

DR. CHEDDI JAGAN

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY SPEECHES

VOLUME 6

**The National Assembly of the
Third Parliament of Guyana
June 1976 -August 1980**

Dr. Cheddi Jagan
National Assembly Speeches Volume 6
With a Preface by Dr. Roger Luncheon
This edition © The Government of Guyana, 2011
Preface © Roger Luncheon 2010

Cover design by Peepal Tree Press

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

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

ISBN 978-1-907493-30-0



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

Declaring Vacant the Seats of Members of the Assembly:	
18th June, 1976	1
Public Business Motion: 23rd June, 1976	5
Approval of Financial Paper No. 4/1976: 30th June, 1976	8
Approval of Financial Paper 5/1976	14
Approval of Financial Paper No. 5/1971 (Cont.)	17
Funding for Development Programme: 16th September, 1976	36
Sabotage of Cubana Flight No. 455: 24th November, 1976	43
Broadcasting of Budget Speech and Debate: 12th December, 1976	49
Budget Debate: 1st January, 1977	51
Sympathy Motion on Death of Winifred Gaskin: 30th March, 1977	65
Constitution (Amendment) Bill: 19th May, 1977	66
Sugar Industry Special Funds (Amendment) Bill: 1977	70
National Insurance and Social Security (Amendment) Bill:	
3rd June 1977	74
Maritime Boundaries Bill: 3rd June, 1977	76
Caribbean Food Corporation Bill 1977	77
Regional Development Authorities Bill: 15th June, 1977	86
Motion on Guarantee of Loan to Guyana Stores: 14th July, 1977	93
Reports of Near Starvation in the Rupununi	97
National Security (Miscellaneous Provisions) (Amendment) Bill:	
1st September, 1977	99
Summary Jurisdiction (Appeals) (Amendment) Bill: 1977	107
Constitution (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill: 16th September, 1977	112
Teaching Service Commission Bill: 16th September, 1977	115
Confirmation of the Travel Voucher Tax (Amendment) Order:	
16th September, 1977	120
Affirmation of Travel Tax Regulations: 16th September, 1977	125
Matter relating to the strike in the Sugar Industry:	
15th December, 1977	127
Budget Debate: 8th March, 1978	129
Condemnation of Invasion of Belize Territory: 8th March, 1978	144
Condemnation of Invasion of Zambian Territory: 8th March, 1978	146
Constitution (Amendment) Bill: 10th April, 1978	148
Congratulations to the Prime Minister and Cds. Janet Jagan and Ramkarran: 17th May, 1978	167
Referendum (Amendment of the Constitution) Bill -	
Correction to Clause 5: 17th May, 1978	168
Motion – Government agreement with the I.M.F.: 24th August, 1978	177
Administration of Justice Bill: 1st November, 1978	191
Breaches in the Sea Defences on the Essequibo Coast:	
4th January, 1979	198

Local Authorities (Postponement of Elections) Bill: 8th January, 1979 ...	199
Budget Debate: 21st March, 1979	209
Estimates: 29th March, 1979	225
Guyana Chronicle Article on Appointment of Ombudsman: 30th March, 1979	228
Customs (Amendment) Bill: 30th March, 1979	230
Condemnation of Somoza Regime and recognition of Government of National Reconstruction: July 5th, 1979	233
Extension of Part 11 of the National Security (Miscellaneous Provision) Act: 27th August, 1979	245
Constitution (Amendment) Bill: 3rd October, 1979	250
Constitution (Amendment) Bill – Bill No. 11/1979: 15th October, 1979	260
Division XXX, Ministry of Trade and Consumer Protection, Subhead 2, (New) Buildings	263
Settlement of Refugees in Guyana: 24th March, 1980	265
Motion to Increase the Liability in Respect of Guarantees: 21st April, 1980	267
Inquiry into the circumstances of the death of Dr. Walter Rodney: 5th August, 1980	272
Local Democratic Organs Act: 18th August, 1980	273

DR. CHEDDI JAGAN

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY SPEECHES

VOLUME 6

**The National Assembly of the
Third Parliament of Guyana
June 1976 - August 1980**

Public Business Motion

Declaring Vacant the Seats of Members of the Assembly: 18th June, 1976

Dr. Jagan (The Leader of the Opposition): Cde. Speaker, this Motion standing in my name is being dealt with in this House not for the first time. Way back in the late 40s or early 50s, this question was raised but then it received the same fate as an application by the State of Arizona to enter into the United States union.

As I was saying, this Motion received the same fate as an application for admission by the State of Arizona to the United States Union. When that application was presented, there was in the application a constitutional provision for the recall of judges. The then President on seeing this measure vetoed the enabling Bill and remarked that the provision was inconsistent with republicanism. In those days of colonialism – I refer to the late 40s and early 50s – recall was regarded to be inconsistent with monarchism. Today we have a different situation in the country and I hope that this measure will receive the full support of all the Members of this House.

Recall is based on two, what I consider to be, fundamental concepts; one is the question of democracy and, secondly, the concept of morality. First of all the concept of democracy. If a people were to elect and have a sovereign right to place persons in the Parliament to speak on their behalf, *ipso facto* it seems that those people should also have the same right to remove such an individual, if they are dissatisfied with his representation, especially if he has gone against some of the things which he had enunciated to the people when he sought their mandate.

This provision of recall, therefore, has been incorporated in many constitutions most notably in the constitutions of the socialist states, but even certain Western countries - the Scandinavian countries, for instance, have incorporated this in their constitutions. In the United States of America, while it is not part and parcel of the Federal Constitution, the principle of recall, initiative and referendum, has also been incorporated in the constitutions of several state legislatures. I understand from a book which was written during the War that at that time recall was applicable in over one thousand municipalities and in more than twelve States. Public officials and State officials were subject to recall. In fact, only two days ago, I read in one of our papers that some officials in the United States had been removed by the recall.

The other principle to which I refer is the moral principle, that is, that if individuals are elected on the basis of either a party programme or a manifesto which they had put out to the electorate, and subsequently, they decide to depart from the policies expressed in the party programme or in their personal manifesto then, it seems it becomes a moral question and as such those who have chosen such an individual must certainly have the

right to remove such an individual.

Well, Sir, we have had experiences from time to time in this House where persons elected on a party ticket subsequently either crossed the floor or remained on the same side of the House but refused to obey the Whip of the party on whose ticket they were elected.

It behooves this House to deal with this matter from the two positions I have stated, the democratic principle and the moral principle, and to support it. The Motion speaks of declaring vacant the seats of Members who cease to support the party on whose lists they were elected to the Assembly. Normally in single Member constituencies, the procedure is somewhat different from what is suggested here and that is that a certain percentage of the electorate can sign a petition requesting the recall of the Member whom they had elected and, once a goodly number of petitioners have signed such a requisition, then a new election is held, a runoff election as it is called, and if the individual who was elected loses the runoff election, then he automatically vacates his seat.

Under our Constitution, we no longer have single Member constituencies. Under the Proportional Representation System, especially the list system of P.R. where the whole country has become, so to speak, one constituency, it is not possible to adopt that procedure and so the procedure which I propose should be, I think, accepted by the House, that is, that the representative of the list should be given the right to declare the seat of a person vacant if he and the Party which he leads, considers that such a Member or Members cease to support the Party.

This principle has already had recognition in this House in another way. Individuals have been elected on the basis of going to the electorate on a Party list, with a Party programme and, therefore, they have collective responsibility to that Party. If they do not abide by the aims, wishes, policies of the Party on whose ticket they were elected, then they should be removed from the House.

This principle was raised for the first time in 1968 when provision was made for the representative of the list to select names at random anywhere in the list of fifty-three candidates. You will recall, Sir, that in 1964 the procedure was different. The representative of the list had to choose the persons in order of priority and the sequence in which they were listed. This was changed in 1968 and the argument for that was that all the individuals who were there and those who were elected, were elected on the basis of a Party programme, elected by the people who voted for them, not as individuals, but as a Party.

Thus, keeping in line with that same procedure and practice, I propose that the same should be done on this question of recall, that is, that the representative of the list should be authorised to withdraw, to declare vacant the seat of any Member, or Members, if such Member, or Members, ceases to support the Party.

As I said, I do not think this is a controversial issue, I think it is based on

sound principles and I commend this Motion to the Members of the House.

Cde., Speaker, first of all, I wish to address my thanks to the Hon. Minister of Justice for his contribution to the debate and his assurance of support for the Motion. I wish to assure, also, the Hon. Member Cde. Da Silva of the United Force – I hope that I can call her comrade. She objects, so I shall call her the Hon. Member Mrs. Da Silva – that there is no question of dictatorship so far as that P.P.P. is concerned. In fact, I should like to say, for her information, that before the Members were selected, although I, as the representative of the list, have that power to elect them the selection was made by the leadership of the P.P.P. And if there were to be any removals, I can assure her that even though it would be exercised through me, it will be done in the same way, that is, democratically, the Party having considered the matter at its highest level.

Perhaps the Hon. Member does not understand how a Marxist/Leninist Party operates and that is probably where the confusion is. She first has to be forgiven for this because in bourgeoisie politics and bourgeois parties, even though they talk a lot about democracy, they all run dictatorially. The leaders generally make the selections, as they do, for instance, in the Conservative Party in England. But Marxist Parties have the principle of democratic centralism, centralism for the purpose of discipline which we heard the Minister of Justice speak about as being essential for socialism.

Democracy also is the fundamental question relating to socialism, and this is how the P.P.P. operates. The Hon. Member need not have any fear. She spoke of an unscrupulous representative of the list. Maybe she was thinking of her own Leader, the Leader who, as a representative of the Liberator Party list, refused to carry out the behest of the Liberator Party and decided to come into the House in the name of the United Force. That makes the confusion more confounded and the morality even more immoral. However, I think I have made the point and I need not dwell on that any longer.

