial Legislature of the early fifties was not prepared to give this. At that time, the R.M.B. was selling rice to the West Indies and that price was lower than the world price. The C.D.C. wanted to sell in the world's market and make a billing while the farmers had to sell to the West Indies at a lower price. Even the men in the old Legislature who would normally be sympathetic to such a point of view rejected such a proposal and Sir Frank McDavid had to withdraw the Bill.

It was then that the C.D.C. went into the economics of the rice industry and found that, as Dr. Garleen O'Loughlin from the University of the West Indies pointed out, that rice was only earning a net profit of about \$7 per acre. When the C.D.C. saw that rice was a marginal crop, was not earning much profit, and it could not get this marketing concession it had wanted, it contrived to come in as usurers and lent the Government \$5 million. The then economic wizard, Sir Frank McDavid, said: *"Give us some more money. We will not only expand our cultivation at Mahaicony-Abary but we will set up a new mill at Anna Regina. We will soon be wallowing in money and we will be able to pay back."* They bought a rice mill which was far too big for the available paddy at the time. Therefore, the cost of operation in relation to the overhead charges became very high. The mill was badly sited at Anna Regina, a point which involved many intermediary points of transportation, there-

fore, handling costs were increased and, instead of making profits as Sir Frank McDavid anticipated, year after year it suffered losses.

Sir Frank McDavid did not, as he should have, enter into a long-term agreement for this \$5 million loan. The gentlemen in the Government are now saying: *“what can we do? We have no alternative but to give away our lands.”* I am saying that we have no moral responsibility. The British Government was part and parcel of this. It had a vested interest in this deal because it wanted rice to be grown in Guyana not only to feed what was regarded as a hungry world *“threatened by communism”* in the Far East, but also, I am told, to make explosives – something to do with rice having cellulose for the manufacture of explosives. Therefore, the British Government had a hand in this project and it was its experts who agreed to the establishment of the mill, the white elephant, at Anna Regina. It was the Colonial Government here, the Governor and his chief cook and bottle-washer who endorsed the whole thing and who did not make a long-term agreement going into twenty years which was the normal loan period for such agreements.

Members on the other side ask what we did. Surely, we could not afford to pay the loan and it was stupid to think that the P.P.P. Government could have found \$5 million off the bat to pay this loan. The Minister of Finance said that we pushed the interest rate but if he is honest – and one assumes that he is honest he should not make such a statement – he should say that all C.D.C. loans are tied to the bank rate in England.

If the P.P.P. Government was in the jaws of the lion it had to agree to a higher rate. It is far better to pay a high rate than to not only pay a high rate, as we see from this, but to sell out the rights of this country by giving away to this company not only the whole of the Bartica which it already has but the whole of the Pomeroun and the Northwest. I say that we had hoped to get out of the jaws of the lion.

The Rice Development Company was losing money up to 1961 and then it began to make profits. These are the figures: 1961/1962 crop year - \$211,169; 1962/1963 crop year - \$114,931; 1963/1964 - \$145,018. I had to talk to the C.D.C. in London on several occasions. The manager of the Rice Development Company and the Chairman of the Board also sat in on some of these discussions. We showed to the C.D.C. not only these figures which they knew about but projections where it was possible that with new lands in the Tapakuma Scheme and what we had hoped to be the follow-up Scheme at Tapakuma – that is in the Pomeroun mouth – and later on, the Drainage and Irrigation Scheme for Mahaicony/Abary/Mahaica which will bring in more lands and give better irrigation, the mill would not only have enough throughput but that it would have more than it needed and that it would also have additional facilities – by this I mean drying facility, storage facility and cleaning facility – to match the milling capacity which was in these two mills.

The C.D.C., looking at the profit figures and seeing that the position

was improving and seeing the prospects for the future, was even willing to consider giving the Government a loan to finance additional expansion which was necessary. But what has happened? The Coalition-run R.D.C. has run into losses:

		<b>Losses</b>
The 1964 – 65 crop	-	\$3/4 million
The 1965 – 66 crop	-	\$1.1 million
August 1966 – 67	-	\$1 million so far.

That is the position in which the Rice Development Company found itself.

The thing this Government should do is not to barter away the heritage of the Guyanese people. The thing to do, first of all, was not to surrender the Cuban market on the orders of the people of Washington. Secondly, the Government should not put round pegs in square holes. We have seen where a new manager has been appointed – a Mr. Seaton. I have nothing against this gentleman, but surely you cannot take a clerk from somewhere and put him to manage a complex organization like the Rice Marketing Board! You cannot bypass people who have grown up in the organization and appoint a manager over them.

My Hon. Friend Mr. Hubbard has already referred to the big salary increases which were given by an organization which is losing money. Clearly what the Government should do is not to surrender more of our lands to these people and not to adopt corrupt practices for this country. If what the Hon. Minister of Finance and the former Minister of Economic Affairs say is true, then let us get good administrators and the right people to put in these important jobs. Because of the Government's policy of discrimination, several qualified people are leaving this country today. There is a brain drain from this country at the moment.

It will be recalled that Mr. Mahadeo was running this company and they threw him out. Mr. Sahadeo Singh was also hounded out. Another individual who was acting for the manager on several occasions, Mr. Allen Chan, who was a technical man as well as an administrative officer, has also left the company. How can you take a man like Seaton and put him there to run things? You cannot expect people to do competent work under those conditions? That is why this company is losing money today. It is a disgrace for this Government to come here today and tell us that it had no alternative than to do what it is now doing.

The Members of the Government are the people who have been telling us that they got the best terms from their friends. If the C.D.C. had gone into the rice business here, it would have lost money. It did not do that, but it lent Government money at 6 per cent or 7 per cent interest. I understand that the interest payments alone, from 1954 to 1965, have amounted to \$3.1

million on a loan of \$5 million. How do you expect a country like ours to develop, when our usurious friends in the United Kingdom have imposed such exorbitant conditions on a poor country like Guyana?

I am not saying that this Government must not pay back the loan. I am merely saying that this Government must not be forced by big-stick methods not only to pay, but to hand over our lands to this company. I am saying that this Government should have consulted the Opposition on this matter, and that is where the Government has failed. I am sure; not only in the interest of the country but in the political interest of the Government that had the Government consulted the Opposition in this matter, it would have been able to conduct its negotiations with the British Government from a stronger position. The British Government has a moral responsibility to give us a 20-year loan. ) Because you were looting and burning down Georgetown).

We are prepared to back this Government if it demands a loan from the British Government. This Government has placed us in a great dilemma. Having said that the west is our best friends, and they give us the best conditions, the Members of this Government cannot stand up to the west and say that they are usurious. This Government has surrendered its position. In spite of the fact that this Government says it is nonaligned – the Prime Minister says that this Government is nonaligned. However, the Hon. Minister of Finance says: *“we are aligned; we know who are our friends, and they give us the best terms!”* He cannot go to the Amerindians and tell them about this matter. Let him go and tell the Amerindians about this!

We see that the U.F. party has already split from the top and now we read in the *Evening Post* that the P.N.C. also is splitting. Time is telling on them. I repeat, the Government is in a strong position on this issue, and that is why I took the opportunity to remind the Assembly of the conditions under which this loan was negotiated. Our proposal at this time is that the Government should not sign this Agreement, that this matter should be discussed more fully with the people of this country and with the Opposition and a fresh approach should be made to the British Government. Mr. Bottomley came here not too long ago telling us how generous the British Government is in giving loans to Guyana but we see that generosity did not extend very far and the same strings that are attached to the Canadian and American loans are now also attached to the British loans.

I would not worry too much about the selling of the land at what is regarded as lower than the market price. My colleague has already referred to it. I would have much preferred to see the Government sell the land at the market price and subsidise the people who are going to live in these houses. If, let us say, the houses will cost \$4,000 and the Government wants to subsidise them because they will cost too much, then subsidise the people who will dwell in them. In that way the Government could even win some votes. But do not give away land to these people, the C.D.C.

In view of what I have said, the Opposition cannot support this Motion

before the Assembly. This Agreement is bringing back colonialism with a vengeance. The British Government has said that Guyana is politically free, but the British Government through its agency, called the Commonwealth Development Corporation, is now going to lay hold of Guyana with a vengeance and will take hold of the vast areas of land in this country which can be the only means by which this Government can make progress in the very near future.

The Members of the Government are talking about the importance of agriculture. They are reaping the wild wind which they have sown. In our time they advised the people not to go on the land. Now the land has become so important that everybody must go on the land. Members of the Government are saying that they have given many thousands of acres to people, but they forget to mention that these are the same lands that have already been handed out but not formally given by lease. Ask the Minister about the delegation which I sent to him! These were persons who have paid for land title for which have been held up for two years and now all this land is added together and the Government claims to have given it out.

Having decided not to embark on an industrialization programme, having taken orders from their masters, having amended the R.D.C. law to the effect that Government should not undertake industries, Members of the Government have no alternative now but to say that agriculture will be the backbone of the country for many years. Agriculture and forestry development depend on land and if the lands are going to be tied up by Bookers, if the sugar planters are going to tie lands up on the coastlands and the big timber producers, Willems Timber Company, de Freitas Limited, Charlestown Sawmills, the C.D.C., Toolsie Persaud and Company, are doing the same in the interior, then the small people are not going to be given a chance.

This Government will do well to hold up this Agreement and with our backing renegotiate this Loan Agreement. Demand not only a 12 ½ years Loan Agreement, but a 25 year Loan Agreement. We managed in our time to hold off the C.D.C. from dropping on the Government like a carrion crow. We held them off by paying them the interest which was falling due. This should be done and the Government should immediately set out to recognise the Rice Development Company.

The Government should also import a new factory by which it was planned to convert a lot of the rice bran into oil. That was another project which this Government cancelled. An Agreement was signed for such a factory and the Government cancelled the contract because the factory was coming from East Germany. These are the reasons why it is losing money. The way forward is not to sign such an Agreement, but to reconstruct the Rice Development Company and to set up ancillary industries which will make the Rice Development Company a paying proposition, through which it will be possible to pay back the loan, not only the interest but also the principal, when given a favourable time in which to pay.

## Guyana Pandits' Council (Incorporation) Bill: 31<sup>st</sup> March, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** As we listened to the Government's spokesman on this Bill we appreciated the dilemma of the Government's position. On the one hand the Leader of the House protested to high heaven that this was not a Government measure. He criticized a few provisions in the Bill, but having done that he came vehemently to the defence of the whole Bill.

Why the dilemma? It is because certain precepts and principles have come to be accepted in this country even though some Hon. Members on the Government side only pay lip-service to them. I speak of principles such as the belief in individual freedom, belief in the equality of opportunity for all Guyanese, belief in democracy, in representative institutions, belief in the doctrine of separation of the Church from the State.

As I said, these things have been accepted, even though they are on occasions honoured mainly in the breach. That is why the Leader of the House, when speaking on this Bill said that he did not see in it anything about directions and he did not like the definition of a Pandit, that a Pandit must be a Brahmin, because this clearly denoted a rigidity, a position of caste, which does not permit of social mobility of the people who are Hindus.

On the one hand he shouts these things, but on the other hand, as one Hon. Member (Mr. Bhagwan) pointed out the Government is out to win political support and, therefore, it is prepared to throw these vital principles overboard. This is its position and this is why there is all the talk that Government is not sponsoring this Bill. Let us be clear about this. If the Government did not give its blessing to the Bill, it probably would not have reached here. If there was a free vote in this House - free vote, yes, with the terrorists behind! Our objection to this Bill stems from two fundamental positions, (1) what is being proposed is not a representative body to speak for the Pandits in this country, and (2) what is being proposed is an institutionalization of the caste system.

Now, let me deal with the first point. My colleague, Derek Jagan, has already pointed out the procedures by which this body got itself appointed. This reminds me of the way in which another Congress was railroaded in 1955 when an election was held and two P.P.P.'s were formed. Then we saw that when the General Election was held only a few members were present, and even they could not have been found at the crucial time. I have not heard anyone doubting this. If, according to Mr. Budhoo, there are 230 odd Pandits supporting this organisation, and if, according to the Minister, there are over 170 Pandits backing this organisation, why are they so afraid of having a democratic election?

A short while ago a name was mentioned here and I take the right to call the same name, Dr. Balwant Singh. He called me on the telephone and

said: "Doctor, the Hindu community is breaking apart. You are the person who can, perhaps, help to cement this breach. Call the two sides together. Have discussions with them." I said: "Look, I do not think I will be able to solve this problem because I understand that there are fundamental divergences of opinion." He said: "I understand the question has to do with who should speak in the name of the Pandits' Council. The Maha Sabha elements are saying that this body is not really representative of all the Pandits and it would seem to me that what is necessary is to bring all the Pandits together for a new election." Well, Dr. Balwant Singh said: "Try to find some solution outside of that." I then told him that this is the key question.

When I spoke to Reepu Daman Persaud, he indicated to me that as far as he was concerned, he was prepared to stay out of the election. I told Dr. Balwant Singh I would try, but I did not see that this question would be solved unless this democratic procedure was gone into. He then made the point – and I want to emphasise this – that those who are now to be incorporated did not want that kind of solution.

Now, if they have the support of all those Pandits – the figures were given yesterday – why are they afraid of having a new election, free and fair? If that is done there will be no disputation, there will be no need for this Bill because they can then decide what standard they want for Pandits, whether they must be drunkards or not. This must be decided democratically by them. This is the key question and what we are seeing in this Bill now is a small group of people, not representative of the majority of the Pandits in this country, trying to immortalize their names through the Legislature, as the Kitty Village Councillors tried to do with the street names the other day.

This is a big question in this country. In the trade union field, we have seen the question of democratic procedures and democratic elections plaguing this country for 15 to 20 years. Only a few days ago the waterfront was tied up on this issue. No procedure has been set out in this Bill as to who will be registered as Pandits, when they will vote and how they will vote. We know that these provisions can be made in the Pandits' Council's Rules and Requirements, and we also know the devious ways which, for instance, the officers of the M.P.C.A. used in order to maintain themselves in perpetuity, even though it is a known fact without question, that only a few persons want this union to represent them. These people should not come and tell us that provision will be made for elections annually, because the basic premise, as Dr. Balwant Singh admitted to me, is that they will not seek a solution to the division by means of a free and fair election. It is clear.

As to the Minister reading out names, we know the power of coercion that the Government has. I am not talking about the terrorists that it has. I am talking of the perks which it can give: creating Justices of the Peace, Marriage Officers, etc. Therefore, there are lots of people who will want to put their mouths where the soup is dropping. Let the Government hold

free and fair elections under a secret ballot. It will never do it.

I will now come to the next point: institutionalizing the caste system. We have heard, in this House, loud protestations by the Government against minority rule in Rhodesia. We have heard that the Rhodesians must take to arms. We have heard this in defence of people who are regarded as sub-human by the Smith fascist regime. We have heard support enunciated by the Government for the Negro struggle in the United States where Negroes are treated as second class citizens.

What is this? How different is that from the caste system where the "Chamars" and "the Untouchables" were regarded as beyond the pale? Was the way in which "the Untouchables" in India were treated different from the way in which the Negroes are treated in Southern USA, or from the way in which the Africans in South Africa or Rhodesia are treated? Is there any difference? Why then are we violating a principle which the Government holds dear? All men are created equal and all men must be given equal opportunities so that they can show what capacities they have, develop them to the fullest and rise according to their abilities.