I think that this is an important question of principle and as the Minister of Justice said we are now in a new era. We are in an era of socialism, not only when socialism is winning out throughout the world as a system, but when more and more the Guyanese people are looking forward to the emergence of a socialist society.

In this sense socialism will have to be built on principles, principles of democracy, principles of ethics, principles of morality. We may have had all kinds of reasons before in this same House – behaviour perhaps – but we were not at this present stage, when we are talking about socialism, when the whole country expects to go ahead with socialism. Therefore, we need to begin thinking not just of the material aspect, but of ethics and morality because these are inseparable from simply creating a society of material wellbeing.

What we need is a new man, a new type of man, a moral man. If that is to be so, if that is part and parcel of socialism, then the time must come

when we must begin to do it in the highest chamber of this land, the National Assembly.

Attempts have failed in the past, in the 40s and in the early 50s and even as late as in 1966. The Hon. Member from the United Force referred to the 1966 failure. She referred to the then Attorney General, Mr. Ramphal, but Mr. Ramphal is not here. Perhaps he is now in a place to which he really belongs, because with those quotations being thrown at his face, he would have been out of place in Guyana.

Let us go forward not looking back but looking at the situation dialectically. This is also a principle of the philosophy we believe in, Marxism/Leninism. But one must view things on different occasions depending on all the factors and all the circumstances. 1976 is not 1950, it is not 1966. I hope that all the Members of this House will support this Motion.

Public Business Motion: 23rd June, 1976

Dr. Jagan: Sir, I would like to supplement the point made by my colleague. As we move more and more into the direction of public ownership you have Government assuming more and more responsibilities, many of which will be strictly of a financial nature and in this sense, public accountability is very, very vital and important. People will have confidence and this will be demonstrated if there is a great deal of independence so far as auditing of public accounts is concerned. We have a Public Accounts Committee so far as public expenses are budgeted for. My colleague has just reminded me that we have not met for some time, but, we hope that is something we can correct.

I think it was suggested some time ago that corporations should all fall within the ambit of the Directorate of Audit. In other words, it should be a body independent from the administration. I do not know, Sir, if that may not be intended. If it is not, it is time we seriously look into this question. In many Third World countries there are always charges of corruption and the necessity to have public confidence, therefore, in all transactions, in state corporations, particularly, it is very, very vital and important if we are to enthuse people to greater effort. In this sense, if it is not intended, I am sure the Government would have no objection to all corporations coming within the ambit of the Directorate of Audit. If they do not have enough staff, then the Parliament must vote money for that. The question is one of principle so that the Members of this Parliament who represent the people of the country must be able to have accounts of all corporations presented before it. I think in that sense there will be more public confidence in corporations, than by leaving it only to the administration to decide how these things will be run. They appoint the directors, they appoint everybody and we sit in parliament. We do not know what is going on. You can even be a director and not necessarily know what is going on, unless you can have a close look at every single item and that has to be done by independent people. There is a tendency sometimes for expenditure which can even be accounted for by giving receipts but then someone is needed to probe them.

I heard the other day one man was having a \$10 dinner at public expense. Well these things sometimes have to be looked into. This is not a very big Minister or anything like that but if there is no questioning, if there is no proper accounting and so on, you can find that after a while the public corporations are losing money whether by way of theft or inefficiency or by expenditure in a way which should not be tolerated. In that sense, Sir, I think the point made by my colleague is very important and it is that time this country should adopt that procedure so that all corporations should come within the ambit of an independent body such as the Director or Directorate of Audit.

Sir I would like the Minister to answer directly the question which was posed by us. As my colleague said, this law can state that, for those institutions, the Director of Audit will be responsible for the auditing of the accounts.

Let us do not hide our heads in the sands. We have had, in this country, charges made against Ministers about corruption; we have had them brought before the Ombudsman. We have had a Select Committee of this House to go into the question of enlarging the powers of the Ombudsman to look into corruption. We have had the previous Director of Audit talking about the irregular accounts of the country, the previous one who left before the new one was appointed, Mr. Dunlop made severe stringent remarks on this score.

We are therefore asking for a principle, Government must now face up to this question and not just make declarations and call for a code of conduct and so on. The time has come in Guyana when the people want to know how their money is being spent. This is a country with very high taxation and the cost of living today is mounting daily, I do not know how poor people live today. The Cde. Member is laughing. It is well for the Ministers, the two of them are earning big money, they do not have to worry about prices in the markets. Go into the market. The price is 50 cents for one grapefruit; we were hearing about agriculture today. Anyway, I do not want to go into that.

My main point is that it is time the Government understands that it has to deal with the public in a way that can bring satisfaction in all these areas where there are doubts. We are not making the doubts; they are there for all to see. All we are asking is for this principle to be accepted, and if the principle to be accepted, then there is no harm in putting it in the law. Put it in the law so that it can be clear.

Perhaps the Minister would say that it is not a time for us to discuss that principle, we are dealing with a specific Bill, but we raise it in reference to this Bill as a general matter and if you agree with the general then, specifically, let it be stated. Do not to leave it open for the Minister or some other Minister to decide. Long ago, it used to be said that the Director of Audit is not qualified to deal with commercial accounts. This was one of the arguments. I remember I raised this matter years ago, and I was told that he was not competent; he was not trained to do that kind of accounting. It may have been good colonial thinking in the old days, a bourgeoisie principle. As the Minister said a little while ago, the Credit Corporation was a colonial corporation. Well I do not know if it really was a colonial corporation but if you want to change the boys and give a new set of boys jobs that is another matter. Right now we are talking about seeing that the public have some confidence in what is going on. Before you know it in a lot of these corporations, the Government will have to guarantee some of the loans. Soon you will hear that losses are being made and taxpayers will be called to write them off. This happens. Therefore, we want to be assured,

the public want to be assured that there is going to be proper running of these bodies and not only a proper running but accounting for how the things are being run. In that sense we are asking for the functions to be enlarged so that the Director of Audit can be stipulated in the law.

Public Business Motion
Approval of Financial Paper No. 4/1976:
30th June, 1976

Item 6, head 7 – Public and Police Service Commissions, Subhead 1 – Personal Emoluments.

Dr. Jagan: I notice that provision is being made for the reclassification of officers of the Public Service Commission. I do hope that in the reclassification, which is no doubt intended perhaps to give the comrades in these commissions the highest status, they will be a little bit more observant and they will look especially to the appointments of renegades. We understand that a lot of renegades are being appointed to positions in the Public Service and I hope the Service Commissions will take due note of this factor.

I wanted, Sir, to make a few general observations on this list of items before us dealing with requests for huge sums of money. I tend to support the view expressed by the last speaker about these huge sums which are being requested, not too long after the Parliament has gone over the Budget.

I would like to request that in the future, before Members of the House are asked to deal with details, the Minister of Finance should be good enough to present to the House a financial statement, the kind of statement showing how a company is doing which, I think, is presented to directors of companies when they meet from time to time. In this case the statement will show how the nation is doing. We had a review which is the Budget for the previous year and on that Estimates were built. Now, we have estimates which show the total expenditure of current and capital as nearly \$664 million and, as we heard from the last speaker, supplementary estimates are already before this House to the sum total of nearly \$90 million.

I am not going to lay as much stress as he did on this question of having proper estimates. What I would like to have at this time is a review as to how the premises on which the Budget was built, that is, expenditure, revenue and so on, are being validated because premises made, let us say, for calculating revenue and expenditure may have gone wrong, haywire for some unforeseen reason. Let us say, when the Budget was made, there was no estimate of the kind of weather we had this year, what effect will that have on the economy of the country? What effect will the loss in the rice crops, for instance, have? We were told a week ago, I think, that the estimate for the spring crop was 70,000 tons and only 48,000 tons had been yielded or reaped. What is likely to happen in the future if the rain continues? Some people say, we may not only have so much rain for this period but perhaps a drought may follow the rain. If so, what are the financial repercussions of that? In other words, the Minister of Finance must now give us a review. For instance, what is likely to be the estimated revenue in view of this calamity, unusual weather, which has befallen the country and,

which was not expected when the Budget was framed.

On the revenue side, we know sometimes at the end of the year, revenue sometimes falls very short of what was estimated. Sometimes it exceeds the expenditure. We should be in a position about the middle of the year to know how yields in revenue are going so that we can be in a better position to say: *"Well even though these estimates are here, perhaps it may be necessary to trim them here or there."*

I think some time ago the Ministry of Finance and, I think, the Ministry of Economic Development used to put out periodic statements about the performance of the economy. I know the Bank of Guyana generally puts out monthly statements but that is not what I think the House needs. It needs supplementary reports from the Ministry of Finance which will take into consideration what is being done in the various other Ministries in order to give the House a review, so to speak, every half year or every quarter of the year so that we in the House can deal with supplementary estimates more intelligently, not just send a whole lot of figures and asking for expenditure here and there. In many cases, the legend does not give great detail about the expenditure so that we on this side could make as valuable a contribution as we should when we debate these estimates.

Another general matter which I would like to deal with, Sir, is the question of agriculture, as I just stated. We see estimates here of all kinds of things and huge estimates of expenditure. I think that Government should declare this year an emergency year so far as agriculture is concerned and a crash programme should be worked out and all the resources of the Government, - manpower, financial and so forth, should be mobilized in order to rescue the economy and to rescue this nation. Sir, so far as I understand it, very little relief has been given to the flood-hit farmers of this country. The Government has taken the position that Government is not responsible, and farmers are not entitled to compensation. Well, it is all well and good to say that when farmers lose their crops they are not entitled to compensation but what provision has been made, for instance, for crop insurance? There is no crop insurance in this country. Floods and droughts not only affect the farmers but affect the economy of the country and we know in the case of rice particularly.

We notice that the Minister of Foreign Affairs is now at the United Nations and has made a speech there which was reported in the press today. I would have expected that while he was there he would have referred to the threats against Guyana which we hear so much about. I think the United Nations forum is obviously the best place where it is necessary to mobilize international support in the cause of Guyanese sovereignty and territorial integrity. I am surprised that the Government has not taken this wonderful opportunity to raise that matter at this forum.