It is true that Hindus, by and large, are Indians and that they came from India. We are living in Guyana and even in our environment religion is undergoing certain changes. We have seen where people from this country, who call themselves Pandits and all kinds of things, went to India but could not fit in, however strong was their emotional attachments, and they had to come back here because Guyana has evolved – the same people under different conditions, have become the impact of different cultures and so forth.

What is happening here? The President of this organization is deputing upon himself the right to speak not only for Pandits but for Hindus. Indirectly, this is what he is hoping to do. I should like to read a statement which appears in the Graphic newspaper:

*"Now, Mr. Sharma declared, we have seen a clerk of a big department store saying prayers for the Hindus."*

According to some of those reactionary elements in our society, we must go back to the old conception of caste. The Brahmins must be the elite; the others must do the dirty work and carry the filth. In other words, a man cannot be a "Pandit" if he is a worker. I am told that, in this case, this man is a Brahmin but he is employed at William Forgarty Ltd., and because he is a worker he is not entitled to read prayers for these Pandits. They will want exploiters like Deeroop Mahraj who cannot win one election on the Essequibo Coast. People like him are exploiting the Hindus the whole week and, on Sundays, they put on their dhotis and become big Pandits and Brahmins. But they are accepted.

A letter dated 16<sup>th</sup> December, 1966, calling upon certain Pandits to rally behind this Bill, was sent out by the President, on behalf of the Guyana

Pandits' Council. It states *inter alia*:

*"If this is considered to be the objection then we will now ask you to put your shoulders together to foster Brahminism in Guyana."*

One would have thought that we have evolved in this country. We have been told that, in India, the home of Hinduism, different reformist sects have come out to join the Buddhists, Arya Samaj and so on. We have seen that even in this country, under the impact of cultural, social and political pressures, changes have been taking place among the Hindus. A little while ago I was talking to a visitor from Trinidad and he mentioned that a man who is a "*Chamar*" is a big Pandit – not in the Arya Samaj – and he is accepted by many people.

I have it on good authority that certain people in this country, as a result of their experience, do not want certain people who have been foisted upon them as Pandits and Brahmins. So long as a man is the son of a Brahmin, some people are not concerned with whether he is a robber or a drunkard. Some people are doing this sort of things and they are still accepted as Brahmins. Even people who are not Brahmins have been accepted as Brahmins. These things are happening in this country. What is the question of worth?

We understand that one of the provisions of this Bill is to allow for examinations to be conducted to establish standards. Here it is not a question of more standards; it is not a question of whether my son or a Brahmin's son can reach the necessary standards to be able to interpret whatever may be in the scriptures, but it is a question that in this Bill the first prerequisite is that the person must be a Brahmin before the question of standards can be considered. This rule of Sanatan Dharam is like asking an anti-Marxist to tell the world what communism is.

The Sanatan Maha Sabha, faced with challenges from various sects, is also trying to reform itself in order to hold its followers – competition for souls! That is why the Sanatan Maha Sabha has been evolving. In India the Sanatan Maha Sabha is a very backward, reactionary organisation; it was responsible for murdering Mahatma Gandhi. He was not in agreement with the so-called concepts of the caste system, and the time came when it was felt that he was obstructing progress – what are we trying to do in Guyana today. In Gandhi's time, he fought against some of these dogmas such as relegating the untouchables to the lowest caste. There is no difference between this and what is happening to the Negroes in the United States. Gandhi fought against racialism in South Africa not only for the Indians but for the Negroes as well.

In India today changes are taking place. Faced with the colossal problem of mass starvation – millions of people are possibly facing death by starvation – a big fight is now going on between the modernists and those who are still living in the past. In their high places, they do not mind tak-

ing 60 per cent of the crop of a peasant for rent. Their religion teaches them to love one another, but they would not stop robbing the poor people. They would not want to touch millions of cows which are unable to produce milk or to be used as beef to feed the people who are starving. They are destroying millions of tons of grain when millions of people are starving in India.

What is on trial today is the people who call themselves religionists. In Rome, the Roman Catholic Church is in great travail today. Against the impact of certain world problems and certain forces which are leading to poverty – that is admitted on all sides – the Church had to go out of its way to create worker-priests, as was tried in Paris, only to find that the worker-priests became communists. It is a problem all over the world, and that is the cause of all of this misery.

While the capitalist apologists are now saying that too many people are being born and something should be done about the matter; the Church is being faced with a dilemma because all along the Churches were saying that there should be no birth control. Discussions are going on now as to whether there should not be a different approach to the matter. A high-ranking priest said the other day that the dogma of the Church is unnatural. The point which I want to make is simply this: religion like everything else has become institutionalized and it must move with the times.

We see movement in this country, movement in the Sanatan Dharma Maha Sabha. We see where they play a progressive role in this country unlike what happens in India where they play a very reactionary role. That is the reason why an attempt is being made now to split the community and to use religion – as Mr. Bhagwan so well put it – as a vehicle to win some political support.

I ask the Members of the Government not to enter into these short-term schemes because they can do lasting harm to this country. I was conversing with the Minister of Finance the other day and he had to admit that much of the troubles of today are due to the very incitement which they encouraged in this country. Don't think you can create a tiger and then hope to get off its back. If the Members of the Government have any principles, if they have any sincerity, then they cannot support this measure. This will not only take our country backward, but it can do a lot of harm. How can we talk about "*One people, one nation, one destiny*", when we are trying to institutionalize the caste system, while the people by practice, are breaking out of it. I know about this. My parents are devout Hindus. When I was growing up my mother could not hear anything outside of caste, or of intermarriage and such things, but she has changed in the last 25 years. I did not change her. It was the impact of new forces in Guyana. Twenty-five years ago when a marriage was being arranged great care would be taken to match one caste with another, male and female. This is all gone and if it is practised it is done in a very small way.

Whatever may be his motives, I think that when the President talks about

defending Brahmanism in this country he is doing great harm to Guyana. I am sure that the Government Ministers cannot accept this position that they will not decide that people, by mere status of birth, must hold certain positions. My friends have argued that this is even contrary to what is laid down in the Constitution. I ask the Members of the Government not to look for petty short-term gains. This will not succeed; it cannot succeed. It is going against the face of history. It has been tried in the past. There was a gentleman by the name of Abdul Majeed who was President of the Sad'r Islamic Anjuman. They worked on him and caused him to become a U.F. supporter. What happened to him? First, he lost his position as President of the Sad'r Islamic Anjuman and secondly, he became bankrupt.

There are more recent examples. At the last General Election G.A.I.L. was set up as a counter to the Hindu Maha Sabha. Its political arm was the Justice Party. As a counter to the Sad'r Islamic Anjuman, which had removed Majeed from the position of President, Hoosein Ghanie was brought in with G.U.M.P. What happened? We know the results of the elections. They won no seats even though P.R. was created on purpose to encourage that kind of splitting organization. Even collectively they did not win one seat.

If persons have any self-respect, or an understanding of reality, they will appreciate that this kind of thing will produce nothing. We are too far gone in Guyana to go back to these shoddy tricks. They are not going to produce the political results which the Government hopes for. Therefore, why try to bring in a reactionary device? This is religion we are quarrelling about. We are talking about establishing a caste system to prevent social mobility. We know that before the last General Election G.A.I.L., G.U.M.P. and the Justice Party received a lot of money and motor cycles were being shared out like peas. When somebody referred to the C.I.A. a short while ago the Minister said he was being irrelevant and asked what had that to do with religion. *"You haven't got any sense of decency?"*: that was how he put it, but exposures in the United States over the last few weeks have shown that the C.I.A. has no sense of decency.

The C.I.A. tried to subvert not only youth organizations, student organizations, research organizations – one headed by a so-called socialist – universities, and so on, but it also tried to subvert churches. The National Council of Churches in America received C.I.A. funds. Billy Graham the great evangelist, who goes all over the world, was named in *TIME* Magazine. The C.I.A. is using every organization all over the world to carry out its dirty work which is in defence of American imperialism to maintain the status quo.

The Minister told us that he is giving all religions equal radio time. He mentioned the Gandhi Youth Organisation. The Gandhi Youth Organisation is not a religious organization. It is supposed to be a cultural organization. Gandhi will be turning in his grave if he knew what is going on. The Minister did not tell the House that it was the P.P.P. Government which

gave equal radio time. It was the P.P.P. Government which allowed Hindus and Muslims to have a chance on Sundays. Yet we are always told that the P.P.P. does not believe in religion. Why have they done this?

The Minister talks about giving equal radio time to the Maha Sabha and the Gandhi Youth Organisation. Why this love all of a sudden? Perhaps he will tell us how is it that the Gandhi Youth Organisation gets money to buy drugs when Government cannot afford to buy drugs for the poor patients. How are they getting food and scholarships when other organizations in this country cannot get these things? How is it that the Maha Sabha, which is a far bigger organization so far as popular support is concerned, does not get these things? Where will the Pandits' Council get the money to establish a college? This Government is begging people to build self-help High Schools. These people think that Guyanese are fools. The Guyanese people have gone a long way. No doubt they have been fools. But, as Lincoln used to say, "*You can fool some of the people some of the time but not all the people all the time.*" They are waking up and I am not talking about Hindus only, I am talking about their own supporters.

In all seriousness, I ask this Government to withdraw this Bill. (All right, if you want to make a distinction without a difference we will do it for you. We will ask "*Pandit*" Trotman to withdraw this measure. The Government cannot, in seriousness, support this measure.) It is no use telling us that there will be a free vote because we know why that was done. The Whips are going around. There are things in this Bill which violate principles which we hold dear in Guyana, and, therefore, it is better to leave this matter to the people concerned.

The P.P.P. has the support of all the people. We do not tell the people that they must be Brahmins before they can become Pandits. This is a matter which will evolve and you should not put it in the Statute Book because, when you do that you harden it. When you harden it, it is very dangerous. I beg of the Minister who has spoken, to use his influence, either to ask the sponsors to withdraw this Bill or to bring it to a Select Committee so that if he has certain proposals we will at least be able to hear them and discuss them in full. The public should also know what is going on. While that is being done, perhaps some effort can be made to invite the Hindus through their Pandits.

If the Minister thinks that provision should be made for elections, then the elections that are due to take place in four months' time should be postponed. Government should take out the obnoxious sections of the Bill, call all the Pandits and let them elect their own representatives without any political interference. Then if it is still necessary, the Bill can be brought here. I, therefore, suggest that the Member who moved this Bill should withdraw it or take it to a Select Committee so that further consideration can be given to it.

In the meantime, efforts will be made to unify the Pandits in this country so that the Hindu religion will be on the same basis as other religions –

Christian and Muslim – and its affairs can be managed without interference by the State. The doctrine of separation of State from religion must be observed. We, who are politicians, should not try to create more divisions in our country. What we should do is try to bring about as much unity as possible, both on a religious and racial level, and the quicker this is done the better for all of us.

## Emergency Sitting of the National Assembly: 24<sup>th</sup> April, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** I spoke to you only yesterday on this very question. We do not object to the Government summoning the Assembly for an emergency meeting, but we think it was gross discourtesy on the part of the Government not to have consulted the Opposition and not to have intimated to us last Thursday, when the Assembly adjourned, that this meeting would be held. As you recall, Sir, the Assembly was adjourned last Thursday to Thursday next. For that reason I spoke to you yesterday, suggesting that this was not dealing with the Opposition in the manner with which it should be dealt and, indeed, it was a discourtesy to Parliament.

Yesterday, on your advice, I had a chat with the Leader of the House, by telephone. He promised to speak to me again by 11 o'clock. I have not heard from him since. I think that this is certainly not the way for this Assembly to be managed. We have no objection to meeting here in an emergency, but some of the Members of the Opposition live in remote areas and do not receive their Papers in time for us on this side of the House to have prior consultation on what should be our stand. Therefore, I wish to register a protest from this side of the House on the manner in which Government deals with Government business.

## Expulsion of Undesirables (Amendment) Bill: 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** I was hoping that Hon. Members on the other side of the House would have filled in the omissions on the part of the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs who introduced this Bill. We have been brought here in great haste, but the Hon. Minister has failed to tell this House and the nation what was the urgency in this matter.

There is no doubt that any Government must have powers to deal with people who intend to interfere with the security of the State. No one will deny this, but the Government, by consultation or pronouncement in this House, has not given a clear lead as to the matters which caused it to rush with apparent indecent haste during the last weekend to bring this Bill for debate today. One wonders what will be the extent to which this measure will be used.

Why is it that the Government has not brought, with the same haste, before this Legislature a Citizens Bill? Many months have passed since the Constitution was drafted. Surely the Hon. Minister of State and Attorney General must know, and the Government must know, even at the time of the drafting of the Constitution, that it was necessary to bring before this House a Citizens Bill. We have neither seen a draft of the Citizens Bill nor do we know whether it is in the embryonic stage.

We would not deny this Government any legitimate powers which it will require to deal with cases of emergencies such as a treasonable act or an act against the State, but I am of the opinion that the Government has not made out a case for this measure. If it were intended to include British subjects or Commonwealth citizens within the general umbrella of the law as it stands, then, perhaps, a simple Amendment should have been brought here to achieve that aim. That is not all that is being asked at the moment. We want to ensure not only that Commonwealth citizen should be brought within the purview of the law, but that the whole procedure by which persons can be expelled should be changed. Previously, one had to make an Order and to go through the normal procedures laid down in the law, but the Government now seeks to circumvent them.

It is strange that the Members of this Government, when in Opposition, conspired with people, not only to subvert the Government but to sell the rights of this country. Today the Government talks about expelling undesirables, but if there was a definition of "*undesirables*" I think that some measure could be brought before this House to expel the whole Government, for no one could have been more treasonable than the Members of this Government.

We have seen agents come to this country, one after another, in the name of trade unionists, in the name of research scholars, in the name of persons and now, at long last, the truth is coming out. Even the erstwhile friends of

Members of the Government, even right-wing forces such as *The New York Times*, *The London Times*, *The Daily Telegraph*, are now exposing the conspiracy in which they were engaged. Here is one clipping from *The London Times* of 16<sup>th</sup> April which says now, the C.I.A. got rid of Jagan. Money came here, thousands of dollars, hundreds of thousands of dollars to a C.I.A. front organization called the Gotham Foundation, which, I understand from this article, has now been wound up by Johnson's cleanup campaign. There was a Foundation channelling money through the Public Services International, whose agent was McCabe, who was very active during the 80 - day strike in Guyana.

It does not come well from the mouths of these people to talk today about expelling undesirables. The whole country has been sold to the Americans. Examine the policies of the Government. One sees the directing hand of the State Department in every single policy of the Government, be it domestic or foreign. This is the first thing the Government must try to clean up, this influence of a foreign country with a foreign ideology which is inimical to the interests of the people of Guyana.

That is why problems are now arising not only among Amerindians but among farmers and among workers. Only last week the Government refused to give guns and ammunition to its own supporters. Parrots are destroying the crops, wild animals are uprooting ground provisions. This is the dilemma in which Members of the Government are placed; they want production and the people need weapons to protect their lives and their crops, but the policies sponsored in Washington are ruining the economy of this country. Now, every week through their weekly papers' the Parties take opposite positions and hit out at each other. In this week's edition of *New Nation* we found the following stated in the editorial:

*"New Nation says a firm no to any proposal of Venezuela for joint economic development of the Essequibo region ...."*

*"We say no, because as the Trojans learnt to their cost, one should fear the Greeks, especially when they bring gifts. We say no, because it is clear that Venezuela's only interest in Essequibo is to acquire it, and joint economic development is one step for them towards their goal."*

If we turn to *The Sun*, we see the United Force calling for joint development of this region now claimed by Venezuela. We read in the *New Nation* that the O.A.S. is something that we must be worried about, that we must be guarded against, but we read in the *Sun* that the O.A.S. is something wonderful to join. No wonder this country is getting nowhere. Instead of progressing it is retrogressing. Instead of coming here with a tangible policy which can achieve not only success as far as the support of the people is concerned, but which appeals to intellectuals, the Members of the Government come forward, with a Bill like gunmen, like hold-up men.