Surely Sir, in the case of the United Nations, if the matter was raised in the Security Council we would have had a position where other countries would have come forward to express solidarity with Guyana. I think that

this is very important at this stage.

So far as I am aware, through the auspices of organizations of the World Peace Council, there has been international activity on behalf of Guyana. But what we want is at the level of the United Nations. This is a premier organization in the world.

Another Minister is asking from his seat what about Algiers? Algiers was a limited forum of foreign Ministers. I believe the Conference he is referring to the Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Movement. The Non-Aligned Movement is not the whole world. In the Security Council itself we have the major powers, world powers and the representatives of various blocks apart from the Non-Aligned Movement. I think at this stage it is necessary to get either some nations to come out and say where they stand definitely and others to come out and make pronouncements that they do not intend to be involved in any kind of destabilization or counter revolutionary moves against this country.

The Government seems to be hesitating. Why is that? Surely we know that the matter of tactics and strategy is a matter for the Government. Why should the Government not use the forum of the United Nations publicly to say that efforts are being made to undermine the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Guyana. From that forum, we could get to the whole world. We have journalists, we have all kinds of non-governmental organizations affiliated to and associated with the United Nations. Get them to be committed.

When the Government moves in this direction one sometimes must question whether all this talk is really serious. I remember that when a journalist from *Time Magazine* was here he asked me: "*Do you think that the Government may only be trying to divert attention from its internal problems?*" I said, whether it is so or not, I am not concerned with that. What I am concerned about is the fact that the Government says the country is facing attacks and, if so, we are prepared to say publicly, and we have done it here and abroad, that we are prepared to unite our forces with the Government forces in order to defend this country.

If we saying so, then the Government must use its opportunities at all levels to do so. I do not see where one has to split hairs on tactics on this question. What is the tactical game in not having it mentioned in the Security Council? What is the Strategic objective of not mentioning it there, especially at this time when Guyana is in the chair? Why not, when the world, so to speak is focusing attention on matters dealing with international situations and when we have a chance to let the whole world know about Guyana.

We welcome the Minister's statement about the Middle East. But we also want the whole world to know about Guyana at this particular moment. Therefore Sir, one begins to wonder what is the Government's motivation? Why are they remaining quiet on this occasion?

I am too concerned about the expenditure under this Ministry. Looking

at the Estimates I see that in 1967 there was an expenditure of \$223, 646 and this year in the estimates we have \$4 ½ million. That is from \$ ¼ million we have moved to \$4 ½ million. It seems to me that every day we are adding more and more to this Head. Of course in the last resort, the Government has to decide on priorities but we also have a right to criticize seriously. As I mentioned already, the rights of people are being jeopardized. I mentioned this in the case of prisoners who have to stay sometimes as long as two years without having their cases heard. If the Government cannot reallocate money then it should release people, open the gates. It must also begin to examine seriously whether in this critical period all this expenditure is necessary, whether the money should not be diverted to other more important things like giving relief to people who have suffered from the recent floods.

Cde. Chairman, when I spoke previously on this question you suggested that I raise it at this particular time. I had remarked on the serious situation facing the farming community as a result of the fact that not only of the excessive rains but in some cases because farmers could either not get machinery and in other cases because the farmers could not get the machinery on the field because of the condition of the dams and so on. In other cases, farmers do not have enough credit. We noted that some amount of money – I believe the latest sum which was published was \$90,000 – was given out as aid and my view, as I expressed before, is that something must be done.

Looking at this situation from the point of view of a real emergency, I think the situation needs a crash programme on the part of the Government to undertake works. I am sorry to say that I see highways being straightened. Millions of dollars are being used to straighten roads. As I was coming the other day from Essequibo, where farmers were suffering, and driving to town, I saw on the West Coast deviations being straightened out. That, no doubt, costs millions of dollars. I see in the whole Georgetown area, roads are being widened. Again millions are being expended. What is being done about the internal roads which are servicing agricultural areas. This has to do with the economy of the country, the livelihood of people. The Minister, in answer to my colleague when we were debating the question of the banks and the amount of credit which was given, said something to the effect that in socialist countries certain things are done the scientific way and I think the Minister of Finance in reply said, *"Look at the Soviet Union, they had losses in crops and so on"*. It is true that one cannot control the weather completely and there are times when you are going to have unusual situations. But what must be done must be done. From the days of Eleazer in this Council, legislators have been talking about drainage and irrigation in Guyana. Long before we came to this House there was the Hutchinson Scheme. A Minister of Works and Housing was himself one of the first engineers of Guyana who drew up a blueprint. There he is. He was the one who drew up the blueprint. When he brought it during the time when I was Premier, I said we do not only want to see the

engineering blueprint, we want to see the feasibility study to see how the things could be financed. The years have gone, we have not got it yet. Therefore it is no use talking about the weather. As I said, there are times when you have unusual weather but if the necessary things had been done, if there had been water control schemes and if priority had been given to them and the priority had been given for first things first. As I asked, which is more important for an economy which depends up to now primarily, to a large extent, on agriculture? Which is more important, straightening up deviations, making highways and wonderful roads as approaches to the city, or making roads semipermanent, if not permanent in the agricultural areas so that the machine can go and so on. It may be either as my colleague said at a previous debate, that the Minister of Agriculture is a minority in the Cabinet and he cannot get his way – one is just praying to God that he has been spared.

As I said before on this question, I can see, if things go on like this that not only the farmers will suffer, but the working people of this country will suffer greatly here. Already, the prices on the markets are very, very high for local commodities. In the rice industry, they have said over and over that they are not going to have to adjust wages automatically with the rise in the cost of living. That is done in most countries where working class interests are looked after. They said they are not going to do that. This means that the working class in this country has had a fall in the standards of living and this year, with prices escalating, local food prices and so on, the situation will be worse for the working class, and later on we may find ourselves faced with demands. Let us hope that the Government will not then say that the workers must not strike and must begin lecturing to them and preaching and putting out a lot of pamphlets and propaganda for which we are paying dearly too, as we just saw in the Estimates for the Ministry of Information.

I think the situation today calls for a crash programme in agriculture. This is in the interest of the farmers, it is in the interest of the working class, because what is produced in the countryside has to be consumed by the workers and in the face of a wages freeze, if prices rise, it means that the standards of living will fall.

I hope that the Minister of Agriculture, in collaboration with the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Economic Development, will see to it that something is done urgently. \$45 million should be voted now not \$90,000. We find millions voted for all kinds of things. Why can't we sacrifice a few millions now to give relief? And it should not be done on a partisan basis as happened in the case of the cane farmers in the Canals?

We have statements which showed where the farmers came to me and said that they were forced to join the Cane Farmers' Association which the Minister of Labour recognizes. Money was to be deducted from their payments for canes sold and handed to that organization. Is this the way of relief? In other words, the farmers were told that if they wanted relief, if

they wanted loans, they had to join the Federation of Cane Farmers. This is what we are objecting to.

Let me say here, Sir: we are not going to get unity in this country in this way. We are going to get turmoil. If that is what the Government wants okay; they must accept the responsibility for it. But it will happen if methods like these are used as is now happening in the case of the shooting which we were talking about a little while ago.

We do not mind the renegades leaving us. But let them take a vote today and the people's Progressive Party will win P.R or no P.R. It will be stronger than ever. I am not concerned with a few renegades leaving us. What I am concerned about is the renegades using the State machinery to get bodyguards and policemen to shoot down people, to gun down people for Party purposes and to use public money to offer people jobs. Where did Harry Lall get \$350 to offer to a sugar worker?

This is what they are doing. They are using Government jobs for Party purposes. They are going around to different people in the P.P.P and offering them jobs. They cannot get jobs unless they are members of the P.N.C. Now as soon as they leave the P.P.P., they can get jobs. Anybody who has a little dissatisfaction can get a job with the P.N.C. Is this the way we are going to have unity in this country? If they want it that way, it is all right. But let us understand that you are not going to get anywhere like that and the country is not going to get anywhere either.

This country is largely still an agricultural country. We have not gone anywhere yet in industry, nowhere for that matter. We are independent. We are fighting to take over from imperialist companies but the back door is still there through CARICOM which, no doubt, will hinder our industrial development. Therefore, Sir, agriculture is still the backbone of this country. The largest number of people still earns their livelihood from this and I think, outside of party politics, this is economic sense. The Government must understand, even if the majority of the farmers do not support them, that this has to do with the economy of the country.

I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture knows this and realises this. He is not only a scientist who is versed in the field of agriculture. He is also versed in development economics and therefore, he understands this. Unfortunately in this country not only science works, not only logic works. This is a pity. Therefore, I am urging at this crisis in our history, at this critical period that logic and a scientific rather than a narrow partisan political position should prevail so that the country can really go forward and create conditions for all this socialism that is talked about so much today.

Public Business Motion - Approval of Financial Paper 5/1976

Dr. Jagan: I refer to these matters because the Prime Minister does not have to come here only to give facile excuses because in the long run it costs the people that price - those who partake of those meals - that the quantity is much too small. I should imagine that there would be some form of subsidy at the hostel because you can go to any restaurant and get a meal at that price. At least at the hostel one would imagine that it would be cheaper and that it would provide large enough meals to satisfy the appetites of the people using the service. But there are many complaints that this is not so.

I think, too, that the toilet facilities are not being properly maintained and I would like the Minister concerned to look into it and see that all possible care is given in the maintenance of these hostels because the hostel is the only place where visitors from the Interior who come to Georgetown can board and lodge. I think that it should be our duty to take care of them properly.

I should like to speak on item 200. Expenditure for special visits and representation at external conference was estimated at \$800,000. We had a previous supplementary provision of 50 percent, that is, \$400,000 and now we are going to have another supplementary vote of \$270,000. We saw in a publication recently that 36 or 38 people went to the Non-Aligned Conference. Many wives were included, and children too, we understand. Let us hope that the children were not included as is rumoured.