Let us have powers to expel at will. This is precisely what is happening.

The Hon. Member Mr. Wilson is right; the Members of the Government are afraid of their own shadows. They are fighting shadows. I doubt very much that the intimidation which they are now practising against the Amerindians will help. A few days ago they brought an Amerindian captain from Kabakaburi to Georgetown for questioning. You know his name. How do they expect to win the support of these people? These people were their supporters and now they are trying to intimidate them. They are intimidating not only the small man at the bottom but even a Junior Minister of the Government. The Hon. Minister of Information (Mr. Bissember), have you dismissed him yet? I thought that he would have been dismissed already, as a result of what happened last Friday.

The day the Junior Minister made a statement, pressure was put on him. At least we see that some people have guts. The Hon. Minister of Information did not expect that the Junior Minister would have shown courage, so the same day that he wrote his lies in the newspapers, he was contradicted by the Junior Minister. Such deception is going on in this country today, even in high circles in the Government itself. That is not the way to power.

First you conspire with C.I.A. agents; then your fiscal and economic policies are being dictated by Washington; and now you are intimidating your own supporters from top to bottom. Taking power to intimidate people further, to threaten them, to expel them out of the country, would not solve the problem.

The Government says that you cannot be expelled if you are a citizen. Who is a citizen? We know how the Government deals with the Constitutional provisions which can be violated and circumvented in many ways. We have seen how the Government has interpreted many provisions in the Constitution. A person will test the Constitution in a court of law after he has been expelled from the country. That is the way to do it. We would not normally refuse to support measures giving such powers to the Government as it now seeks but, in view of all circumstances which I have mentioned, we cannot lend our support to this measure.

Division!

I beg to move an amendment to Clause 2 of this Bill. In the definition of "undesirable person", insert the words "or any person entitled to be registered as a citizen" between the words "citizen" and "of". The definition would then read as follows:

*" 'undesirable person' means any person, other than a citizen or any person entitled to be registered as a citizen of Guyana, in respect of whom the Governor-General deems it conducive to the public good to make an expulsion order; "*

As I remarked earlier, the Government has not brought before this House the Citizenship Bill under which a person who is likely or who could claim to be a citizen of Guyana could, on examination, be deemed to be a citizen. In the absence of the Citizenship Bill such a person will not have an oppor-

tunity to register as a citizen because the law has not yet been enacted. I, therefore, feel that it would be an injustice to such a person, if the Government were to use the powers it now seeks in the Bill before the House. I am sure the Government will use the powers in this Bill to expel people from the country. There are certain persons who really want to become citizens of Guyana as defined in the Constitution.

## Guyana Pandit's Council Bill (cont.): 27<sup>th</sup> April, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** I think it is written somewhere in the Bible that Jesus said, "*Many shall arise in My name and they shall deceive many*". It seems that in debating this Bill we have seen many such persons who, in the name of religion, seek to betray the people of Guyana.

Not too long ago I received a letter from someone who has not signed his name. Perhaps he is afraid of reprisals from the new Pandits Council. I think it would be interesting for this letter to be put on record. I refer to this because I know that today there is grave concern about where the country is heading. Day by day there are admonitions in the courts. Only the other day a magistrate told practitioners and prisoners that soon there will not be enough room in the gaol to house the prisoners. After increasing the penalty from three years to five years when someone appealed in a "*choke-and-rob*" case, the Chancellor threatened life imprisonment.

One would expect, therefore, that Ministers of the Government and persons who support the Government would begin to set examples to the people of Guyana so that they would follow and lead good lives. But we find no such thing. We see that Members of the Government – I would not say the entire Government because there is a big controversy about it – with the exception of one, are supporting this retrograde measure. Instead of going forward, they are going backwards.

The caste system is condemned among all civilized peoples, but our Government, the majority arm of which claims to be socialist, which wants to end exploitation of man by man, which is seeking to bring about world peace, is bringing back this retrograde practice which was dying out in this country and which we had hoped, in the fullness of time, would have died out completely. Who are the people who are going to be the leaders in the Hindu community? Who are the people who are going to be sitting examinations? Crooks and vagabonds!

This letter from Enmore is dated April 14, and it is addressed to me as Opposition Leader:

*"Dear Doctor,*

*So we are getting an ex-prisoner, who cheated the Government and got five years, as Pandits' Council Secretary, Pandit Oudit Narine Sharma. Please try your best to define a Pandit in the Bill."*

I have nothing against Mr. Sharma. If the Government has any sense of decency, how can it foist not only this abominable system of Brahminism, but people like these, on the members of the Hindu community? What kind of example are you setting? These people were set aside because of their

past, because of their records, and the Government now seeks to prop them up.

No wonder this country is going to the dogs! No wonder the Chancellor is threatening life imprisonment! But life imprisonment, fake parsons and priests, and Government's perpetual preaching will not help to solve the problems in this country. We have offered the Government our assistance. We will support anything good that it brings here. Today we go around the country supporting the Government's "*Buy Local*" campaign which is good thing.

[An Hon. Member (Government): You did that?]

**Dr. Jagan:** Yes, we did that. When I was Minister of Trade and Industry I went and drank Banks beer, although I do not drink beer, and I advised the people to drink Banks beer. I did not know that the head of that company would have robbed the Guyanese people and made 50 per cent to 60 per cent profit.

[Mr. D'Aguiar: You started a boycott.]

**Dr. Jagan:** Yes, because you were cheating the people.

We want this country to move forward. The Government must be aware of the grave dissatisfaction in this country, therefore we would like it to change its course as far as this Bill is concerned. I will ask the Government to exercise even though it is already late – an objective judgment and not to be bulldozed by orders. Let us delete these measures from this Bill.

## Loan to Guyana Electricity Corporation: 29<sup>th</sup> May, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** The Hon. Minister, in introducing this subject, indicated that one of the reasons for the Government having to come to the House for this sum at this time is due to the unfavourable terms of repayment which were negotiated by the past Government.

Now, I am sure that the Hon. Minister has all the papers, the files which contain the reports of Preece, Cardew and Ryder, consultants to the Guyana Government, past and present. In these Reports, elaborate charts, diagrams, etc., were given to show what was likely to be the profitability of this Corporation. Indeed, it was because of these figures which were cited by Preece, Cardew and Ryder that the P.P.P. Government embarked on the purchase of the Demerara Electricity Company at what was considered to be a very high price at that time. Preece, Cardew and Ryder indicated that this Government, after its acquisition of the company, would make a net profit of \$60 million in 20 years. Of course, this is what the Hon. Minister had his eyes on when he was thinking of purchasing the company.

The Minister is saying that Messrs. Preece, Cardew and Ryder never said so. Either it is ignorance, or a deliberate attempt to confuse the people. Let me produce the figures. It was on the basis of these figures and the high profits estimated to be made year after year that the people were willing to give the Government, through the Corporation, credit amounting to approximately \$18 million. The question of repayment of this loan was set aside one against the other so that there would have been a balance. It is not true to say that the past Government made an unfavourable deal as regards repayment of the loan. The people who lent the money are hard-headed businessmen who supplied materials, equipment, generators and so on. They were looking at the Balance Sheet as put out by Preece, Cardew and Ryder who are a reputable consulting firm.

If the Government finds itself in difficulties today it should not try to blame the past Government and say that it made an unfavourable financial deal. The Government must tell us why the Corporation is not making the estimated profits, which it should have made, to meet the loan repayments which the previous Government committed the Corporation to. That is what the Government should come and tell us; but we hear no such thing. We are given information in a vague and general way. The Corporation is being run in such a way today that there is additional expenditure and jobs for the boys. One was taken from the G.I.S., Mr. Carto and was put there probably at double his salary. No doubt this was to make room for one who has now become consultant with the G.I.S., Mr. Nascimento. So the corruption goes on in this country. Only today I had to issue a release on the position of Mr. Forsythe at the G.I.S. (Hon. Members do not like to hear

the truth.) Mr. Forsythe at the G.I.S. has far more experience in that kind of work. He has been in the Department for several years. He went to the same university as Mr. Nascimento; he got a better qualification and was offered a job as a professor, but he does not get the job as consultant. There is an adviser already at the Department, another protégé, Mr. Cholmondeley, the son of the Prime Minister's friend.

That is the kind of corruption and political patronage that is going on and that is why the Electricity Corporation cannot pay its way today. Concessions have been made to their friends and that is why the Corporation cannot pay. I am wondering whether this is not all a deliberate policy. I notice that the Trinidad Government which has been pursuing a policy similar to this has been getting the country into bankruptcy. Recently it dismissed the Financial Secretary and now public enterprises are to be sold. The Hilton Hotel and other Government-owned Corporations are to be sold because they are losing money. Maybe this is a strategy. They could buy it then.

When the government took office the Prime Minister, after he had met the Board, gave an indication that the Government was going to sell this Corporation because people knew the profits that it was likely to make. Now they are running it into bankruptcy deliberately so that they can come later on and say, like the Trinidad Government, *"Public enterprises cannot pay. Let us sell it."* The sharks will then move in. That is what is going on in this country. All this camouflage about coming to get loans and so on is only a move to cover up the rackets that are going on, the corruption and patronage. It is a disgrace to this country.

This was one of the most viable enterprises. The Minister of Finance knows this; all of them know it. The figures are there; let them produce the figures. Let them tell us why income has not come up to expectation as predicted by the consultants. The Corporation is expanding. It has gone in for rural electrification and this is supposed to be less profitable because of the extended lines. They have not gone in for what was earmarked in that scheme. In other words, it should have gone further. They have gone into a few places like the West Coast of Berbice, to help their political friends. They put it there whether the people can or cannot pay. It does not matter; they must keep the boys quiet. Jobs for the boys and keep the voters quiet.

This kind of corruption is going on in this country. It is a disgrace that a Corporation like this should be run in such a way that we will not get hold of this \$60 million in time to finance the further development of this country. They are sabotaging this so that they can come along and say, *"Public enterprises cannot pay. Let us sell the country to Yanks and investors from outside."* Already we are in a mess.

## Prorogation of Parliament

**Dr. Jagan:** I think, on balance, it can be safely said that this past year has been good neither for the people of Guyana nor for this Parliament. This country has certainly embarked on a course of breaking records. For the first time in the history of the country we were indebted to the banks at the beginning of the year; there have been a record number of strikes and an increase in the cost of living.

These are things which we all know about, but I should like to refer to the other record, the record in the number of suspensions of Standing Orders. I do hope that, in this respect, the next session will be much better than the past one. If I may use a colloquial phrase, Sir, you have had occasion to “pull up” the Government on its conduct of business in this House. I hope that you will keep those scales evenly balanced and that, particularly after your recent sojourn and course in the United Kingdom, you will be able to quote chapter and verse to the Leader of the Government on matters pertaining to how this Parliament’s business should be conducted.

It is true to say, in spite of the nice words just said by the Leader of the Government, that there were many stresses and strains during the past year in the conduct of our Parliamentary affairs. You know, Sir that we have had to see you privately on several occasions on questions pertaining to the day, such as Questions remaining unanswered.

Unfortunately this Parliament will be prorogating with about 75 Questions unanswered. We agreed some time ago that at least one day per month would be reserved for Members’ Motions. We have not seen that promise fulfilled. We are still waiting to have a Member’s Day Motion presented. If the Government is to conduct the affairs of the country under what it called “consultative democracy” then this is the place where it should be exercised and it should not present at the last moment what it wants to present and rush it through Parliament without the country or the members of the Opposition having time to consider the matter carefully. That is why, perhaps, Members’ Motions and Members’ Questions are necessary because, at least, they put the other point of view. Government should, therefore, honour the provisions which are made in the Standing Orders that one day per week, Wednesday, should be set aside for Members’ Motions except, of course, when there is urgent Government business.

We agree that the Government can forego this right of the Opposition when there is urgent Government business, but we have seen, time and time again, that when there is no business, the House does not meet. When there is business, we meet on Mondays and Tuesdays and then we meet again on Thursdays and Fridays. The Government studiously avoids meeting on Wednesdays which are to go to the Opposition.

I hope that, at the next session, all these positions which were certainly

not in fulfilment of pledges given and of Parliament's traditions and conventions as we know them, would be changed. I also hope that there would be no occasion for you to hear protests from us on this matter. I know that at times we have been rather heated in demanding our rights but we feel that Parliament is an important institution in our country and you, Mr. Speaker, are the repository of fair play in this House. I hope that we would not have the cause to speak in heated terms again, in this House.

## Consideration of Financial Paper: 28th August, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** I noticed, on reading the organ of the P.N.C. that there was a great deal of corruption taking place in the Ministry of Works and Hydraulics. I would, therefore, attempt to ask how much of this money which is being voted is to meeting losses due to corruption and not to satisfy the needs of the people? What investigations have been carried out by the Minister, personally, to deal with this question of corruption in the Public Works Department in the Ministry of Works and Hydraulics?

What investigations have been carried out by the Minister of Works and Hydraulics personally on this question of corruption in his Ministry? The Minister (Mr. Singh) did say something on the Essequibo Road, which is a matter I want to raise. I feel somewhat sorry for him because his colleagues on one side of the Government are attacking him. I was told only this morning that on his recent visit to Pomeroun and Charity he threatened to resign. He told the people in that district that he was mad about the road. He said, *"I came from Cameron and Shepherd and I can go back. I don't have to have this job"*. We are a little bit happy to hear that. The *"Pomeroonians"* will now know that something will be done. The excuse was always given that the past Government was responsible for this kind of thing. I heard the other day that when Members of the Government were giving this excuse, somebody said that the past Government introduced an air service to the Pomeroun district which is no longer carried on. There should be no excuses; he should get down to the business of doing what is necessary to be done so that those of us who have to travel on the roads and not by air, to meet the people can conveniently do so.

## Customs and Excise – Revenue Protection

**Dr. Jagan:** I should like to assure the Hon. Minister that we are not giving support to this, nor do we condone it, but from the figures which the Hon. Minister gave just now it is clear that this is a major industry. At least the people are showing more initiative than the Government in establishing industries in the country. Let us hope that the Members of the Government will not only use measures mainly for suppression and thus waste taxpayers' money. They are in the seats of Government now; they must initiate things; nobody can stop them now. They have power. Where are the industries? Where are the places where people can get jobs? Now, people are making bush rum; they are making guns; soon we will hear they are making other things.

The Government must be careful not to spend more and more money on suppression. Prevention must start at the bottom and the Government must initiate things. All over the country, no matter where one goes, there is this big problem of unemployment. Farmers cannot get good prices for their produce. They cannot get guaranteed minimum prices. Look at the vote for this year! How much was cut out from the vote for irrigation? How much was cut out from bonuses? How much from other things that could initiate development? What should be done to prevent these people from producing bush rum? As one Hon. Member said, you are spending more money and you are never going to catch them. The more you catch, the more you will have.