This is a poor country. Why do we have to such a large entourage attending a Conference such as that one? I refer to that one because this is the general practice. Is the taxpayers' money to be used to entertain people, to give them free trips, to give them huge expense allowances of \$3.50 to \$4.00 a night? If this is a poor country and we are calling on the people to make sacrifices, why do we have to spend this kind of money in the lavish way it is being done? A big country like India with a much larger population - we do not even have a million people, they have over 600 million - with much larger resources and a much bigger trade, sent 30 delegates and they are right next to Sri Lanka. We have to take delegates from one part of the world to the next and we take practically a whole plane load. I have been looking through these Estimates. As you know, we were not involved in debating or discussing these estimates and no where can I see, even under '*Other Charges*', such a vast sum of money put as a block vote without being debated. I remember they used to have estimates which were explained in detail.

Only this afternoon we were talking about representation abroad through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and we were talking about the standard, the lifestyle and so on. I remember years ago when we were thinking of

this question that the India Government for instance was talking about setting up one-man Embassies. Embassies are doing a lot of the spade work, the investigation work and so on. That is what they are there for. At least one would hope that they are there so we can get the affairs of the state done at the least possible cost to the taxpayers of this country.

The British never worked like this in colonial days. I thought you said this was how the British operated.

Many comrades in this House unfortunately do not get out of their air-conditioned offices and in some cases, their air-conditioned cars, to go around and see what is happening to the small man today. They do not really understand what is happening. They must go to the markets and see the prices that the people have to pay. And, when the people, on top of that, are being insulted through the press and radio, even the Ministers' pronouncements, then you cannot expect the cooperation which the people should give. And so, Cde. Chairman, I hope that when the next Budget is presented we are going to see some justice being done to the people of this country where all these extravagances are severely restricted and out in fact so that money can be spent for more useful things. Get the money from the C.I.A if you want to travel but don't put it on the taxpayers here. I do not run the Greenland Cooperative Society; I did not run rackets. If you are suggesting I ran one I am telling you get the money the same way you got it when you were Minister of Works. The same way you build a big house. Your mother and father?

I would like to correct the record of the misinformation given by the Minister of Finance. On the question of allowances; there was a fixed rate. In fact, the rate under the P.P.P. Government was a reduction of what existed under the Interim Government. That rate was mainly an out-of-pocket expense of \$10 U.S. When it comes to hotel bills and so on, these had to be presented. When the Minister says there were no statements, this is all rubbish.

What is being done now? All are lumped together; allowance, hotel meals and everything and then a lot of these people are going on official visits which are paid for by the host countries in many cases. I want to know whether in Sri Lanka you stayed in a hotel and you paid or whether it was provided by the host country. You see it is a big difference in all these little subsidies. We have been told that we had a minimum delegation. Add up wives – we were not told how many wives went to Sri Lanka. Recently, at another Conference, wives went and the State had to pay. At many of these Conferences, especially State visits, the host countries pay but then you give an allowance – which is not just out-of-pocket allowance, it includes hotel, meals and everything else, then you say it is... That is why the Minister does not want to give the figures. He knows the figures. Let him tell the House, let him tell the public. But they do not want to tell us, or they put it in the papers at \$400 a day.

Cde. Chairman, I should like the interject again. So far as I was con-

cerned, bills were always presented. Secondly, the Prime Minister at many times jibed in this House and elsewhere that: "*You think we are going to live like you.*" So from what the Minister is saying now, he is giving the impression that under the P.P.P., because there was no specified amount, the P.P.P. Minister was living extravagantly whatever the bill was that they went to the posh hotels, the biggest. This is what they are doing and, therefore, whenever they fix a rate now it depends on the question of values. This has to be taken into consideration. That is why he does not want to mention the sum. They used to jibe us by saying: "*Look at the class of hotel you are staying at.*" We used to stay at the one which was modest. I cannot remember the names now. Let the record be straight because the way the Minister of Finance puts it, he is giving the wrong impression and that is why I want this thing to be put right. So far as the allowance was concerned it was a reduction from \$25 in the Interim Government to US \$10 during the P.P.P. time.

Approval of Financial Paper No. 5/1971 (Cont.)

Dr. Jagan: What are we developing under this so-called National Development? Is this national development or P.N.C. development? We have in this country today, a Ministry of Economic Development; we have another Ministry of National Mobilization and we have another Ministry called Information and Youth development or something along that line. Culture and Youth come under that too.

I want to make the point first that we have a lot of unnecessary Heads in these estimates. That of course accounts for all the top-heavy Ministerial cabal we have over there which the taxpayers have to pay for. Secondly, on this particular Head, why is it that we do not have details as to how the \$3,300,000 will be spent? Why were there no details for the voted provision of \$10,000,000? Is it because a lot of people who are on the P.N.C. staff are put under the National Development and paid from public funds to do P.N.C. work?

Members on the other side are masking a joke out of this whole matter but this is a serious business. Very soon the taxpayers of this country are going to be called upon to meet more burdens. There is talk in the air about the removal of subsidies. We have already seen a rise in the price of chicken and eggs. We hear that there may be other forms of penalties to be placed on the working people of this country. If that is going to be so, why is it that we have to squander public money for P.N.C. purposes?

For instance Mr. Elvin McDavid was a Minister. Probably because of certain statements he made and public criticism of the State and the Party being the same, he was removed from his post. Subsequently, we heard that he was an Assistant Secretary of the P.N.C. but he now sits in the Ministry of National Development. Is he working? Is he a public officer? Or is he a party officer? If he is a public officer then let us know what post he holds. We understand, for instance, this gentleman went to two conferences abroad posing as a Minister of the Government. He sat on the rostrum and it was known that he was representing the Government of Guyana as a Minister of the Government.

Where is the Head? I do not see anywhere in the Estimates or in the notes which are provided concerning the size of the Ministerial apparatus that Mr. McDavid is a Minister of the Government.

We have a Government building in which many of these P.N.C. people are working. I received a Bill for the P.N.C. New Motion that was sent to me in an envelope marked '*Government Service*'. Is this how we are going to call upon the people to make sacrifices in Guyana when public money is being thrown down the drain? Millions of dollars, \$13,000,000 are involved. It is a disgrace.

Government vehicles, jeeps are marked '*P.N.C. and Ministry of National*

Development'. Where is the public accounting? I would suggest that we have the Public Accounts Committee immediately meet and the first item they must consider is this expenditure because there is a lot of jiggery-pokery going on here. Persons who are not public servants are being paid under this Head and they are working all over the place. For instance - you must be aware of this, Sir - Cde. Saywack is working every day at the Maha Sabha Headquarters. We have other names such as chauffeur Angad Persaud, Richard Mora Persaud as Education Officer and Administrative Officer in the Ministry headed by Mr. Salim is now paid by the Ministry of National Development and is working full time for the Maha Sabha.

If it is in the interest of the country and the Parliament then say so. Put it on the Estimates. Why are you going around devious ways trying to fool the public and not having the guts to put it in the Estimates and let the public know how this money is being squandered in the country?

We have the case of another person named Mr. Teekah. Mr. Teekah has been caught red-handed intimidating a P.P.P. parliamentarian. Because of the harassment which we have been complaining about and the intimidation, comrades approached the police. They put a special connection to the telephone where he could dial "O" at the time when the call is being made. The telephone was traced to Teekah's home. This matter was brought to the attention of the Commissioner of Police and copied to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Home Affairs. Nothing was done. Next thing we heard - we saw it in the *Chronicle* - was that Mr. Teekah is employed by the Ministry of National Development, obviously from the same vote. If he is employed in the Ministry of National Development one would assume that he is paid from this block vote.

We do not understand and that is why we are asking that the Public Accounts Committee should go into this Head and find out where the money is going. There are lots of other things which we need to know, and I am going to ask that the Minister of Finance should present a detailed estimate under this Head showing details of the amount of money which was originally called for, and this amount which is now being voted. Until then we are not going to vote for this sum. Yes you know you can carry it, you have the majority which was stolen in the elections, but this country is facing a national crisis and it is no use saying, "*Don't worry; we have the majority over here*". If that is how you are going to run this country, okay.

I would like to refer to certain statements which have been published in a full-page advertisement or statement in the *Sunday Chronicle* of 10th October, 1976. I quote:

"The Militia embraces our entire people- making every citizen a soldier. The aggressor will know we are united and that every Guyanese is willing and trained to oppose him. Our whole people - determined and mobilized in the militia - can never be 'surprised' by invasion or defeated after a struggle."

"It will have members in all districts right down to the smallest communities."

And it adds:

"The Militia is based on political commitment; the Army is based on professional motivation. The Militia can engage a people's war, of self-defence; the Regular Army may specialize on conventional operations."

The thing about this Government is that it can always put up very nice statements about democracy, about involvement, about all kinds of things which, when looked at, are very well presented but when it comes to implementation it is a horse of a different colour.

At a May Day rally in Georgetown when this matter of a people's militia was raised the Prime Minister indicated that this will not be a P.N.C. militia, but a people's militia.

The last time this matter was brought up in the House, certain problems were raised but these have not yet sorted out. I wish to say that what we have today is not a people's militia but a P.N.C. militia and every effort is made by the P.N.C., by administrative and other devices, to keep this from what it is supposed to be and what it is declared to be. You can have what you wish. But no use coming here and belly-aching about sabotage of defence and security amounting to \$90 million, later coming, as we come now and perhaps with bigger estimates, calling for additional expenditure.

Our point of view on this question is that we must be prepared to defend the country. But this is a small country with limited resources, limited population, limited taxable capacity. At the same time, there are many other services to be met: education, health, housing, jobs, etc. Therefore, we have, while keeping defence in mind, to keep an intelligent balance otherwise we may find that too many burdens are put on the people. You will have a boomerang effect and the very people will help to destabilize the country.