## Ministry of Finance – Accountant General

**Dr. Jagan:** The Government is treating this matter lightly. These figures tell a very serious tale. Clearly something is wrong. The Government estimated \$30,000 which would indicate the normal ebb and flow of recruitment, people leaving and people coming in. If, in addition to that normal expenditure, \$80,000 has to be voted now, then clearly something is very seriously and radically wrong with what is going on. The Prime Minister is just being flippant in this House. He would make this Assembly become a farce. Let us be serious for a change. Surely the Government must have some explanation for the Assembly, and for the nation. Why must there be a tremendous turnover? Is it that people are leaving because they are fed up, or because of discrimination, or because they are dissatisfied with salaries? Let us know; perhaps we may be able to help. While talking to the Chairman of the Public Service Commission I gathered that he is fed up. He has put up recommendations to the Government but he has heard nothing. The Government must tell us the reason why it has done nothing. It should take us into its confidence so that we can appreciate the problems which it is confronted with. We can appreciate the problems but the Government is running the place as if it is a fowl coop.

These figures tell a very sad story and the Government is merely being flippant by not trying to answer what is denoted in these figures. We deserve an answer. Why is there this big turnover? How many persons have left the Service this year? Surely, the Government must have the figures. Ask for them and let us have them.

## Gratuities to Non-Pensionable Officers

**Dr. Jagan:** I should like to speak on Item 63 – Gratuities to Non-Pensionable Officers etc. Am I to understand that this relates to people who work in the Public Works Department on Sea Defences and so on and who get a gratuity if they work for seven or eight consecutive years? I wonder whether this is the category which this Item relates to. It seems then that these figures tell another tale because, normally, there would have been a certain amount of persons, which the Government estimated for, leaving the service in one year. The Government made an estimate of \$100,000 but, having got rid of so many people; it had to come back for an additional provision of \$50,000 because it had to pay pensions and gratuities long in advance of the anticipated time when those persons would have left the service.

I should like to know whether this additional provision of \$50,000 has become necessary because of the retrenchment of about 1,000 persons within the last year. Let us hear what is the explanation? It would be a good thing, on these occasions, for the Minister to get up and give an explanation before we speak. We do not want to hear our voices. Let us hear what he has to say and, if necessary, we will say something. We have to ask, dig and attack, and even then we do not get answers.

## Ministry of Information

**Dr. Jagan:** Under this Head – Ministry of Information – an additional provision of \$24,850 is now sought, whereas the voted provision was only \$5,000. It is stated in the legend that this is to provide for increased publicity in connection with the Development Programme. I understood that we were dealing with a Capital Budget. I should like to know from the Minister what piece of equipment this money was intended or used to buy. Or is it just intended to buy extra duplicating paper? The legend seems to indicate that it is more paper. If it is more paper, surely it should go in the Recurrent Budget! We know that the Government likes to juggle capital and recurrent so as to make it appear that the Budget is balanced. While the money is to be spent on development, we are not getting development but pure propaganda.

I should like the Minister to tell us what this money is to be spent on. Is it going to be spent on capital equipment or just on paper? Or is it going to be used to pay consultants like Mr. Nascimento big salaries? Mr. Nascimento is now paid \$800 a month. He is paid more than the most expert person in the department, a person whom, I understand, was trained in the United States at the same college that Mr. Nascimento went to, and who got a teaching job at the institution because he was better qualified. Mr. Nascimento was manager of the *Daily Chronicle*, but when it folded up, because he was a member of the United Force, a place had to be found for him. He is given a travelling allowance of something like \$120, to go from his home to his office. This is a disgrace! And if all of this is added to arrive at this sum, then the country should rebel against this. This is a racket that is going on! This is not capital expenditure, this is a political racket! It is time that the people start 'raising hell' in this country! I ask the Minister not to give us a philosophic answer, this is material.

Clearly, from what the Minister said, this should go into the recurrent programme, this is not development. It does not mean that because something is going to publicise development, it is development. When we talk about development, we want something concrete, something which can contribute to the Gross Domestic Product or the national income of the country. This is something to throw away – paper. This expenditure should go in the Recurrent Budget. The Government can spend all the money it wants on information, but put it in the right place. Do not fool the people. Put it in the right place so that at the end of the year the public will know how bankrupt this country is. When you have a deficit do not hide it as you did earlier this year in the Budget by taking grants from the United Kingdom and elsewhere, and putting them in recurrent expenditure when they should have gone to development. You are now taking recurrent expenditure and putting it to development.

I said that money given as a grant or grants, for the purpose of development – to buy and produce tangible things – was allocated to the Recurrent Budget. It was in your Budget Statement for this year. The point I want to make is that the income was inflated and, therefore, the balance which was shown was not a real balance. In other words, what was shown in the Budget as a small surplus should really have been quite a big deficit. If this, and other expenditures such as this, had gone to the Recurrent Budget, they would have shown a bigger deficit. But the *Times* and the *Daily Telegraph* cannot say Guyana is doing well if there is a deficit Budget.

The Minister of Information has made a clear statement. I think that the officers who know about this – I know that they are sometimes told what to do about such information – should take it back to the right place. That is all I am saying.

I wonder if I can come back to the item dealing with Publicity. I should like to ask the Minister whether the sum being asked for is likely to be the sum needed for the whole year. I am concerned about this. We have now created a Ministry of Information and no Minister wants to administer a Ministry that has no money.

I should like to say that once you set up a Ministry, expenditure automatically will grow. This country is too poor to waste a lot of money on information services. We saw this during the time of the Interim Government. When the period was over there was nothing to show.

The Government had better rethink its whole strategy and tactics for development. More publicity is not going to fool people. This is certainly an extraordinary amount. I am not quite sure what the past votes were, but every attempt was made in our time to keep down expenditure. In fact, because the staff was big, we were economizing and waiting for people either to retire or go out so that the staff should be further reduced and expenses under this Head would also be reduced.

We had Information under the Prime Minister but having now created a separate Ministry, I am afraid there is going to be more and more expenditure of this kind, which this country cannot afford.

I say that the Government can go ahead and spend this money and do as it likes, but this kind of money is going to be wasted while it could be spent on producing things that are more necessary.

## Loans to Guyana Rice Marketing Board

**Dr. Jagan:** The Minister is not very clear. My colleague asked whether the Legend on page 5 is wrong. It states that:

*“...due to losses suffered by the Company in the past two years.”*

It seems that this should be the *“Board.”*

Now, I come to the \$2 million for the Rice Development Corporation and the \$8 million for the Rice Marketing Board. In view of the fact that the Government, in the person of the Prime Minister, has announced the proposed merger of the Rice Development Corporation and the Rice Marketing Board, I should like to ask whether it is intended that, when this merger takes place, the losses which are being sustained now by the Rice Development Corporation will be passed on to the farmers? I am not speaking only of the annual working losses but also of the \$5 million debt which the Corporation owes to the Commonwealth Development Corporation. In other words, I am asking for a clear and unambiguous answer as to whether the losses suffered by this Corporation, or any loans made to this Corporation will now be transferred to the producers who sell their paddy to the Rice Development Corporation, or their rice to the Rice Marketing Board? We would like to know clearly what is the Government's intention on this matter.

This Government is squandering the taxpayers' money right, left and centre. We have just referred to the case of Nascimento. Now the Government's liability is to be passed on to the farmers in this country. They are on their way to ruining the farmers. All over the country the farmers – even their own supporters in Dartmouth and Hope Town – are now... This is not only a disgrace, it is robbery committed on the poor people by a Government which has assumed power by force and fraud, and with the help of the C.I.A. Do not take the power to such extreme limits. Do not stretch it so much. Why can you not ask Uncle Sam or the Commonwealth Development Corporation to give you the money? The Commonwealth Development Corporation is a British organization. Ask it. You want to pass it on to the taxpayers. If you have to find more revenues by taxation, then you must tax both the *“small”* people and the *“big”* people. But you should not pass on all the taxation to the poor people who have already had a fall in take-home pay.

Surely the Prime Minister knows that if the Government has this liability it must raise money by way of the Budget or cut down expenses. If you do not want to have additional taxation, then trim the Budget. The Government does not want to do this; it wants to give jobs to its boys, to have a lot of round pegs in square holes, like Nascimento and others. Now it wants to fleece the poor. I warn them.

## Protest by Leader of the Opposition

**Dr. Jagan:** I should like to make an observation. I do not like the way the Leader of the House is conducting the business of this House. Last week, very early in the week, I got in touch with him and indicated to him that my Party had a very important meeting on Friday evening. He gave me, not an undertaking, but the impression that he was going to consider my request to adjourn at 6.30 p.m. On Thursday, in the lobby, he categorically stated that if the business was not finished at 6.30 p.m., we would go on to seven o'clock. We agreed. I was not here but I understand that we adjourned and he continued after eight o'clock. Today he wants to stop the proceedings of the House at this time. We must be told what the wishes of the Leader of the House are. I think it is common courtesy, if the Members of the Opposition have an important meeting, for the Government to meet the request. While we did not want the Guyana Citizenship Bill to be delayed for any long period, surely from Friday to Monday would not have made that much difference to the passage of that Bill.

It is evidence of noncooperation, and not only noncooperation. The House is being handled without consultation and only just as the Minister pleases. This is ridiculous. If he wants to adjourn today at 6.30, he should have informed us because the rule says that we should go on until 9 o'clock. I object to the way in which the Leader of the House is conducting the business of this House. He should have informed us out of courtesy.

## Award of Honours: 30<sup>th</sup> August, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** The award of Honours by Her Britannic Majesty has always been a matter of concern to me and my Party. In many parts of the world, during colonial days particularly, one found that the majority of cases, these Honours were mainly used for the purpose of dividing and ruling, of bribing and corrupting and ruling. At one time, the Indian Congress Party ruled that all who had such awards should renounce them. The famous poet, Rabindranath Tagore, because of British brutality in the Punjab when the Punjabis, who were in a passive demonstration calling for the Independence of their country, were fired upon, gave up his Knighthood and this was followed by the Congress Party denouncing and renouncing all such Honours.

We have seen in our country in colonial times that these awards were given to some of the most reactionary elements, conservative to the bone, who defended and propped up colonialism. It was a way of life to work for these Honours – men serving colonialism. Today, Guyana is a politically independent country and the time has come for us to clean up the cupboards. Indeed, the major Party of the Coalition has set up a Decolonisation Institute and it would seem that while it is considering economic matters, questions of personnel, attitudes and so forth, it should also give consideration to this question which I have set out in this Motion.

In this Motion, I have asked the House firstly, to request the Government to cease making recommendations to Her Britannic Majesty for the granting of such awards in the future; secondly, that if recommendations have already been made for the grant of such awards, that these should be withdrawn; thirdly, that official recognition of such awards cease forthwith; and fourthly, that a committee representative of all interests in the community, should be set up, a controlling national body, to consider and to make recommendations for the award by the State of Guyana of appropriate awards to Guyanese citizens, and indeed, to others who may serve as well. The time has come when, even in the United Kingdom, some of these anachronisms are dying out.

We have seen in the post-independence period in some of the Commonwealth countries that they have also taken this step of abolishing this practice. They now give their own awards and the basis of selection is now put on a different footing. They give awards to people who distinguish themselves in arts, literature, labour and so on. More and more recognition is given to these types of persons, not to those who stooge. We have seen in socialist countries, for instance, that the ordinary people, the workers are given medals; they are made heroes, the State recognises them, the people recognise them.

This Government is placing a great deal of emphasis on productivity.

The TUC is talking a great deal about productivity. Well, whatever goals the Government and the community aspire to, could then be taken into consideration and suitable awards could be made to those who have made accomplishments in the various fields. On this question, I do not think there should be much doubt and hesitation on the part of the Government. This is a national question. While we may differ, and differ very sharply, on such questions as economic policy, trade policy or fiscal policy; but on this question, which is a national one, I do not think there should be any disagreement and division. Therefore, I do not want to speak any longer to delay the business of this House. I urge Hon. Members to support this measure which I have moved in the form of the Motion tabled under my name.

We have taken note of the contribution made by the Hon. Prime Minister in making an amendment. As one speaker pointed out, it seems that the Government is merely trying to get away from facing the problem and, as usual, defers grappling with the situation by appointing a committee.

We suggested in the Resolve Clauses 1, 2 and 3 certain definite things and these are taken out. In other words, the teeth of the whole matter are extracted. It is something like the statement made by the Ambassador from Zambia to the effect that the British bulldog is toothless. It seems that, in Guyana, we have a toothless Government.

I have come down to grappling with the problems. The Prime Minister has raised the question of composition of the National Committee. I do not think at this point that I can just say "X", "Y" or "Z". As one Hon. Member pointed out, great care should be taken to decide on this since there are so many difficult and sometimes conflicting interests in our community, and in some cases some organizations attempt to speak for the same interests.

I would suggest that, in view of the remarks which were made, it may be wise on such an issue since it is necessary to have national consensus, for the Government and Opposition to be equally represented in such a body so that one could avoid this question of who should be represented for a particular type of interest.

We know that the Government sponsors organizations like the Pandits' Council, so while I appreciate the point that the political parties may not speak in such detail as the representative organization itself, I would suggest that if these awards are to mean anything, if they are to be recognised and respected, this matter should be left for consultation between the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition.

But the Prime Minister should not deal with this question as high-handedly as he dealt with the formation of other public bodies such as the Public Service Commission. We had to point out in the House last week that it is because of his partisanship in this matter that the Civil Service Association has become very critical of the Public Service Commission.

On one occasion, I reminded him that when he was in the Opposition he had suggested at the Independence Conference that in bodies such as this,

the Government and the Opposition should be represented equally. But, having got in the Government, he departs from this.

As I said, I hope the Prime Minister will, in the fullness of time, recognise the mistake, and if he is really interested to see this country go ahead, if he wants this country to move forward, then I think this matter should be resolved by a consensus in the full sense of the word; not a consensus just for the purpose of observing what the Constitution states, but for the purpose of achieving the end result.

Having said that, I should like to state our position on the Amendments. We will agree with the deletion of the second and third paragraphs of the preamble to the Motion. We do not agree with the second item, that is, the deletion of the First, Second and Third Resolve Clauses of the Motion. We feel that those are specific objections which we must grapple with now. Therefore, I will propose an Amendment which will be for the deletion of the last Resolve Clause and the substitution of what the Prime Minister suggested, so that the new Amendment to his Amendment will read as follows:...

There has been, as the Prime Minister said, some meeting of minds but I am afraid that it was not complete. In other words, we agree that the Third Resolve Clause in the original Motion which reads: *"That official recognition of such awards do cease forthwith"* should be taken out; that the Second Resolve Clause should remain, but we disagree about the First Resolve Clause. The Prime Minister wants to limit it to the grant of awards pertaining to the Order of the British Empire, which means mainly the M.B.E., O.B.E., and C.B.E. We feel that the others should come in too. We are not talking now of QCs; we are talking of such others as C.M.C., K.C.M.G., G.C.M.G. and any other form of knighthood.

We would like to accept what the Prime Minister has suggested as regards the Second and Third Resolve Clauses, but the First Resolve Clause should read as follows:

*"Be it Resolved that the Government of Guyana cease making recommendations to Her Britannic Majesty for the grant of the following awards:*

*M.B.E.,  
O.B.E.,  
C.B.E.,  
C.M.G.,  
K.C.M.G.,  
G.C.M.G.,*

*and any other form of Knighthood."*

In other words, we are just going a little beyond where he is. I should like to read what would be an Amendment to his Amendment:

*“Whereas Guyana is now a politically independent State; Be It Resolved that the Government of Guyana ceases making recommendations to Her Britannic Majesty for the grant of the following awards:*

*M.B.E.,  
O.B.E.,  
C.B.E.,  
C.M.G.,  
K.C.M.G.,  
G.C.M.G.*

*and any other form of Knighthood.”*

## Motion on Recruitment to the Police Force: 5<sup>th</sup> October, 1967

**Dr. Jagan:** The Minister of Home Affairs (Mr. John) in his speech yesterday queried the decision of the People's Progressive Party to boycott the sittings of the International Commission of Jurists. One would have thought that with developments since the time of the sittings of this Commission, that the Government would have hung its head in shame rather than rebuke the P.P.P. for boycotting the sittings of this Commission. The Minister seems to be oblivious of the fact that the I.C.J. is an instrument of the C.I.A. even though this was publicized both here and abroad. For his and for the benefit of those who like to cover their deeds with a lot of noise, I would like to put the record straight. Mr. Benenson, the Secretary General of Amnesty International, early this year charged that the I.C.J. was in receipt of C.I.A. funds. And he should know because the Chairman of Amnesty International is the Secretary General of the I.C.J. He made it very clear that because of this connection between the C.I.A. and the I.C.J., he was asking Mr. McBride, the Secretary General of the I.C.J. to resign as Chairman of Amnesty International. This information, though in public print, has not been denied by Mr. McBride yet these gentlemen continue to exist as if nothing has happened and they had the gall to question us for not appearing before this bogus organization.

Listen to the logic of the Leader of the House. No wonder he was demoted to his present position!

In the Hon. Minister's reply, the point was made that the I.C.J. was not a technical body and, therefore, what was said need not be implemented. But the Government made it appear to the whole world that it was going to implement the recommendations of the I.C.J. That was the general impression given to the world. In order to excuse itself for not implementing the recommendations, we are now told that the I.C.J. was not a technical body. That was the second reason.

Why did we refuse to appear before the Commission? At the time, we said that we were dissatisfied with the terms of reference of the Commission because the Commission was coming to Guyana to ascertain whether it was necessary for the Police and Security Forces to represent a broad cross section of the Guyanese population. We made it clear that that was not the question which was in doubt. As long ago as the 1960s it was taken for granted by the British Government authorities – I believe a Police Adviser came here in 1960 – that wherever there are multiracial societies, the Police and Security Forces should reflect a broad cross section of the particular country's population. That concept was accepted by the P.P.P. Government, it was accepted by the British Government, and it was accepted as a matter of principle in most countries, except by the Minister of "terror", Mr. Jordon.

We heard the Minister saying that the British Government cannot dictate to this Government. We are not saying that the British Government should dictate to this Government. What we are saying is that before this Government assumed office, it was agreed between the P.P.P. Government and the British Government that steps would be taken to see that the Police and Security Forces reflected a broad cross section of the Guyanese population. When I saw Mr. Greenwood in London soon after he assumed office, I gave him all the facts leading up to this decision, plus the Report which was issued by the Security Branch of the Police Department, and which was called the Research Paper on the P.N.C. Terrorist Organisation. Those documents were put in Mr. Greenwood's hands in order to convince him of the necessity of taking steps to implement, as quickly as possible, the decision that the Security and Police Forces should reflect a broad cross-section of the country's population. The Minister asked if we were going to knock off all the boys. Let me say here and now that that was never the intention.

Some time ago the then Commissioner of Police had written a Report in which he stated that it was necessary to strengthen the Police Force by an additional 500 men. There was also the question of the Guyana Volunteer Force, the recruits of which, as you know, were mainly from Georgetown, New Amsterdam, Wismar and Mackenzie. It was felt at that time, since we were thinking of having one army, the Volunteer Force should be expanded from 500 men to 600 men, and then to 1200 men, to act as a supplementary Force to the Security Forces, and, thus, what was desirable could have been achieved.

The Minister asked how was that to be done and where was the money to come from. I put it to the British Government that, because there was a necessity to have this done, because it was agreed to in principle by the British Police Adviser who came here, they should try to find the money to help Guyana to carry out the change. The money did come, but these people having run the country bankrupt, as they did this year... This year we have seen where grants and loans, given by the British Government to this Government for Independence, have been used not for development purposes but to balance the Budget. They have squandered the money which should have been used for purposes such as that and they now come and say, "*Where are we going to get the money?*"

You people can try to fool the masses, but they always come out right in time. Noise does not fool anybody. Beating empty drums make a lot of noise but they are empty nevertheless. The Minister says now that the Guyana Government agreed to implement the I.C.J. recommendation with a little proviso – "*subject to funds being available*". The first point to be noted is that the Government has taken the funds which should have been used for this purpose to balance the Budget. We will see what funds you are going to divert to balance the Budget this year.

Secondly, they asked what recommendations we had put up. We didn't

say, like the I.C.J., that there should be a 75 per cent intake of Indians and others 25 per cent. We didn't say anything like that. The Governor produced a Report, which the Commissioner of Police has, in which it was shown how gradually the imbalance could have been corrected over a period of time. The Governor in his Report pointed out that in five years, by the method he was suggesting, the number of Indo-Guyanese in the Police Force would increase from about 17 per cent to about 30 per cent, if I remember the figures correctly.

I expressed the view that I didn't think that was fast enough and what I was requesting of the British Government to do was to provide a technical man, or technical men, who would come here prior to Independence to work out a formula which the British Government would be committed to carry out. That was agreed to by Greenwood.

It was agreed that the British Government would appoint technical men who would come and examine the problem in all its ramifications in order to achieve the objectives which have been stated, but when these people assumed office they did not want to carry out this intention and consequently they brought the I.C.J. The American Ambassador must have been consulted; the American Ambassador must have got in touch with the C.I.A. and the I.C.J., the International Commission of Jurists, a great body of International repute, with wonderful bona fides, a body which was entrée to the United Nations, was hand-picked, as they themselves pointed out. This, it was said, would be the body which would give the stamp of approval.

Now, Sir, these were the reasons why we boycotted the Commission: First, because the job which was supposed to be done was a technical job, namely, to examine how the police and security forces would reflect a cross-section of the community. If the Government had any honourable intentions of carrying out this proposal then it would have agreed to the pledge which had been given by the British Government that a technical body would be set up, but the Hon. Members were the Government and they didn't want to carry it out. The principle was there, whichever Government was in office, but this Government didn't want to implement the principle. The Government told Greenwood, "*We are not prepared to honour the pledge given to the previous Government*". As a result of it, the I.C.J. came into the picture. No doubt the C.I.A. which helped to put this Government in office also helped to bring the I.C.J.

The I.C.J. made its Report. We did not plead. We did not go to the members of the I.C.J. and say: "*Do so and so.*" But this was where the whole fraud of the operation came in. The Members of the I.C.J., knowing that the Government will never implement their recommendations, put out what appeared to be good recommendations. It was publicized all over the world that the Guyana Government has honourable intentions to carry out these wonderful recommendations. It was publicized in the *New York Times*. And other reporters wrote that the Government is doing everything to solve the racial problems, and so on and so forth. The I.C.J. mission was mainly a

propaganda device to give the Government an opportunity to parade before the world knowing that the Government need not carry out the decisions afterwards.

Our intention had been that a technical body would have come and examined the problem, would have made its recommendations, and the British Government and the Guyana Government would have committed themselves to a set of procedures which they would have begun implementing. But it is clear that the Government had no intention of doing anything except to use the I.C.J. Report as a propaganda weapon.

Ministers ask, sitting in their chairs: "*Why didn't you do these things when you were in the Government?*" Perhaps I can ask them if they read the article in the *Sunday Times* of April 27 about Duncan Sandys, Harold Macmillan, two top security men in Britain, and a number of British officials in British Guiana, which no doubt included the Governor and the Commissioner of Police. If the Governor, the Commissioner of Police, Duncan Sandys and Macmillan were taking orders from America, could I fire the Commissioner of Police? These ignoramuses say I could.

The position is clear. When we were in the Government those who were in charge of the Police and security forces did not cooperate with the Government of the day because it was necessary to give some excuse for not allowing British Guiana to proceed to Independence under the P.P.P. Government. Obviously, the excuse was to have disturbances, racial riots and so on. Not only did we not have the cooperation of the security forces but those who were in charge of them never intended to see that the Police and security forces should not be a political arm of any political party or any Government.

When we talk of the Police and Security Forces representing a broad cross-section of the country, we are not here talking about race. What we are talking about is the political neutrality of the service – the Police and the armed forces – and in a country like Guyana, where we have seen how politics have turned, it was definitely necessary to see that this principle is implemented. But what do we find? We find that not only is lip-service paid to the recommendations of the I.C.J. Commission but we see in actual practice what is happening today.

The Minister told us of intake in 1966. What the Minister did not tell us what is usually hidden behind the statistics. It is like the big propaganda campaign that the Government is carrying out on the 8% increase in the Gross Domestic Product which, when you analyse it, boils down to nothing. You can give figures, but what is happening behind the figures? Discrimination comes in at the first stage. At the second stage pressure is put on people to leave. There is a saying that there are many ways to skin a cat and the Government practices many ways to skin a cat.

This Government takes people it does not like and pushes them out in the Interior or somewhere else. If the Members of the Government were so honourable in their intentions, how is it that Mr. Felix Austin's head was

rolled? If they were not interfering with the Police Force to make it a political arm of the P.N.C., how is it that Mr. Austin's head was rolled?

You can tell people that intake was so and so but the proof of the pudding is in the eating. What is of importance is to see the reality outside.

The reality certainly is that the Government is doing everything to create a police and a security force which will be the political arm, not only of the Government, but of one section of the Government. This, no doubt, is another reason the Coalition seems to be growing overstretched. We are not stupid. It is very clear to everyone that this Government sits on a very slender support, 40 per cent of the electorate for this side of the House and 12 per cent for the other – 52 per cent. They do not go into the country any more; they are afraid because they know that the extra 2 per cent over the 50 per cent has gone long ago, so we see attempts to rig Elections, attempts to bypass not only the Elections Commission but even such bodies as the Public Service Commission and the Police Service Commission.

Subverting the Constitution – this is what the Government is doing at the moment because basically it knows that it will not be able to win a majority. It is a matter laid down in the Constitution. It is like the Americans holding elections in Vietnam according to the Geneva Agreement. Mr. D'Aguiar, the Leader of the United Force, according to a report in the newspapers, said: "*We do not want any voting machines.*" He said so; so what happens? The Ministers come and make all kinds of declarations but the proof is seen in these little things and big things, heads rolling because the Commissioner refuses to carry out orders to promote "X", "Y" and "Z".

At one time it was necessary to keep the United Force within the Government, but now its supporters are feeling, perhaps, "*we have been left out*". But when the reading of the Voters' Lists takes place and when the voting machines begin adding, dividing, multiplying and subtracting, then they will be sure. No wonder the Untied Force sees the handwriting on the wall. Clearly, this Government, like Marshal Ky in Vietnam, is planning to stay in power with minority support and to do this, it is working up support whereby the police and security forces will be not only pro P.N.C. but 100 per cent – not a cipher of dissent.

We were talking about Felix Austin who, the P.N.C. thought, was good enough to be promoted to the post of Commissioner of Police after bypassing two senior persons. But because he refused to carry out orders from Congress Place, the Prime Minister's Office and the Office of the Minister of Home Affairs, his head was rolled. We would like to advise the Government that this is no way to achieve progress, prosperity and peace in Guyana.

What is the point in talking about efficiency when the Government is putting square pegs in round holes? How is the Government going to get efficiency? Forty-four per cent of the Budget is being concentrated on maintaining the bureaucracy. In most countries it is only 33 per cent. This figure will continue to rise if the Government does not change its ways. I do

not know if the Government has noted figures but I believe that is why Mr. D'Aguiar has bailed out of the sinking ship. Whatever may be his shortcomings, Mr. D'Aguiar knows figures more than some of the persons who are in association with him. The Government has allocated 44 per cent for personal emoluments, 16 per cent for debt charges making a total of 60 per cent – two Heads, first priorities. Forty per cent is allocated for all the things which are necessary – health, education, pensions, subsidies, guaranteed minimum prices.

Everywhere in the country we are hearing the cry: "*We have nothing.*" The Government says it has no money. If the 40 per cent is not enough today, you should ask Mr. D'Aguiar what the position will be in a few years' time. Assuming that you maintain the bureaucracy at 44 per cent, your debt charges are mounting like a kite. Soon they will reach 30 per cent. Where will you be then? If you add 44 per cent to 30 per cent you will get 74 per cent, leaving 26 per cent. If 40 per cent is not enough today, how will 26 per cent be enough in a little while?

Production is not increasing in the country; agriculture is going down; industry is stagnant. You may depend on bauxite now, but how long is bauxite going to continue at the rate of expansion that has been going on over the past few years? Mr. D'Aguiar has seen the handwriting on the wall. He bailed out.

But you do not want to run the Government honourably, you are only concerned with one thing and that is to stay in office and draw fat salaries. You do not care. The position cannot be improved by pious appeals for efficiency. There will be no peace and there will be no progress. As Minister of Labour and Social Security, you know that there have been 146 strikes in 1965, 162 strikes last year and 57 strikes to the end of April this year. Threatening to ban strikes and calling for voluntary arbitration will not solve anything. There will be no peace and progress in this country with that kind of instability.

I conclude by saying that this Government brought the International Commission of Jurists here and if it wants peace and progress in this country, it must honour its commitments, not only to the Guyanese people, but to the whole world.

## Approval of Estimates of Expenditure: 10<sup>th</sup> January, 1968

**Dr. Jagan:** "Confounded" is a better word. I should like the Government to operate on the basis of how things are supposed to be operated. The Public Service Commission we are told is supposed to be independent.

It is independent, the Prime Minister says. Then, why is it after all these assurances were given by these people that something would be done because of the great shortage of doctors, yet up to now nothing has been done?

Before I went abroad, which was about three months ago, I wrote to the Chairman of the Public Service Commission pointing out to him that this person has secured registration. A letter was sent to me in my absence to the effect that the matter was being investigated. I presume that up to now it is still being investigated. That is how frustration is growing in this country. That is why we cannot get things moving.

The Prime Minister says it is a matter of eligibility and suitability. Clearly this is not the case so far as this appointment is concerned.

Here is another example of no stops being taken because of the fact that the Prime Minister made a statement many months ago that those who went on P.P.P. scholarships to the socialist countries will not get employment in this Public Service. When I made this point to the Public Service Commission I was told that the Public Service Commission is not aware of the statement, it does not concern the members of the Public Service Commission, and it will not influence them.

So far as the other people who had applied are concerned, the question is merely one of evaluation. I submit that the Public Service Commission is not as independent as the Prime Minister wants us to believe and that it is subject to orders. If this is so, we would suggest that this institution be abolished. We are prepared to agree to an amendment to the Constitution and let all the appointments be made through what is called the Public Service Ministry or through the Prime Minister's Office. If we dispense with this farce we would save a lot of money. There is a lot of expenditure which is needed and we are told that the Government has no money. In our view, it is better for us to dispense with this farce and let appointments be made through the political arm of the Government, the P.N.C.