We must deal with the question of the militia as a means of obtaining defence at the cheapest cost. My friend, Cde. Collymore, has already referred to the four aspects of internal security, the army, the police, the National Service and the People's Militia. In fact, in the same statement, which I referred to, it is stated that the People's Militia can be the cheapest form of providing security for the country. Why? Because it will be done by the people in their communities. You do not have to pay them. You do not have to feed them. You do not have to transport them. In this sense I think my colleague has referred to the question of the National Service in relation to the question of defence, from the Paramilitary side of it. Let us say we are spending \$20 million on National Service and in their localities. This is what we have to look at. We have to look at the least possible cost.

Security is not only to train and arm people, but also to get voluntary duty. In Cuba, every member of the committee for the Defence of the Revolution volunteers to give guard duty, once every month for four hours. This

is the kind of mobilization we need. Today, you have students from the University picketing outside of the Parliament. As a result of National Service, last year over a dozen students were expelled from the University and right now another forty are facing expulsion, some of whom are ready to graduate.

Last year the Students Society at the University started a farm. Where is the farm today? What is growing in the farm? Is anything growing? The Vice-Chancellor went to examine and others went to Cuba to look at work/study. Some of the same thing that we want to accomplish in the National Service can be accomplished under work/study. You can get a Militia at a University. It comes with satisfaction having to use compulsion and the weapon of expulsion and you will get far more out of the people.

We refer to these matters because we have to look at this question from a very comprehensive point of view. It is not enough simply to come to the House and ask for more money. The time has come, in this period of crisis, to look at the picture comprehensively and see whether it is possible to so organize, so construct, that we can get what is needed in this country.

The problem with the Government is that it is based on a minority of the population and it wants to do things from above. It, unfortunately, does not trust the people. If it had trust in the people there would be a Militia in every single community because this is an obvious necessity, as they themselves say. If they had confidence in the people they would have Local Authorities which are thrown up by the people. If they are afraid of the people, if even in the area where they are supposed to be strong they do not want to have workers' control, not even so-called "*workers' participation*", then they are going to have to do it this way. If the Government had a policy to control the cost of living properly, then it would not have to make irrelevant statements at this time and disturb the meeting of the House. The Government used the State apparatus to bribe people, but some they cannot bribe, unfortunately.

And I think that the time has come when we have to take these matters very seriously. We speak seriously about these questions because, while we may speak with some emotion, this must be understood in the context that we are very serious about the question of where our country is at the moment.

The Prime Minister stated a few moments ago when he was talking about floods and so on and that no country can prepare for unusual conditions like the last flood we had. But what he did not say was the Government's failure to do even the minimum works, the maintenance, and the Drainage and Irrigation Scheme, which should have been done over the last 12 years. It is all well and good to say educate our Members and to make a glib statement like this. What I am saying is that rice production has not fallen simply because of heavy rainfall. It has to do with several other factors like negligence and so on.

The Prime Minister cannot blow hot and cold by saying the economy is

in a bad way, therefore there is justification for tightening of belts, for taxation, for foregoing subsidies and at the same time trying to run things bureaucratically when other forms can be instituted which are cheaper. I repeat you can pass all these measures - you have the majority - but all we are saying is implement what you say in public. See that we have adequate defence, adequate security and so on at the cheapest cost so it would not be an unnecessary burden on the people. This is what our position is and we are going to ask the Government to fulfil its declaration and not to be hypocritical about these matters by saying one thing in public and doing something else in practice.

Cde. Chairman, I note on item 57, Head 15- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Subhead 13- Expenses for the printing and distribution of Information Material, that there is an additional expenditure asked for of nearly \$18,000. The legend states "*Increased activity and cost of printing materials and supplies*". Apart from the observations which were made already by the last speaker on this side, we had an answer about lifestyle and so forth. I think that on the question of expenses from propaganda, this country is really outdoing itself. We have a tremendous amount of printed material not only by the Ministry of Information but also by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. I think a lot of this can be saved, a lot of this is unnecessary. I have seen much of this thing. Much of it is P.N.C. propaganda. So far as I am concerned respect will come not by trying out propaganda, reams and reams of it and also by increasing quantities or by living in a luxurious way. Respect will come out of our position on fundamental issues, where we stand on a fundamental issue of the day. And once our position on these issues is well known I do not think we need to expend the very large sum of money that we are spending today.

This is only, you may say, supplementary, but you relate this expenditure with what is done in the Ministry of Information, we would see that a country like this should not be spending so much for propaganda purposes. Certain countries are respected, Cuba, for instance, or Chile under Allende, because their position is far more important than the propaganda aspect. This is what we would like to point out from the other things which are necessary. We cannot raise living standards in the country. Indeed, if living standards go down, it is no use talking about building socialism because people will suck their teeth and even decry so-called "*socialism*."

We would therefore like to bring to the attention of the Government the large amounts that are being spent under various Heads by these Ministries and the Ministry of Information in particular. As I said, we are not dealing with that at the moment but they all are related in one way or another.

There are other instances which I do not want to go into detail about because the Government can always justify these expenses. But I think the time has come when the Government must exert the greatest amount of prudence in expenditure that will get the maximum value for our work in

the international arena, and in that way utilize the funds for the work in the international arena to build up the support for the country to defend it against attacks, whether from internal or external sources, and also to satisfy the people so that they can have decent standards.

Cde. Chairman, I see under item 64 an additional sum of \$12, 000 is being asked for in addition to the \$20,000 which has already been voted for Expenses of Turkeyen Third World Lectures. This seems to be a lot of money. As far as I am aware I do not know many people are involved in these lectures. Perhaps the Minister will give us an idea of why that expenditure is so much. Do we have to pay the gentlemen and if so are they being paid at a very high rate as lecturers, on the same scale as Prime Ministers and so on are being paid in the United States? Do we have to pay on the same basis? I would like to suggest that we do not bring people from the World Bank like the last one we had here, this gentleman who is now here from Nigeria and also, I think, the Chairman of the Economic Commission for Africa.

This question of Third World development is a very complex question. We must not only think that those who are in some very big positions necessarily have all the brains and have the best positions on this question. We have to see this in terms also of dialogue within the country. People who may have different positions, different in belonging to different party's for instance or different groups, so that debate can take place on particular issues. We know that tremendous influence is still exerted by imperialist states in the appointment and promotion of certain people. It does not mean that because they come from the Third World and they hold big positions in the United Nations, *ipso facto* they are the fount of knowledge. This is not casting any aspersions on them but I am merely making a reference to the fact that if we are to deal with the question of underdevelopment and Third World problems, we must throw the debate wide open so that when people like these come and especially if they cost us a lot of money Guyanese would get on the radio and go over what these people are saying and see whether from their visit, at cost to us, we can broaden the area of knowledge by discussion with them. Otherwise we may take as gospel what some of these people say, and they may have a lot of shortcomings. There is an area of controversy today as to what constitutes development in the Third World.

I would therefore like to make that suggestion that the dialogue must be a continuing one and all opportunity must be given for this kind of dialogue. But I would still like to get from the Minister why it that this expenditure is so high as it is. There may be some justification for it. He will probably be able to answer.

I notice also here there is a very big amount for contribution to the A.C.P. Secretariat. The sum of \$14,000 was voted in a previous supplementary estimates and now we are asking for roughly \$33,000 more. This is becoming very expensive. I know our godly Minister of Trade-

No I am just saying that I read long ago in the *Chronicle* where very recently some writers were questioning the Lome Agreement which was signed. I remember the time when it was signed, that a lot of praise we showered, perhaps rightly. We at that time took the line that we must have a look at it from an overall point of view and examine the position of Cuba and in relation to the whole international market of sugar. The Trade Minister just said the price has shot down from what was 160 per ton and now is 115. I remember reading in the *Granma* the other day where it was said that Cuba was getting 30 cents per pound for some of the contractual sugar sold to the socialist countries. I am not questioning that we must pay, I am merely trying to get information about this Secretariat and also the Lome Convention, because I read in the *Chronicle*, the Government newspaper, when it was signed, that it was a wonderful thing and more recently in the same *Chronicle* that there is now a look of askance about this whole question whether it is really serving the interest of the people of the Third World countries of Asia Pacific and the Caribbean. So on those points we would like to get some clarification.

Item 106, Head 26 – Ministry of Agriculture, Subsidy on Oil.

I should like to refer to the two items for which we are being asked to vote more than \$2½ million extra at this time. The Government, some years ago when we raised the question of coconut production and the fall of production in coconuts, when we alleged that coconut production was falling because the Government was not paying an adequate price to the farmers, such as the price paid in the West Indies, did not give us a satisfactory answer except that it was going to produce more oil through new things such as soy beans, sunflower, palm oil and so on. Yet today, we are before this House, it is asking for nearly a quarter million dollars to subsidize the importation of oil - no doubt, the importation of oil from the Caribbean.

Everything is blamed on the weather, whenever we raise the question. The last time I demonstrated how the Government imported bhusi from the United States, 20, 0000 bags of it. Is this what we are now going to buy for more than \$2 million?

The explanation is not only the rain. The Prime Minister this afternoon attempted to give as an explanation for the failure in this vital sector of agriculture, heavy rainfall, but if the Prime Minister were to listen to even him own officials he could hear that, for instance, because of the negligence of local authorities, not enough paddy in the spring crop and not enough land was ploughed in the autumn crop. In spite of that, the Government goes merrily along and postpones Local Government Elections.

In the time of the P.P.P. there was a subsidy of \$60 per acre to grow coconuts. That was removed and so today we are reaping the harvest of having to pay. Not paying the farmers, we have to pay to import more expensive oil from the Caribbean.

And what about all these glorious Schemes like Kibilibiri, where we had some man named Green who was to grow Soya beans there. By this time if we had a sound agricultural policy and proper treatment of the farmers, I submit that the taxpayers would not have had to pay this amount of nearly a quarter million dollars to subsidize the importation of oil from the Caribbean and, indeed, to subsidies to the extent of \$2 million for the importation of stock feed for poultry for this year.