The Prime Minister tries to deceive the House. He says \$13,000 or more was spent in 1964. Clearly, he is not comparing like situations for we see in these estimates a figure of \$6,977 being actually spent in 1965. Is the Prime Minister telling us that the P.P.P. spent more than the Government spent in 1965? This is ridiculous. The P.P.P. has three Private Parliamentary Secretaries in all and what the Prime Minister is referring to - the expenditure of \$13,000 - includes what he has put under a separate Head, Public Relations Officer to the Prime Minister, and therefore it is obviously not com-

paring like situations. From three Private Parliamentary Secretaries who were working with the P.P.P., the number obviously has increased to a very large number and that is why the expenditure of \$6,977 in 1965 has increased to \$14,694. Clearly, this House must know how many of these political appointments have been made and what is their rate of salary.

We have not seen any yet under this Head. Perhaps the Minister would point them out to us as he was good enough to do in some cases yesterday.

The point I want to make is that I remember some years ago, that is, in the colonial period, there was a vote for social assistance but the vote was consumed by the number of people who were doing the investigation. I am speaking of the days when the Hon. Prime Minister used to be opposing the colonial regime. The same thing is happening now: money which is supposed to be spent on improvements - all over the country roads are in a state of disrepair, health and water conditions are bad. This is where you need to help people and to give them a push start.

The Government has no money. There were to be a lot of Independence projects; now the signboards are falling down. There is no money, yet the Community Development Officers and workers are travelling here and there. What are they doing? What are they achieving? There is much ado about nothing. I think the Prime Minister should get down to work.

The Prime Minister likes to be insulting. I would not condescend to do that. I am not denying that those things were done. No one is denying that those things were done. No one is denying that. Is this the logic, that because schools were expanded the initiative came from the community hacks?

Many of these people see the need for these things. They even approach the Government for them. Does the Community Development organize them?

There are Village Councils, Country Districts; there are Estate Tenants Associations in many places where there are no village authorities. The Members of the Government do not seem to understand the point which I am making because they wish to spend taxpayers' money for their own political purposes. That is why the former Minister of Finance was criticizing the Government and then resigned.

No one is denying these things, but the question is: are we getting value for our money? What I am complaining about is the method of selection and the people who were selected. As long as this is done on a Party basis you are not going to get the very best out of Community Development.

Last night when I spoke here I mentioned that if Community Development and self-help work were to succeed, then the cooperation of the whole community must be solicited. The Hon. Prime Minister told us a little while ago that these Community Development Workers are to be selected or must have been selected by the Permanent Secretary of the Public Service Commission. Now, we know what this in practice means because we know that any opposition to the Prime Minister's dictum today means self-sacrifice, and there are very few in the Public Service who is prepared to face self-

sacrifice. This accounts for the fact that if you go all over the country today you will find that these so-called Community Development Workers who are supposed to win the cooperation of the people are all P.N.C. party hacks who were political campaigners at the last election, organizers of the P.N.C.

All over these Estimates we see padding of public expenditure for political purposes. We saw a little while ago where the Prime Minister refused to give information as to the number of private persons who are going to help. No wonder the Budget is padded. No wonder year after year Guyanese have to pay more taxes and the bureaucracy keeps growing without any tangible results to the Community Development which is being organized and it is not going to produce the results which are intended.

I commented yesterday on the small amount of money which was allocated. The Minister of Finance said that there are votes in other Heads and we will see them as we go through the Estimates Commission. It should utilize the money in some other Department because the whole function of the Elections Commission is a farce. It is a waste of time to pay the Chairman \$12,000 per year and the members \$9,000 per year.

It seems to me that the Government's overall policy is either to subvert or to bypass all the Commissions. In this case, because it cannot subvert – like it subverts the Public and Police Service Commissions – it bypasses. My colleagues have already referred to this matter and I have had cause to refer to it before.

I should like at this time, perhaps belatedly, to refer to this matter from a different point of view. In these Estimates there are certain services not under Ministerial control: Audit, Ombudsmen, Public and Police Service Commission, Public Prosecutions. It would seem to me that this one very important Commission should also fall within the category of those other services which are not under Ministerial control.

The Constitution specifically provided how this Commission was to be formed, how it was to be composed and, indeed, what were to be the overall functions. Since it has now come within the control of the Ministry of Home Affairs, a lot of political judgments are no doubt taking place as to its functions. I think that this Commission should more properly come within the control of the Head of State because he is a person above politics and above political parties – at least the Head of State is supposed to function constitutionally.

I recall that, on one occasion when we saw that the manipulations were talking place, that the Commission was being bypassed, I approached the Governor-General on this question and the answer which was given to me was not very satisfactory. We now know the sort of fine distinction between the overall functions of this body and another body virtually being put in charge of the whole registration machinery out of which will come the voters' lists. I raise this point on a matter of principle.

I should like to hear the Minister on this question and the point of view that I have expressed and to find out from him whether all the work in-

volved in the national registration, out of which, as I said, the voters' list will come, will be subject to the scrutiny of the Commission and Members of the Commission. I say Members of the Commission because as you are aware, there is a Chairman appointed by the Prime Minister and three other members, one from each Party.

I feel that because there is so much secrecy and underhandedness which surround the foundations of this Department, which is indeed unfortunate and which is also directly under the control of the Minister, that there is sure to be some clarification on these points since both the Elections Commission and the registration scheme are under the Minister and he takes upon himself the liberty to make fine distinctions as to where the function of one will begin and where the other one will speak. This is why I speak now of a separation of functions.

If the Ministry feels it will be the duty of his Ministry to carry out national registration, okay, but let the Commission be independent, as I said, completely on its own as we see the Audit Department functioning, the Ombudsman or other Departments – under the Attorney-General. It is not that I want to go back to colonial days because even in Independence, we have a Head of State as President or Governor-General, who should have a national outlook and since elections are supposed to be beyond political parties, there must be no semblance or suggestion that they are under the control either of the Government or a political party or more than one political party.

I should like to get the views of the Minister and to get from him whether the provision of \$20,000 will be enough for the Elections Commission to carry out its functions under the Constitution. Is this sum of \$20,000 provided only for clerical staff and for furniture and fittings or does it go beyond that to encompass all the duties which are provided for under the Constitution? That is why we would like to get some details for in framing the details and the Estimates; the Minister must have naturally given consideration to what the functions of the Commission will be this year. This is elections year. This is, therefore, the time when there will be a great deal of work. We would like to know in detail so that we can see what he and his Ministry thought, step by step, the functions of this Commission will be this year.

The Prime Minister says it is a matter of eligibility and suitability. Clearly this is not the case so far as this appointment is concerned.

## Flood Disaster at Cane Grove: 13<sup>th</sup> May, 1968

**Dr. Jagan:** I am merely referring to the background and the suffering of the people because all these things have been compounding the problems of these poor unfortunate people. Now there is this breach in the dam.

Some of my colleagues visited the area on Friday. I myself went there on Saturday and while something was being done, I am afraid that not enough was being done with the urgency that this problem reserved. I will come to this in a moment.

I am concerned about what seems to have been negligence. In talking to the residents of the area I was informed that a slight breach was observed as long ago as last Wednesday. This was brought to the attention of the people concerned, but very little was done about it until it was too late. The question here is who is responsible? There is a great deal of suffering, a great deal of loss, and ultimately someone must take the responsibility. First, one should place blame at the feet of the Water Commission of the East Demerara Water Conservancy. I recall that many years ago a consulting engineer, Mr. Frank Hutchinson, referred to the ever-present danger of this conservancy.

He made the observation that this conservancy was too small to satisfy the irrigation needs of the sugar estates on the East Coast of Demerara and on the East Bank. He went on to say that because the conservancy was small, the water commissioner kept the water at a very high level and naturally this posed a grave hazard to the people on the East Coast of Demerara because the conservancy dam, which was built mainly of pagasse, was not capable of withstanding the force of all this water which was kept there and blocked up at this high level.

This Report is available to the Water Commissioners, to the Government and to the experts. It would appear that nothing much was done by the Water Commissioners to strengthen this dam, and, indeed, to heed the warning of the residents at the appropriate time to do remedial work so that the breach would not have occurred. So much for the fault of the Water Commissioners.

I now lay a charge at the feet of the Government of Guyana, for drainage and irrigation schemes come within the province of the Government of Guyana. The last Government had a programme for these Hutchinson Schemes. The Black Bush Scheme was implemented after the Boerserie Scheme was completed. While the Black Bush Scheme was under construction by Pauling and Company, Sir William Halcrow and Partners were asked to do the survey for Tapakuma on the Essequibo. While Pauling and Company were constructing the Tapakuma Scheme, local engineers in the Public Works Department began the engineering survey of the Mahaica/

Mahaicony/ Abary Hutchinson Scheme.

Sir, I refer again to Hutchinson. Not only did Hutchinson say that this dam was an ever-present danger, but he also referred to the growing unemployment problem in Guyana which resulted from the population increase, from the eradication of malaria, from the mechanization in the sugar industry, and from retrenchment in every sphere of activity. Hutchinson properly indicated that Guyana is not likely to have massive industrialisation in order to take care of the large number of persons who will be seeking employment.

Besides that, we had the area east of the conservancy, that is, Mahaica and beyond, which is endemic to floods and to droughts. If in one year there is no drought, there is a flood and so, Hutchinson said, abandon this scheme, this East Coast Water Conservancy; take the dam further south, not seven miles from the road but thirty to forty miles at the back, so that a lot of lands under water would become available for cultivation, and extend the conservancy to include not only the East Coast but also the Abary, so that the headwaters of the Mahaica, Mahaicony and Abary would be controlled and contained.

Our experts in the Drainage and Irrigation Department, having gained experience under Sir William Halcrow and Partners, undertook this work themselves. All the engineering designs were worked out. In fact, I myself was interested in implementing this scheme soon after the Tapakuma and so, in order to find the money, we asked the experts – the then Head of the Public Works Department – to work out an economic feasibility study for this area. It was suggested that the cost of this scheme, which was then estimated at \$32 million could be recouped in seventeen years as a result of additional lands coming into cultivation, rental for these lands, increased rentals for lands which would then produce money, and as they are subject to floods and droughts, indirect income coming to the Government because of increased income being generated in the area. The scheme was intended to make  $\frac{1}{4}$  million acres of land available.

I mention these facts because we note that even this Government, which was so critical of the last Government's agricultural and drainage and irrigation policies, and made such remarks as '*Rice-Government*', is now saying that agriculture is going to be the backbone of this country for a long time. We now hear this encouraging thought to rice farmers to produce more rice. If the Members of this Government have come belatedly to the knowledge that what the last Government was saying is correct, can we be told why it is they have abandoned the priority which the last Government placed on the question of drainage and irrigation scheme – Hutchinson's proposals? For in Guyana one cannot talk of the importance of agriculture to the economy, whether one intends to produce rice, cabbage or cocoa, or to have a dairy industry, without thinking in terms of adequate drainage and irrigation, apart from the other ancillaries, such as, credit, marketing, manufacturing of agricultural products, storage and so on.

Government, Sir, has not done the following – set up the Scheme on the Pomeroon which was to have continued right after the Tapakuma Scheme. The Government has not done the East Coast. Had it embarked on the East Coast Scheme – the Mahaicony/ Abary/ Mahaica Drainage and Irrigation project in 1965 – today, this country would have averted this tragedy. We heard only today that Government is going to pay \$ ½ million (Canadian) which is nearly \$1 million (Guyana), for feasibility studies for civil aviation. We have seen road projects and all kinds of infrastructural schemes put through. O.K. The Government has a right to decide on priorities. It has said so. All we are questioning now, as we have questioned before is the correctness of these priorities. Government must govern, so we are told. It will not abdicate its responsibilities. While, if it must make a decision in spite of the warnings, in spite of the records, then it must face up to its responsibilities.

The Prime Minister was there. I am sorry he did not take more time to go around the settlement. His other colleagues went around; no doubt they must have indicated to him the losses made by the people. In Cane Grove/ Virginia one finds still there the remnants of slavery, in logies which are practically out of existence in most sugar estates – all these are now under water.

The people have not got work there - very little. Their rice cultivation is not very successful because of the toxic conditions of the soil. Why? The previous estates owners abandoned the place but because our Government is short of money, we have seen over the last few years that all people are told, “*pay or out*”, which applies to all hard settlement schemes. I hope the Minister of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Mr. Jordan, who was there, has seen for himself. Rice lands inundated, kitchen gardens destroyed. I was shown a little chicken coop owned by a widow – all gone west. Those who have houses on stilts, their kitchens on the earth floor, they cannot cook. Sir, the people are really suffering greatly. One would have thought that immediately after this occurred; the Minister of the Government would have been there to see at the exact moment. They have helicopters now, the exact moment. They have helicopters now. I saw you all. Not only to ride around in their helicopters but immediate relief should have been sent, not to depend on the Red Cross or this or that charitable organization. Government should have voted immediately some relief of \$50, 000 to \$100,000. We criticize the Government for imposing indirect taxation or when they are squandering, but for such things we would always give it our support.

The Government uses emergency powers for wrong things. Up to the time I was there, late Saturday evening, clearly the people were in great difficulty. There was no organised plan, up to that stage. This is an emergency, a national disaster, a calamity. This is when you show efficiency; this is when you move, the whole machinery of the Government should have been co-coordinated. But what do you find? A puny effort.

Surely, people would like to see their Ministers, their political leaders

and what not, but in a crisis such as this more is needed. One section south of the rice mill, where the Prime Minister landed with his helicopter, one saw the residents had to put some earth on a dam to prevent the water, which had already risen high, threatening the logies in that section. I have seen the Guyana Defence Force operating from trucks in the area. I heard they have been engaged in other activities there. One would have hoped that here our people's army would be moved in to help in surrounding the place and building a wall around the area. This particular wall which the people built, although it is small was holding the water for the time being. That was what I saw when I was there. The water was beginning to swell from the rear. In such a case, probably, it was necessary to throw up a new dam at the back of that settlement because large numbers of people are living in the area. Again, I say the fault may be that the Government has not recognised the urgency of this Scheme and has not moved in a coordinated way as is necessary on such an occasion. I do hope that the Government will at this stage move more expeditiously.

I went to the site of the breach. I am not an expert, I have to take the words of those who are, but speaking as a layman, it seems to me that what was being done on the second day of the breach was puny in terms of what the job seems to be. However, I am not going to pass judgment on that. I say that there has not been a concrete drive. In fact, my feeling is that the Government should have assumed emergency powers for this area, to declare it a disaster area; so that Government Departments would have moved in without having to be obstructed by the Water Commissioners or anyone else; so that action could be taken expeditiously and the whole show mobilised.

I was there, as I said, I saw about 15 or 20 men working and I was told that more punts would be needed but they were not there up to that time. It was already late that evening. However, I was assured that it would be sealed during the next day. That was yesterday, but my information up to late last evening was that the breach had not yet been sealed.

I took the word of the expert. One of my colleagues wanted to bet me \$5. The information given the night before was that it would be finished on Saturday but, as I said, I was prepared to accept the word of the expert. It would seem, as some of my colleagues said, that this will go on. The question we ask now is this: Is the Government putting all that it has in to this effort?

We would also like to hear from the Government not only on the question of immediate relief, to which I have referred, but on the question of compensation. What does the Government propose to do? As I said, we are dealing with a history of poverty, which is due to no fault of these people, and now on poor miserable people you have added a burden.

The sugar estates have been plugging profits out of this country year after year and have not concerned themselves with taking adequate care to build a dam which would be weatherproof. The Reports are there pointing

out the dangers. As I said, the Government must share responsibility for this calamity, too, because of the change in order of priorities in its Development Programme.

Consequently, I should like the Prime Minister to tell us something more than that he has appointed a Committee headed by the Minister of Agriculture and Natural Resources, who has not attempted to sort out some of the problem there, to wit, the one dealing with the coconut estate which was brought to his attention. I do not know how much sympathy the people can expect from him.