And now we see the Government has taken a decision that it does not intend to subsidize beyond a certain level so it has got the price of stock feed raised and accordingly the prices of chicken and eggs have been increased quite significantly.

What I would like the Minister of Agriculture to examine- this was told to me only this weekend and I have not gone into it in detail but perhaps he could look at it – I was told that the increase in the price of the stock feed is about 72 percent. I am told that it is spread between the cost of production, the wholesale margin and the retail margin which were significant before in order to get production in the country going to meet the needs of the people. This is what I was told. But now, because the Government wants to hold down to the cost of living - you cannot blame the Government- it has reduced the spread. Costs have gone up in stock feed by 72 percent but the spread between cost of production and the wholesale price and the retail price has been reduced. Consequently, what may very well happen in time is that on the one hand they need to keep the prices of eggs and chicken low to satisfy the consumers because they are very high at the moment, very high. The Government is worried, naturally because it is going to lead to an explosive situation if all the prices of consumer items keep mounting up. At the same time, in trying to hold the prices even though they are high – if my information is correct - they are taking such measures which are likely to lead to a fall in production and if not a fall in production, at least a lot of small people are simply disappearing and leaving the monopolies who can survive.

I would like the Minister to look at this question very seriously because this is a tendency which is developing in the country today in the agricultural sector because of the overall policy. In the case of rice, it does not pay the small man any longer to pay for ploughing, for harvesting and what not. The costs are too high and, therefore, as a certain point comes, because the price he gets for his production is too low, he says, *“All right, I am leaving the production to those who are large, who can get credits, who can hire Government machinery.”* One Vice-Chairman of our Rice Action Committee hired the Government’s machinery because he is a big boy. It is rented at \$25 an acre for ploughing and he submits his machinery to the farmers and gets \$40 an acre. That kind of rascality is going on. The big man survives and gets bigger and the small man is being squeezed out. The Government is caught in this dilemma.

I told you the name of the man before. His name is Jailall. I gave you and

the Prime Minister the name before. His is Jailall from Corentyne, Berbice. I gave the Prime Minister the facts. The man is using the G.R.B. boats for his personal benefit. I am raising these points not because I want to call names but I am just showing the trend in Guyana today. If we continue in this direction I am afraid that all the glorious projections and so on, all the Caribbean Food Plan and all kinds of things will fizzle out because the backbone of this country has been the small producer. This is why we are today in this mess because the Government has not got a coherent policy.

Let us take the rice. The Minister of Finance in his Budget Statement this year said—

—Yes Sir. But what are we paying subsidies for? We import bhusi. We were exporting rice bran before. But now we have gone to the point where we are importing bhusi, not even rice bran, and that is why the matter is pertinent. Let me give you the figures.

The Minister of Finance in his Budget Statement this year said this: *“By the end of December some 180,000 tons of rice would have been harvested for this year. This is 40,000 tons in excess of last year. Exports of rice are also expected to reach a value of \$88 million higher.”* Cde. Chairman, do you know how much the farmers got out of that extra \$39 million? They got roughly \$4½ million. They gave them, at \$2 a bag, what is called an incentive. Well multiply \$2 a bag by 180,000 tons and you get what the farmers received, the men who have to produce the rice got 4½ million and the Government got \$39 million extra. These are the facts. How do you expect the farmers to survive? The cost of production on the other hand is mounting. This is why it is not just a question of the rain. If the Government does not take a realistic and serious view of this situation, I am afraid that not only the taxpayers will be called upon to pay, as in this case, but, as we see now, consumers will have to pay extra because the Government is saying that it does not want to subsidize any longer. I understand that all subsidies are going to be out in the new Budget.

So let the Minister tell us what he proposes to do to give the farmers a break, to give the farmers enough so that they can continue to be in production so that we will not be in the position we are in today where taxpayers' money has to go towards importing what we should be producing right here in Guyana.

Item 5, Division XIII - Ministry of Agriculture, subhead 4 – Development of Fishing.

This is expenditure for the research project in fish project development. We are not opposed to continuing research in fish or in any other thing. At the same time, I think it has been established for many years that Guyana has some of the best fishing grounds in the whole world. Apart from that, we know that outside of shrimp and scaled fish there are loads and loads of unscaled fish on our coastline. I remember during the time of the P.P.P.

Government we had a campaign to get the people to eat skinned fish. They had to prepare cuirass and gailbacker in all kinds of ways to disguise it and make it palatable so that the people would eat it. Today, in the North West District, they are buying cuirass for a dollar a pound and so on.

I would like to ask the Minister this: why is it we are fishing in abundant quantities but not using the fish meal for stock feed? We are importing stock feed of all kinds, not only bhusi. We know that protein is an important ingredient of the stock feed. How is it that we know we have so much unscaled fish on this coastline yet we have not been able to develop this aspect of the fishing industry as a by-product which can be converted into animal stocks, whether it is pork, whether it is beef, whether it is chicken, of which we are short at the present moment?

I would like the Minister to give us an answer to that question. What has happened? Why are we not big producers of fish meal in Guyana? Many countries, Peru for instance, make a big income from the export of fish meal and I see no reason why, with the information which was at our disposal, this country cannot be in the same position.

As regards item 6, North West Region, my colleague has already spoken about this question of pumping millions into Matthews Ridge, and getting nowhere. We remember once there was a big powwow at Matthews Ridge. When horses were flown in for the Prime Minister's comfort. All of that has not produced any results today but we hear from our Comrades that a boat has to take food from the area of the swamp to feed the people at Matthews Ridge.

I should like to put up a serious proposition to the Government. Before, when it was playing hanky-panky with the imperialists, the imperialists abandoned this project to rescue the workers there instead of having them dumped in the army of the unemployed in Georgetown. The Government decided to make the place into a farm to produce, we were told, mostly corn. Now we are importing corn from the United States and elsewhere. Now that the Government has decided to have better relations with the socialist world, I would suggest that instead of pouring more money into this, which is like a drain, it should reopen the whole question of manganese production in Guyana and approach perhaps the Soviet Union to find out. You have Dr. Ramsahoye. He was the big expert some time ago - what happened to that Dr. Ramsahoye?

Let us approach the Soviet Union perhaps or some other socialist country to find out whether it is feasible to reopen the manganese mine, because we know that at the time it was closed we had problems with Venezuela. And we know how the multinationals operate. Perhaps it may have been due to political pressures on the company that they decided to abandon the manganese project. What we are saying now we mentioned at that time. We asked: Why not approach the socialist countries to see whether this place should not be reopened as a manganese mine? But, as I said, at that time, Government was not having relations with the socialist coun-

tries. That time was a different time. But now we are in a different period.

Rather than pouring more money into this, we could invite one of the socialist countries; perhaps an approach can be made to one of them to carry out a serious examination immediately. The same money that the Government is pouring down the drain here could be used to carry out immediately a research examination into the potential, first, of manganese within the area, secondly, on the question of mining, whether it is feasible to mine the manganese. You cannot take the word of an imperialist company. They have their own reasons for shutting down and opening and doing all kinds of things and I think it would be more beneficial to this country to have that approach than continually wasting money, throwing it down the drain as it is doing. These are the two points which I would like to raise at this time.

Item 7, Division XIII- Ministry of Agriculture, Subhead 42 - Emergency Flood Relief.

On the question of flood relief, I should like to refer to the fact that the French Government recently, when there was serious drought, voted a substantial amount of money to pay the farmers. This is a capitalist country. It does not claim to be a socialist country. The Minister of Agriculture knows that in some areas, like the Mahaica- Mahaicony area, every year the farmers suffer from drought. The Prime Minister told us this afternoon of monies being spent east of Mahaicony.

What about west of Mahaicony? The conservancy should have been scrapped decades ago. The Mahaica/Mahaicony/Abary Scheme was not implemented by the Government, they let out the water from the Maduni and Lama Creeks whenever the water rise in the conservancy. It floods out the people in the Mahaica area going as far as the Mahaicony area. This year, in fact, one Minister told me there that was some negligence in opening the relief sluices at land of Canaan.

These people are suffering year by year. This year, in addition to that, they suffered from drought. Where is the compensation for these people? Where is this money to be given? Cde. Chairman, my colleague has asked for information about how this money has been disbursed. We are very serious about this question. We know, unfortunately, how this Government operates, how kisses go by favour, how things are operating only on a Party partisan basis. As long as that happens there is not going to be any peace in this country. There is not going to be any development. In this country if you are going to give relief, let it be done on a national basis, let it be done on a nonpartisan basis, so that every person will feel that he has a stake in the country. But, unfortunately this is not being done. In the same way you have to join the P.N.C. before you can get a job, you have to join the Federation of Cane Farmers' before you get a loan for cane farmers. Similarly, this is how all things work in this country.

I repeat; this is not going to solve the headache. The time is long past in Guyana when there should be a proper insurance scheme on a noncontributory basis. I would say, because the Government is already extracting a lot of money from the rice farmers, the provision farmers, and we have just heard of the cattle people. The sum paid is \$1 a pound, 30 cents per pound is paid to transport it and yet it is being sold for over \$2 a pound. We are always hearing of how the hucksters and the middle men in the market are robbing the people. Who is handling the marketing of beef? Perhaps, we could hear a little of that. I repeat; this whole question of agriculture and agriculture development has to be handled from a new perspective. Otherwise the country will not get anywhere, and indeed the people, as a whole, will be wholly dissatisfied with the present situation.

Cde. Chairman, I wonder if I can ask the Minister a question dealing with item 98, subhead 15- Bakery. I do not know if the legend is correct, but it seems that the sum of \$97,500 is a lot of money just for the baking of bread. Does it involve the whole expense of the baking plus the flour and everything else? I just want to get it clear, whether this is only for the baking of the bread and, if so, how long this operation has been going on. It seems as if we could have brought an oven many times over if this is the cost of baking. The prisoners naturally do this work free as far as labour is concerned and it is just the cost of the baking. As I said, we probably would have been able to buy air freight a new oven and put it there at a cheaper cost. So I would like the Minister to give us some precise information on this question.