This Committee is made up of experts, but we want more than that. We have seen a lot of Committees appointed. We have seen a lot of recommendations in other cases. Committee No. 1 made a report. Government was not satisfied with that report so it appointed another Committee. Another Committee made recommendations. Up to now we have not heard about those recommendations. I am referring to the displaced people on the East Coast. We do not want to hear about Committees. We want to hear about tangible things. First, how much relief is the Government prepared to vote now, immediately, for those starving people? Secondly, we want an undertaking by the Government that compensation will be paid to these people at La Bonne Mere, Cane Grove and Virginia who have suffered as a result of the negligence of the Water Commissioners and the Government.

These are the things we would like to hear from the Government and I do hope that Members of the Government will not, as they have been accustomed to do for a long time, just sit mum when vital questions are posed and remove themselves from responsibility to the public by not making declarations so that people can know what the position is.

I do hope that on this occasion we are not going to be playing politics. This is a national disaster. It is a time of great need and great suffering and I hope that the Government will meet the challenge with which it is now faced.

If that is the understanding of the Clerk in this House, it is not my understanding, I, as Leader of the Opposition, have never been party to such an understanding. I have not been informed either by the Clerk or by the Leader of the House and therefore I am not aware of such an undertaking.

## Registration of Citizens: 27<sup>th</sup> June, 1968

**Dr. Jagan:** On behalf of the Hon. Member Mr. Persaud I ask the Minister of Home Affairs Question No. 17:

(i) Has the Government an adequate supply of application forms for registration of Citizens of Guyana?

(ii) If the answer is yes, why were over 80 persons who have travelled over 17 miles to a Registration Centre at the Horticultural Station, Atkinson Field, turned away on Sunday, 23<sup>rd</sup> June, 1968, between the hours of 2:30 p.m. and 4 p.m.

Is the Minister aware that the Officer concerned not only gave the excuse as to the lack of forms but also said that he could not register the persons unless they were clearly in their respective districts? This was a grave shortcoming and I wonder if the Minister has taken any steps to see that the people are not being pushed around as was done on this occasion.

The Hon. Minister did not answer my question. I want to find out from him whether it is true that the Registration Officer concerned at Atkinson Field told the people that he would not register them, that they had to go back, and unless they were cleared in their districts he could not register them.

The Hon. Minister has given the Assembly the assurance that these people will be registered. That is not the question. We are complaining about the whole system of registration which has been adopted by the Government. Here people have been made to go from one area to another, a very great distance, at their own expense, and then to be pushed around and sent back home. The whole system is wrong and that is what we are complaining about. The Minister is now telling us that the men will be taken care of. Is it true that the Officer concerned told these people that he would not register them unless they were cleared in their districts?

Will the Minister tell us how many forms the Registration Officer had at that time? Did he have none at all? If he had two, if he had ten, it was his duty to register a number of people according to the number of forms he had. It is clear that this Officer did not want to do this, and it would seem that this is a conspiracy between the Government and the Officer concerned.

While the Minister is digging out the information, I should like to enquire whether this amount listed here is for the salaries of the Members of the Commission. As I understand it, the Chairman of the Commission is supposed to receive a thousand dollars a month and the other three Members, \$250 a month. I am wondering too, if the Minister will tell us whether

this Commission, which is highly paid, has been performing any functions pertaining to national registration since the time it was appointed to the time that it has been paid.

We should like to know, because my understanding is that this highly paid Commission is doing nothing so far as registration of voters first and of citizens is concerned. I say registration of voters because from all that we understand, the voters' list is to come out of the registration list and as regards the people who are being registered abroad, we notice a variation, that is, while in Guyana they are being registered from age 14 years up, and while provision is being made for those registered to have their photographs and thumbprints taken, those being registered abroad are not being made to be photographed or thumb printed, nor is provision made that the registration should be for those between the ages of 14 to 20 years. Only persons 21 years and above are being registered abroad.

It seems clear, therefore, that what is being done is not only a registration of citizens of this country but also a registration of voters. I am asking, therefore, if the Minister will tell us in what way has the duly constituted Elections Commission been involved in this business of the registration of persons out of which registration of the voters' list will materialize.

The Hon. Minister told us in due course the Representation of the People Act will be brought forward. Is it true that when the Commission met the Minister and sought information as to when it is likely that this will be done that the Minister indicated that he has no idea? I mention this because my colleague has just asked whether these Members of the Commission are holding sinecures.

This Commission, I believe, has been appointed since 1966. This country is very short of money. We see this all around. What is the purpose of having a Commission, one of the functions of which is to deal with the whole question of registration of voters? Certainly, this must be a part of its functions. What is the purpose of paying members of this Commission all this money when they are being kept out completely? The Members of the Commission, even the Chairman, are being kept completely in the dark.

For instance, it was only after the Registration Officers were appointed that the Commission was told, but by that time the persons' names were already published in the Official Gazette. Only this afternoon we were complaining about the farce on the East Bank of Demerara, when the people were being thrust from one place to the other because of the method by which the registration is being done.

Why is it he has kept out the Commission from these functions? Why all the secrecy and great security which is involved with this whole registration? What is Shoup International doing here? The C.I.A. Organization—what is it doing here in connection with registration? Sir, if the Hon. Minister and the Government want to cook up the whole registration system, they are perfectly free to do so; but what is the farce about having an Elections Commission which is being paid from public funds. It has squan-

dered the taxpayers' money and this money is needed in other quarters.

Sir, will the Minister tell this House why it is he has kept out the Commission from these functions which rightly belong to it, of seeing or being involved in the registration of voters; and when it is likely that this Bill is going to be brought before the House; and why the discourtesy that the Elections Commission was not even given the assurance that before the Bill is brought, they will see the draft and be consulted?

Let us dispose of this farce. The Prime Minister went abroad recently and said that people can come and examine what will be done at elections time, to see that the election is free and fair. We are not talking about examination at the time of election; we are talking about examination now – the Elections Commission and the Registration system. This is where the whole working is being concocted. I repeat, why is the Minister keeping out the Elections Commission from these normal functions? When would this Bill be brought before the House so that the Commission could begin the function according to the purpose for which it was established?

## Guyana–Venezuela Relations: 17th July, 1968

**Dr. Jagan:** Sir, in moving the Motion the Hon. Minister of State entreated this House with the request that we should speak out as a people with one voice. I do not think that there can be any doubt as to the position which we on this side of the House take on this issue. Our stand on this question has been made clear not only in words, but in deeds where all may see. Even the Prime Minister in his statement has referred to the effort made by the previous Government to bring an end to this question.

In the Resolution, we would like to state that we agree that the Venezuelan Decree should be considered a nullity, that the Decree is a threat of aggression, and that the implantation of the Decree should be considered an act of aggression. We are called upon by the Government to approve of the Government taking all necessary steps to secure the territorial integrity of Guyana. As I have said before our position on this question is quite clear.

We made the point year ago; we put it in a nut-shell when we said "*Not an inch of territory.*" The Prime Minister in the same vein said "*Not a blade of grass.*" But, although the words were similar how different was the treatment! Therefore, when we called upon to approve of the Government "*taking all necessary steps to secure the territorial integrity of Guyana*" we wonder what is in store, whether it will be more words and no action.

You will recall, Sir - and this has been put very clearly in the statement made by the Prime Minister - that the Government of Venezuela was given every opportunity to look at all the documents. Venezuelan officials went to the Foreign Office; they searched there, but in the end they came out with nothing. What was then our position? We said the issue is closed, to use the Minister's word - the old award was a full and perfect settlement. The matter was closed.

The question is why was there the need to reopen this issue on the eve of Independence?

Can we put all our trust in this Government to take the steps necessary to defend our territory, when we see that a conspiracy was entered upon and has led us into this impasse?

The Hon. Minister (Mr. Ramphal) regaled us just now with all the events which disclose that Venezuela is a great enemy of Guyana, a great denier of liberties and a trespasser on international law. But, to put the record straight I should like to inform the Minister and his colleagues that this was not always so. The Prime Minister will recall that at a Conference which we attended together in Venezuela in February 1960 - all the Venezuelan parties, without exception, mentioned not a word about this claim on Guyana's territory.

I led the first official delegation to Venezuela in 1958. I held unofficial

discussion with all the Venezuelan parties and they said individually and jointly that they would not either renounce or resurrect the claim on Guyanese territory, renounce because they felt that this was a political question and no Party wanted to put itself in a position where it could be attacked for being unpatriotic, and not to renew because they regarded Guyana then as a friendly country with a friendly Government.

Incidentally, in those days the P.P.P. Government and the Government of Venezuela shared the same aspirations – not only the Government of Venezuela but the Opposition as well, as the Prime Minister will bear me out.

At this Conference, to which I referred, the Americans tried unsuccessfully to get a Resolution passed which would condemn Cuba, but all the Venezuelan Parties without exception voted against it and the manoeuvre failed. The whole Conference rejected the American manoeuvre to brand Cuba as an aggressor in this hemisphere and a danger to the peace and security.

This brings us up to February, or April, as the Prime Minister said, 1960. A few months later at San Jose, Costa Rica, the American Government got all its puppets in Latin America to agree to a declaration which branded Cuba as an aggressor, or as a nation to be eliminated, and thus the blockade and everything else were mounted. The Foreign Minister of Venezuela, Senor Arcaya, refused to sign this declaration in August 1960 and because of this his Party, the U.R.D., came out of the Coalition, and from then the Accion Democratica, the leading ruling party, Bettancourt's party, began toeing the American line.

It is important to note this because the Minister tries to point to Venezuela as the enemy, but the No. 1 enemy behind this is the United States of America. Let us not fool the people of this country by shouting how wicked the Venezuelan people and the Government is; because the Venezuelan Government today is the puppet of the Government of the United States of America. Let us put them together so that the Guyana people know where they stand.

The question of Guyana's independence came up, particularly after the 1961 elections which we won. The 1961 Constitution Conference in London stated clearly that whoever won the elections in 1961 would lead the country to independence. The Americans became hysterical about developments in Cuba and they began to tie Guyana with Cuba. To them a planned economy, according to the Truman Doctrine, is a denial of democracy and freedom regardless of whether doctrine is a denial of democracy and freedom regardless of whether power is obtained by violence or by constitutional, peaceful means. A planned economy to the Americans is synonymous with a denial of freedom under the Truman Doctrine which is still honoured and which still motivates United States policy.

After our victory, it was not the Venezuelans who were concerned primarily about Guyana's leftism; it was the United States of America and we

must see how the pressures began to be directed. There was a three-pronged attack against the independence of the people of Guyana.

One prong of the attack was pressure on the United Kingdom. President Kennedy made a special trip, in the summer of 1963, to have talks with Macmillan. In two articles headed, "*How the C.I.A. got rid of Jagan*", the *London Times* disclosed that Macmillan, Sandys, two top security men in British and a number of officials in Guyana backed the C.I.A. plot. That was one prong of the attack. But lest the pressure should have no results, unrest had to be created at home because the British Government had been committed, by the 1960 Constitutional Conference in London, to grant independence to the victors. So the C.I.A. came here, and now it is also disclosed that Howard McCabe, who posed as a trade unionist, was a chief C.I.A. agent, who not only financed but instigated and kept going the 80-day strike and blockade in this country.

But the third prong of the attack and pressure was on the Venezuelan Government. Just in case the pressure failed in London, and just in case the Guyana elections were to be won by the P.P.P., then the Venezuelans must enter the scene. Thus the resurrection of this long dormant claim, thus the raising of something which, up to February 1960, was dead and dormant in the more recent period.

I say this is not because I want to resurrect a lot of issues which have passed but so that the Guyanese people, the Guyanese nation, would recognise the realities and not be led astray by the legalism, the legalities. We must deal with the realities.

The Minister of State wants us to be diverted into channels of international law, of legalism – who is breaking what international law and what not – but, clearly, he knows that behind all this legalism, since the days of the Monroe Doctrine, there has been piracy in these parts of the United States Government, open intervention in the affairs of sovereign nations. Unfortunately, the Prime Minister now sees this necessity for the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic. No doubt, he will be persuaded by the Americans to see the necessity for the Venezuelan intervention into Guyana!

This is no time to prattle about law. This is the time to recognise the realities of international politics where force and big stick are the key factors operating in this hemisphere and more talk is not going to get us anywhere.

To come back to this conspiracy, the United States, the United Kingdom and Venezuela were involved. We must not, of course, leave out our friends in the Government for, according to Schlesinger in his book *A Thousand Days*, in May 1962 Mr. Burnham, and not Jagan, must be backed in Guyana. So we have today what started as part of a plot becoming a Frankenstein's monster which got out of control.

Why was it necessary for the Government to sign the Geneva Agreement? Why did the British Government which, in our time, said that the

matter was closed, agree to the reopening of the question at Geneva? Was it not to allow the Venezuelans to keep this question going, to be examined by a Mixed Commission until perhaps another Election comes along, which the P.P.P. might win, fraud or no fraud?

Fortunately, the records come out very quickly nowadays, not like in the good old days of the British when they kept buried for a hundred years. The experts now write memoirs the day after they are out of their seats. I should like to read a section of the *Guyana Graphic* of today's date to show how people are seeing the affairs of Guyana, this conspiracy which was plotted so many years ago. I quote from page 1:

*"The sources said Washington was evidently interested in avoiding problems to the Guyanese Prime Minister Forbes Burnham, who will once more be called to test his popularity in forthcoming general elections.*

*The Dutch, the Surinam and the Venezuelan Government were asked to ease demands against the Guyanese Government at least for some time, the source said.*

*As far as Washington was concerned, there were only two tactical approaches to the internal Guyanese problem in order to facilitate Burnham's second consecutive victory.*

*The first was that countries with border claims against Guyana – Venezuela and Surinam – create as few problems as possible to the Burnham administration.*

*The second was for Venezuela to continue its pressure, making sure the Guyanese realized the danger they would incur if leftist leader Cheddi Jagan triumphed in the elections.*

*In the latter case, Guyana would be the only communist regime in South America."*

Now we see why British signed the Geneva Agreement. Now we see why our Government, despite advice to the contrary from the Opposition, signed the Geneva Agreement. What more was there to examine? Quite clearly, this is what should have been done at the time of Independence. When transfer of power took place, the territory's geographical boundaries which comprise Guyana should have been lodged with the United Nations. This is what should have been done by Britain. But now it would seem that our boundaries are still in a fluid state and the Venezuelans are interpreting this fluidity as they choose by occupying Ankoko and now moving into our territorial waters.

Now we are told that this country is in a grave predicament. A small nation with no navy, no air force, no battleships, beset by a bully. We want to ask why is it that the bully has now raised up the question. Perhaps, the Prime Minister will tell us when he speaks about his talks with Leoni? How did he view the question, and so on, so that we can know more about these discussions? Unfortunately, there are too many things secret in this country, like the deal with Reynolds Metal Company and others, which we never know about.

Sir, in my view, the Venezuelans have raised this question at this particular time for two reasons. Number one, jingoistic reasons, so as to whip up internal favour in Venezuela in support of the Government. The governing party today is in complete disarray. In 1958, the Accion Democratic won 47 per cent of the votes. Because in 1960 it toed the American line, the U.R.D. came out of the Coalition. A section of its party broke away and called itself the Movement of the left (M.I.R.). At the last election, the support of the leading Party dropped from 47 per cent to 33 per cent. Now, the Chairman of the Party, Bertran Prieto, has come out of the Party and is leading a new Party which is threatening the Government and which is likely to win the coming election. And so, Leoni and company, who now have very little support among the masses of the people, are using this issue to generate hostility, and also to generate support.