Cde. Chairman, I notice that there is under this item 185, subhead 23- Expenses Fish Project, an expenditure of \$138,000 in addition to the \$640,000 already voted. The legend says: *"To meet cost of increased quantity of fish purchase and increase storage facilities. This amount has been advanced from the Contingencies Fund."* I do not understand why we have the question of fish distribution under the Ministry of Cooperatives and National Mobilization. There is the Guyana Marketing Corporation which deals with and handles produce - the purchase of fish, the storage and all of that- why do we have to have the Ministry of Cooperatives and National Mobilization coming into this to distribute the fish? Is it because the fish is to be distributed only through the Cooperatives?

Recently, I saw a letter which was written by the Guyana Agricultural Workers' Union asking whether facilities can be made available so that sugar workers can also take advantage of this facility, but a reply came stating that the letter was referred to the Ministry of Cooperatives and National Mobilization. Presumably the Ministry of Cooperatives and National Mobilization will have to go about setting up cooperative stores all over the country before the people can be supplied with the fish because that seems to be the rationale behind the C.M.C. transferring the fish of this Ministry and then the Ministry distributing it. If we have marketing surely marketing deals with it, but marketing should come under Marketing Corpora-

tion, the distribution and everything else.

My friend referred to something fishy and we must say it. At one time we asked why is it that the Guyana Marketing Corporation has the flour distribution for which it is given a commission and then it subcontracts this to the Greenland Cooperative Society which then makes a big sum out of it. If we are going to have State Corporation let the State Corporation deal with this as one body centralizing all aspects of this question of fishery produce, distribution and so on. This will make sense; otherwise we have too many things coming into it, too much duplication and all kinds of other things.

We have not yet found out who are the directors of the Greenland Cooperatives Society. Recently we heard that they had merged with some Paramount Building Cooperative plus what used to be a private company headed also by a big P.N.C. bigwig, Alphonso and Company. All are now merged into another big cooperative which recently got a big \$2½ million contract for the fishing wharf plus many other buildings going up in town.

We do not know what is going on in all these things but the time has come when a lot of this smelly business must stop. Fishy business, Yes, Either there are rackets running on the side, or permissions are being given to friends and contracts are being given to P.N.C. companies masquerading as cooperatives. In this case fish is being distributed to friends and relatives through cooperatives which are party organizations.

Let us deal with these matters on the basis of principle. If you are going to have state corporations, let them be run to deal with certain entities and don't let us have these middle organizations or middle men or Ministries, acting as middle men. Or is this a justification for the Ministry? Is this the reason why we have to have so many Ministries dealing with national mobilization and national development and economic development? Maybe they all have to have a little something to do to justify their existence and probably that is why fish from the Guyana Marketing Corporation has now to be sent to be distributed through there. This is showing now a cost of \$138,000 in addition to \$640,000 for the expenses of the fish project.

We would like the Minister to tell us how much revenue is coming under this Head from the selling of this fish through his Ministry. We do not know whether they are buying the fish at a certain price from the G.M.C. and selling it at a lower price because this seems to be what it implies. Let us get some figures to indicate whether this is a subsidy for the taxpayers or whether this is simply an advance being sought which will be recovered from the sale of the fish. We should like to get an explanation of this before we can pass judgment whether this is justified or not. I repeat that I do not see the justification or the necessity.

If there are consumer's cooperatives as a matter of State policy, okay. They can get their preference, their priority, and what not. But they do not have to go through this middle source. The policy of the Government, whatever it is, should be carried out by the State corporations. The policy is

determined and handed down.

This is why I was quite surprised when I saw the answer to G.W.A.U. by the G.M.C., to the effect that the Guyana Marketing Corporation is not dealing with this question of distribution of fish; it is in the hands of the Ministry of Cooperatives and National Mobilization. Perhaps the Minister will tell us the justification of this and also whether the amount sought here is a subsidy that the taxpayers have to bear or whether income which will be obtained from the sale of fish will recoup all this expenditure.

The Minister did not say exactly in his reply about the sum of money which is set aside here, whether this is a subsidy or whether it is a loan, an advance, to the body which is distributing this fish. The Minister told us from the letter he read just now that the fish is being distributed through one wholesale Cooperatives Society. May I ask a supplementary question? Is this wholesale Cooperative Society a state organization or is it a semiprivate organization? Is it a State body? The State corporation, the G.M.C. is the Corporation which has to do with all the handling of the fish brought into the country. It has to do with the shortage and everything else and it no doubt has transport trucks and so on. Why does it have to go through the Cooperatives Wholesale Society? That is why I am asking a supplementary question. Is that a State corporation or is it a means by which the state's money is being handed to some private people. Could the Minister tell us if this amount voted here is a subsidy or whether it is going to be recovered from the proceeds? Let us get the answers from this question clear.

Cde. Chairman, I would like to raise some very serious objections to the way things are done in this country. We would like to get this matter quite clear. Time and time again we see in this House where subsidies are being voted and certain people, middle men and so on, are profiteering and getting rich.

Cde. Chairman, we have seen where, in the case of machinery which was referred to earlier on in the debate today, Rice Action Committees, where the P.N.C. - I am dealing with the general question of rackets which are going on in this country. While we are talking about socialism we have a lot of middleman, contractors, fish sellers, cooperative wholesale companies, credit banks who have State patronage being done through these bodies and a few people we hear - cooperatives, trade unions and so on - are creating a new set of parasites at the public expense and to subsidise P.N.C. supporters. The letter was sent. Why? The letter was sent the same way that machinery pools are used for P.N.C. people only and the Rice Action people, in the same way fish is being distributed at subsidized prices to P.N.C. supporters and so-called cooperatives, that subsidized oil is distributed through P.N.C. groups and P.N.C. offices, while other people cannot get. How are you going to have peace in a country like this? There is talk about equity. We cannot use the State, in the name of socialism, to help certain people to get rich. Under the umbrella of cooperatives, we are hav-

ing a whole new breed of parasites. Even the Wholesale Society like the Greenland Cooperative Society was getting the bulk of money every year for subsidies. Why? Because when they can get something it is taken and given to another P.N.C. middleman, not one middle man but a group of them who organize themselves and call themselves cooperatives.

Is this the way we are going to build socialism in Guyana? This is why, no doubt, the Code of Conduct was set by the Prime Minister, share holding in cooperatives is excluded. So we can invest all the money we get, whether it is from allowances or big fat salaries or whatever it is, put it in cooperatives and the state business goes through these cooperatives. Whether it is contracting companies, auditing companies, they become cooperatives. Whatever it is we put a big label of socialism behind it. This is fishy socialism. It stinks. The quicker we stop this nonsense things will get better because the taxpayers have to foot the bill for all these things. When we asked the questions today about the expenditure of \$10 million, the Prime Minister said *"That is all I have to say"*. It all goes under a big umbrella. The Ministry of National Development spends \$13,000,000 and there is no explanation to this House.

The time has come, if this country is to move forward in harmony, that these rackets must stop; these discriminatory practices must stop. If the Guyana Marketing Corporation has produce to sell, fish or whatever it is, let it do so directly. It is a marketing organization. If it has to submit to some other organization, let it be done through the state organization, not through middleman, or through so-called cooperatives which are controlled by a few persons masquerading as cooperatives. In this way more people will be satisfied in this country because as we have seen in so many places, whether it is farming communities, whether it is consumers, whether it is loans, anything, people are not getting a fair deal.

We cannot build socialism based on this kind of behaviour. It is a question of morality; there is ethics of socialism. Apart from economics, where is the ethics? Where is the morality? We cannot just preach to the people and say tighten your belts, work harder, make more sacrifices, when they see these things happening daily in front of their eyes.

The time has come if the Government really means what it says, when we have to set up certain procedures which people will have confidence in, which will be impartial, which will deal with people equally so that there would not be frustration which causes people every day to want to escape out of this country. And those who remain are not going to make any contribution because they are going to be dissatisfied and they are going to suck their teeth all the time. Is this what we want?

Cde. Chairman, we had a big debate the other day where two men walked out of a Conference in Trinidad because somebody said there is no press freedom in Guyana. Surely you can make all kinds of statements but we must not delude ourselves that we have freedom, that we have equality, that we have democracy. The Minister just said two areas where we still

have some support. Why don't they hold Local Government Elections if they are so strong? They are afraid that the fraud which took place in 1970 will be exposed as it was exposed in the sugar belt in the last poll.

The State Corporation must work on State Corporations. The Government must set them up, must delineate the policies by which they will be guided in the national interest and let the State Corporation carry on with the job. State Corporation should not become P.N.C. Corporation and then use its control of the organization and fill the pockets of the P.N.C. people. That is not socialism. As somebody said, that is cooperative capitalism not cooperative socialism.

The time has come when we must stop fooling people. That is why they are annoyed when we go abroad. We talk about the defence of sovereignty, territorial integrity and so on but when we raise these points they say we must not talk about these things. When we talk about discrimination they say we must not talk about it. Well, we are not going to stop talking. You try your best to shut us up but you cannot. That is the problem -

The House is not everything. Politics is everywhere. All we are asking is to take the Members of the Government at their own pronouncements. We are not fooled by these pronouncement but they are trying to fool a lot of people. If they are not fooling people they should perform in the way they are pronouncing. Let there be equal opportunity, equality of treatment for all Guyanese so that all will feel they have something to defend, that they have something at stake, put their shoulders to the wheel.

Cde. Chairman, I see here the sum of \$161,000 to assist New Amsterdam Town Council in meeting increased cost of operation of the New Amsterdam Electricity Works. This amount has been advanced from the Contingencies Fund. Why do we have to assist New Amsterdam Electricity Corporation with \$161,000? New Amsterdam Town Council is charging the highest amount to the consumers at the moment, and indeed some of that money is being used, I understand, for income for their other works.