The other reason is clearly intimidatory – to intimidate the Guyanese people, that they must not get rid of these puppets here. This is the other reason. That is why it is raised at this time. It is clear that we have landed ourselves in a big boat. Unfortunately, the boat is not big enough. Carl Blackman, last Sunday, asked, “Where are our friends?” He not only asked where are our friends, he also said that someday we will have friends with rockets willing to use them. I did not know people believed me when I said long ago that we had friends with rockets. Maybe we need assistance.

What about the British? They have Colonel Pope, the muscle of the British Government and the Army, but what of the British support for us? The Prime Minister in his statement said that Britain has a responsibility to Guyana. By what measure of international standards of morality has the Prime Minister come to this conclusion, has he noted the failure of the British Government to honour international commitments? Take Rhodesia; take the question of immigration from East Africa; take the question of Vietnam and other international questions. Whether legal or moral, has the British Government taken a stand in favour of justice and humanity?

The plain fact of the matter is that Britain is a country moving by self-interest only and her self-interest today with a balance of payments crisis and other crises indicates that the Queen must visit Latin America so that they can do more trade there. In this context, Guyana versus Venezuela, it is clear where the British Government will stand and it is clear, considering the orders which Britain took from the United States on the question of our independence, that Britain will always consult the United States of America before she makes any move on the question of Guyana.

What about our friends, the United States – Uncle Johnson and Uncle Odo riding horses together. Now is the time to call on our friends. Yesterday, in the *Evening Post*, we read a story datelined, “Caracas, Venezuela, (*Associated Press*)”, that Maurice Bernham, U.S. Ambassador to Caracas, said the United States will assume a posture of strict neutrality in the border dispute between Venezuela and Guyana. Why is it that the United States all of a sudden – our great protector, the nation that has put this Govern-

ment in office, the nation that sponsors this Government, that helps it, that aids it in this zero hour says it will be neutral?

The United States has indicated, so far as Latin America is concerned, that she, from the time of the Monroe Doctrine, will be boss in this area. She has assured all the nations which constitute the Organization of American States that questions of self-determination, questions of territorial integrity, etc. will be solved in a peaceful manner through the O.A.S. Why then has not the Americans invoked the O.A.S. Why have they not referred this question to the O.A.S. and come out openly? Is there any doubt that this is aggression? Is there any doubt that this is a threat? I am sure that the Prime Minister and the Minister of State could not have failed to urge the Ambassador who is here that this is a threat. They have done this convincingly to this House and to the nation.

Are the Americans so illogical that they cannot sense logic from two brilliant lawyers, two Queen's Counsel of Guyana? No, Sir, it is not that they are bereaved of the sense of the logic; it is the question of self-interest. The United States of America has in Venezuela a big share of self-interest. Approximately 60 per cent of its Latin American investments are in Venezuela in oil, iron ore, steel, etc. and therefore the United States does not want to take sides lest anti-Americanism should develop in Venezuela. In 1960, the Vice President of the United States Richard Nixon, visited Venezuela and he has mocked, mobbed, and spat upon by the people. This represented the feeling of the Venezuelan people until the Belancourt regime betrayed them. The Americans do not want a similar feeling to develop again in Venezuela; nor do they want anti-Americanism to develop here more than it is. We would like to qualify anti-Americanism means anti-imperialism. There are two types of Americans - the Americans of the industrial military complex and the Americans of the brand of Dr. Du Bois, Carmichel King and Dr. Benjamin Spock, the famous child expert who is celebrated all over the world. Of course, all mothers know him. The United States has just sentenced him to three years imprisonment for mobilizing the young people to oppose the draft, which sends them to go and die in Vietnam. When we speak about anti-Americanism, we do not speak of that kind of American. Johnson, and all the others, from the days of Truman, who save big business in America, clearly do not want the P.P.P. supporters to be opposed to them; nor do they want the supporters of the U.F., the P.N.C. the supporters of the Government to take up an anti-American position.

This is why the Americans have decided to stand aloof on this issue. To whom are we to turn? America has taken upon itself the mantle of guardian for this hemisphere. America supplies to all the puppets in these countries military arms and weapons so that they can maintain themselves in power. The United States of America helped them with military aid between the years 1952 to 1964 amounting to \$800 million (US). The puppet regime of Venezuela also was helped - some of it is now coming to patrol

our territorial waters. These are our friends!

There is the question of Ankoko. O.K. Let us assume that they blundered in signing the Geneva Agreement and that the talks were getting us nowhere. What did they do when the Venezuelans invaded and occupied Ankoko? This was a clear case of aggression. By that act they virtually mollified the Agreement. No use telling us now that the Decrees are a nullity. Venezuela breached the Agreement which our own Government blundered into. What did the Government do? In other cases we have seen when there was an attempted aggression in 1950, when it was alleged, I say alleged, but not even proved, when North Korea invaded South Korea, the United Nations acted promptly, and passed a resolution sending United Nations forces to deter the aggression. Why did we not go the Security Council? That is what they are there for. Did we have illustrious Mr. Braithwaite and now Mr. Carter as window-pieces there? This is the time when the matter should have been brought up immediately. But before this Government can take the matter to the Security Council, it has to go through a certain set of reasoning, who will support it and who will not.

Where will the Communist Bloc be? Where will the Afro-Asian Bloc be? How will it split the Latin American group? Where will the United States of America and England be? It is clear from what we see now, the neutrality of the United States and the virtual toeing of the US line by Britain, that these countries would not have liked the question to go to the United Nations. Perhaps the Prime Minister will tell this House why. I would have preferred the Minister of State, instead of regaling this House with what everybody knows, to tell us what concrete steps have been taken; what they have done. Has the Government spoken to the Americans?

Sir, the United States Ambassador Mr. Delmar Carlson said that as regards the Venezuelan Government's Decree of July 9, "*it is a question of International Law and we have made clear to the Government of Venezuela the US position on that matter.*"

Has the American Government told the Prime Minister what they will do? Should the matter be taken to the United Nations what will be their study? Have they urged or advised that the matter should be taken to the U.N.? We would like to know this, Sir, because we know that nothing is done in this country without the consultation of the Ambassador.

Let us know what is the position, because mere talk is not going to get us anywhere; mere arguing about international law is not going to get us anywhere either. While we quibble, as they say, Rome burns. The Venezuelan fleet will be taking over the shores. Clearly, we are naked. As Mr. Blackman said in his editorial on last Sunday we have no friends. We have no friends because of the bankrupt foreign policy that our Government has embarked upon since Independence

Who are their friends? Chiang Kai-Shek. My friend, the ex- Minister of Economic Development (Mr. Thomas), made a trip to Taiwan. Doctors have come from South Korea and we understand from the press that it has been

agreed that the South Koreans will establish an Embassy here. We have recognised the status of another puppet regime, which cannot stand on its own feet without U.S. bayonets.

Who are our friends? On Independence, when the puppet Chinese Government was invited here, People's China which speaks for the people of China was not invited. The Russians who were here requested of the Government that the two countries should establish diplomatic relations. Nothing has been done. We are establishing diplomatic relations with South Korea.

Clearly, if the Russians were here, the Prime Minister could have called them in and said "How about it? Where do you stand?"

The *Evening Post*, one of the apologists for the Government, suggested that the friends of the Government had better do something otherwise the Government may be forced to turn to some other quarter. It says in this editorial of July 14 –

*"The reaction of Britain and America to this latest threat from Venezuela remains to be seen. But both countries must be reminded that if pushed too far the Government of Guyana may feel called upon to seek assistance wherever it can be found."*

How? Not by this Government. This Government is too committed; its hands are in the pockets of Uncle Sam who has handcuffs there.

We should like to join in the Motion. I repeat: we are patriots. We will fight to the last man; we will fight not only like the Vietnamese people, united, but we will fight with friends. We must get international friends. Why is it that the Vietnamese are ripping hell out of the Americans? Because they have friends with rockets who have given them military equipment and because they have friends all over the world who are demonstrating on their behalf in America and all over the world. What friends do we have? Where? Nowhere. This Government dares not raise its voice anywhere lest it affronts the United States of America who does not want to be put on the spot to take sides.

So, while we will give every support to the Government and unite against the terrorist aggression, we want to put the blame squarely where it really lies, not only on the Venezuelan Government but on the American Government and on this Government for joining in the conspiracy, for signing the Geneva Agreement, for failing to lodge, in conjunction with the British, at the United Nations the boundaries of Guyana at the time of Independence, for failure to negotiate a Treaty of Guarantee of our territorial integrity with the great powers, east and west.

Any politician would have known that this was a threat to our sovereignty. Perhaps it is a wrong conclusion – not any politician would have known, because the politicians over there were part of the conspiracy and therefore they could not sign such a treaty, Austria was able to sign a treaty

recently with the east and with the west. Russia, France, Britain, America guaranteed her territorial integrity.

When we were in Government we said that even if it might appear that we surrendering part of our sovereignty, we were prepared to sign such a treaty with the Great Powers, who will not only see that Guyana remains neutral, but who will guarantee our territorial integrity. Perhaps it would have been a surrender of a bit of sovereignty in that we were saying they would supervise our neutrality. They, the Opposition, did not like this, but then we were facing reality knowing the predatory nature, not of Venezuela but of the United States sitting behind Venezuela, who will want to use Venezuela to jump on our shoulders. And so, such a treaty was necessary. Let the Government tell us whether they tried, because the United States was not only its protector but the country which brought it to power and, therefore, there could be no question of having any country from the east guaranteeing our territorial integrity?

That is why, no doubt, we have not had the request of the Soviet Union for diplomatic representation in this country granted. I have already referred to the failure of the Government to take to the Security Council the Venezuelan occupation of Ankoko. We would like hear of so far is about circulating documents and seeing the Latin American group. Is that all we are going to do now? Perhaps the Minister who speaks next will tell us why we have not yet gone to the Security Council and whether we intend to go on this question now.

Early this year when the Budget crisis was on we saw the Surinamers beating the war drums.

Now that the civil servants and Government workers are talking about going on strike, the Venezuelans are beating their war drums. This headline appeared in the *Evening Post* of yesterday's date: "Because of border issue hold over interim play claim, G.E.U. urges F.U.G.E.". So now that we have another border crisis, some people will have no wage demands and, no doubt, sooner or later, we will hear, "Let us have no elections."

As I have already pointed out, the Venezuelan aggression is an act of intimidation.

Another point which must not be forgotten is that it is creating the atmosphere in Guyana for the militarization of our politics. Why do I say this? We hear the Prime Minister is going to the U.S.A. No doubt, he will include in his itinerary a visit to Mr. Johnson or Mr. Ball at the United Nations, or some other United States representative. "Restrain the boys over there", but not only that, "Look they have warships, aeroplanes, military planes; we do not have any. Will you please give us some?"

I warn against this road. Militarization of the politics of Latin America has been one of the reasons why the people are so poverty-stricken today, why Latin America is on the brick of revolution. Over two thousand million dollars is spent by these poor starving countries, for military purposes. Militarization has become necessary because the puppets who are in office

can no longer win free and fair elections. They have to resort to fraud and intimidation as we are seeing here already.

The next step is military coup. In Latin America between 1961 and 1963, there were eight military coups. Aside from the danger to democracy which these military regimes pose, it means further impoverization of the people for more money has to be found in the Budget to keep the military regime going. I understand that last week we had to vote thousands of dollars for the Youth Corps. This is another part of the military apparatus.

To conclude, I wish to say that the time has come for action, not just talk, and we want to assure this House and the nation that the P.P.P. will be backing whatever action is taken 100 per cent, as long as it is in our interest. We therefore suggest that the Government should not only talk but embark on some of the following steps:

**Number 1:** Scrap the Geneva Agreement and break off the Mixed Commission discussions. The Venezuelans have already broken off the sub-commission of the Mixed Commission. Here again we do not understand the Government. Some time ago, as was disclosed in the *Guyana Graphic* of May 25, 1967, the Prime Minister said that he was opposed to any joint development of this disputed territory – so called disputed – but yet later on we saw that a Mixed Commission was appointed. We saw where the Venezuelans have walked out and made a fool, a football, of this Government and we seem to be important and helpless. Therefore, let us dispense with all those frivolities and waste of time and taxpayers' money. Scrap the Geneva Agreement and break off the Mixed Commission discussions.

**Number 2:** sever diplomatic relations with Venezuela. We saw here, on the question of Rhodesia, because Britain did not take firm action against Rhodesia, several African States like Tanzania and others broke off diplomatic relations with Britain. They were not directly involved but they did it as a matter of solidarity. Here our territory has been occupied, other incursions are taking place, and we are still having cocktail parties with these people and sending them goodwill messages and all kinds of nonsense. The time has come to act. Sever diplomatic relations.

**Number 3:** refuse radio time to the Venezuelans. The Opposition here does not have time on the radio, but the Venezuelans have time to brainwash the people in this country. We must not only deny them radio time but also restrict them in their activities in other places. Let them go home.

I have already said that the question should be taken to the Security Council, if necessary, to the Hague Court. I know that these things may not bring us the results that we want but we will be using an international forum to expose not only the Venezuelans but also the United States which is backing the Venezuelans and which has started this whole thing. We

have friends in the West Indies. Trinidad and Barbados are in the O.A.S. Again I do not regard the O.A.S. as an instrument of progress, but ask your friends in Trinidad and Barbados to raise the matter in the O.A.S. Let us see if they have some courage.

Next, the Opposition must be involved in all future negotiations. The Opposition has not been truly involved from the very beginning. I understand that when the Venezuelans were at Geneva they had the Opposition and all kinds of institutions there so as to have a national consensus. Why are you afraid to carry us? You do not have to act on our advice, but at least you would know what half of the people of Guyana think.

I would also suggest that, at this time of crisis, it seems improper for the Prime Minister to depart for the U.S.A. Who will make all these decisions on important questions of the day? Surely, it will be beneath the dignity of the Prime Minister to go knocking about at the United Nations trying to lobby people.

If the matter was going to the United Nations Security Council, yes we would welcome our Prime Minister speaking there, standing up for the integrity and sanctity of our country, but at this time I urge him not to leave Guyana .

I am here; I am always here. I am like the rock of Gibraltar. The last but not the least. I urge the Government to depart from the path it has so far pursued. What is needed in Guyana today is the adoption of new domestic and foreign policies. Domestic policies today are leading the country from one crisis to another; even "*Mr. Cassava*" is being sold at 16 cents and 18 cents a pound. This is the extent of the crisis – the cost of living is mounting. This is not the time to think of partisan interests. Now is the time to think of the nation. And so, in order that new policies can be pursued in this country, domestic and foreign, we call on the Government of anti-imperialist unity. I repeat, anti-imperialist unity, for this can be the only basis of any Government and people which can be strong. We must not only talk, but we must sink our differences. What is the use of talking that we are threatened and we must all come together. It is wishful thinking. It is like some of the Churches telling the people '*love thy neighbour and everything will come right*'. It is not coming right; it is getting worse. Mere pleadings are not enough. The time has come, as I said, for action and we recommend to the Government the steps which should be taken. As a start, I am sure that if there is genuine consultation and the Opposition is brought into the confidence of the Government, then perhaps, more fruitful avenues could be explored so that Guyana is taken out of this difficulty not only for now but forever.