But Cde. Chairman I would like to draw your attention to something which is even more serious and it falls in line with what we were talking about a little while ago.

I have been made to understand that a lot of the problems which this electricity works is confronted with arises from the fact that they put a foundation which was not properly constructed and on this foundation the new generators were mounted. Experts were taken there at great cost and told them this. We do not know what they intend to do. It happens that Alphonso, a P.N.C. big boy from Berbice, and at one time Mayor of New Amsterdam asked Cde. Branco, and she knows New Amsterdam well. This man was Mayor at one time and now is a big boy at Bermine. His company used to have a lot of money during the interim period to build the Takama sawmills which went bust. Now we see that a cooperative is going to take over the saw mill and operate it. No doubt he will have a big loan from the Government. Anyway Messrs. Alphonso & Company contracted for this

job. How they got the contract nobody knows. Clearly the job that was done was improper. That is what the experts said. The foundations were not built properly and as a result of sinking and what not, the generator, I am told, is out of line. So they work for a little while, they spend a lot of money to fix it and they go "bust". We understand the lines are now being extended from Bermine to connect up to New Amsterdam in order to give them, I suppose, temporary relief so that they can probably redo this whole thing.

We are now having a national grid or something like that. Why is this work not tied in with the general operations? Anyway the gods know better, and the gods are taxing the people more and more. We have to pay, because one of the gods who got the contract did not do the job well, and so it goes. This is why this country is in a mess because of this kind of thing which is going on. When we speak of the Opposition being here and there, we want to be there so that we can know when contracts are going, when tenders are being awarded, to which P.N.C. big boy they are being given or to which so-called "cooperatives" they are being given. This is the reason. So that we can see the loopholes of corruption which are rampant in this country today. This is why they do not want to involve the workers in workers control to that they can check on all countries, all purchases and all sales. That is the job of workers' control, not just to produce and talk about production and, as the Minister said once at Guynbau, to become involved in disciplining themselves. You have Machiavellian rascality; you want to give the workers the raw end of the stick.

Yes, because you rigged the elections there, and your "yes" men are doing what you want them to do. Cde. Chairman, they rigged the elections at Linden and they told the puppet trade union leaders what to do. I am referring to a question.

These rackets are getting the country nowhere and the time has come when there must be a law dealing with corruption, an Integrity Act. Jamaica has it, Nyrere has it in Tanzania, and Trinidad is going to make it. Why can't we have it here so that we can stop a lot of these things? The taxpayers are called upon every now and then to foot the bill and they do not know any difference because the press is muzzled, the radio is muzzled. You cannot bring it up, even what we say here it is not reported.

This is a serious matter and the Government must call for an account to let Alphonso pay for all of this. If he was negligent, let there be an examination. We are going to put a Motion here for an enquiry into this job to find out whether there was negligence and, if so, how much it has cost the Town Council already, how much it is now costing the taxpayers and whether the amount should be recouped from the contract. This is how this country should move and not the way it is going at the moment.

Cde. Chairman, I should like to refer to item 14, Ministry of Finance, subhead 12 – Acquisition of Bookers Holding where a sum of \$9,490,947 was already voted as a supplementary provision and now \$707,195 will be

provided for cash payment on the acquisition of Booker Group of Companies. I mention this because in this year we see that Booker is going to get roughly \$10 million. Some money will be going to Jessels and the Government, through the levy, will be collecting its own very hefty sum which, no doubt, will be somewhere in the vicinity of what was collected in 1974 and 1975, between the two figures.

While Bookers will be getting \$10 million, if they had continued running the industry they would have lost money. I say lost because, artificially, the Government takes out the levy in advance of the final accounting. They would have lost and got nothing because the Prime Minister has recently stated that GUYSUCO will break even. Guysuco, on the other hand, is telling the Government – Cde. Chairman, I am only showing what nationalisation is doing to us, what it is doing for the workers.

I am saying that through the process of nationalisation Bookers will get \$10 million according to this. Jessel will get its pound of flesh. Government will get nearly \$200 million and the sugar workers are being told that they will get practically nothing because either GUYSUCO will lose or breach as even the Prime Minister indicated, which means that the workers will get no profit-sharing and they will get little or no increase in wages.

I just want the records to be put straight so that we understand the realities of Guyana and when the sugar workers go on strike we must not have the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs sitting in his office saying that the strikes in the sugar industry are irresponsible. This is how things are operated in Guyana today.

If the nationalisation had not taken place with the levy operation, they would have lost money or they would have broken even, to use the Prime Minister's most favourable view of the whole situation. That is why they decided to tell the Government to take over. They went to the Government and told the Government to reduce the levy that they were going to lose millions of dollars. The Government refused and so Bookers said "*Okay, take us over*". And for the taking over we now have to pay them. The workers who had to sweat to produce will now have to fork out \$10 million to Bookers and state capitalism will be able to get nearly \$200,000,000 this year. The workers will get little or nothing.

Cde. Chairman, they have got \$131,000,000 in 1974. They get about \$250,000,000 in 1975 and from what we have said, the Chairman of GUYSUCO commented on the way sugar is going and at what price.

They are talking about world prices. As far as we can see from the statement made by the Chairman of GUYSUCO, only a very limited amount of the sugar produced this year will be going to markets where the world price will pertain. We can only calculate from the statement made by the Chairman. If you have other figures please tell the Chairman to correct what he said. We can only calculate on the basis of the figures the Chairman gave, that is, how much sugar will be sold at what market and at what price. That is why we say that whatever the figure is - whether \$100 mil-

lion, or \$200 million and – I am putting it on the record and saying it for the knowledge of this House, the Government will gain, the former capitalist will gain and the workers will get nothing. So when there are strikes in the sugar industry let us not hear from all and sundry that the workers are irresponsible. This is why I referred to the Minister because not too long ago he said that the sugar workers are calling irresponsible strikes and the farmers are listening to irresponsible people and limiting production. It is easy for Ministers to make these irresponsible statements but the facts of the matter are different and this is why we would like this to be noted.

The Prime Minister stated a few moments ago when he was talking about floods and so on and that no country can prepare for unusual conditions like the last flood we had. But what he did not say was the Government's failure to do even the minimum works, the maintenance, and the drainage and irrigation Schemes, which should have been done over the last 12 years. It is all well and good to say educate our Members to make a glib statement like this. What I am saying is that is that rice production has not fallen simply because of heavy rainfall. It has to do with several other factors like negligence and so on.

The Prime Minister cannot blow hot and cold by saying the economy is in a bad way, therefore there is justification for tightening of belts, for taxation, for foreign subsidies and at the same time try to run things bureaucratically when other forms can be instituted which are cheaper. I repeat you can pas all these measures – you have the majority- but all we are saying is implement what you say in public. See that we have adequate defence, adequate security and so on at the cheapest cost so it would not be an unnecessary burden on the people. This is what our position is and we are going to ask the Government to fulfil its declaration and not to be hypocritical about these matters by saying one thing in public and doing something else in practice.

Funding for Development Programme: 16th September, 1976

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, one would have expected the Minister of Finance in trying to find funds to finance the Development Programme of this country would have put the whole situation in perspective. One cannot blame him and the Government for trying to find aid, developmental capital, wherever it comes from. But, at the same time, one must not give a false impression and lead the people into experiencing illusions.

The Minister of Finance pointed out that there have been set up various Development Banks throughout the world, the Asian Bank, the African Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and even the Inter-Caribbean Regional Development Bank. But as my colleague Cde. Narbada Persaud pointed out, it is the failure of all these banking institutions which caused the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka to talk about the creation of a new type of institution, as the Minister of Finance warned us. On the other hand, he has told us that there are good possibilities.

My other colleague Cde. Lalbahadur pointed out that this Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank started at the time of the Cuban Revolution year after when Mr. McMillan was making his famous 'winds of change' speech in South Africa calling on metropolitan countries to give independence to colonies and not delay too long lest there be more explosions. And President Kennedy responded by convening a conference in Punta del Este in 1960 to which Fidel Castro went. He told them that another conventional arrangement would not help and what Latin America needed was a change of the whole structure of the economies of Latin America and perhaps developmental capital aid to the extent of \$19 billion.

That was the background. Has anything changed? If anything at all, the position of all Third World countries has worsened. This relates to all Third World countries, by and large, except those which are taking the revolutionary, democratic course and moving towards socialism. This is the context in which the Minister of Finance should have put the whole thing and not make us Guyanese feel we are going to have something which is going to bring us out of the doldrums. Put it in proper perspective. Not only that, relate it to the whole question of what makes for development, the role of the socialist world in the struggle to develop socialism, the help which those countries are giving countries which are moving in that direction. Let us take the general statements made by the Minister of Finance which unfortunately are not based on reality and can mislead people. He said, for instance, bilateral aid was bad in that it was tied to a specific country and thus we have now under the Inter-American Development Bank, for instance. All right, perhaps I did not put it in the exact words but the meaning of what you said was this, that the Inter-American Development Bank

is multilateral aid, and that this is better than bilateral aid.

Bilateral aid from the imperialist United States or western imperialist countries is different from bilateral aid from socialist countries.

First of all, 80 percent of the bilateral aid from socialist countries has gone into the productive sector, industry, agriculture; nearly 80 percent of the bilateral aid from capitalist countries has gone for infrastructure. That is the qualitative difference which is important to note. It is not just to deal in generalisations and say that bilateral aid is bad. The fact is that because American imperialism particularly uses as a vehicle of domination, economic then political then military control to maintain the status quo of dependency for Third World countries, bilateral aid was giving much. The Government of this country accepted such aid in the previous Development Plan but by 1970, the same Government was beginning to call for aid to be "*rid*" in the Budget statement. That is bilateral aid. I say again, we must make a qualification. Imperialist bilateral aid from imperialist countries is different from bilateral aid from socialist countries.

It is because of this development by the 1970s – not 1959 when Castro appeared on the scene when there were revolutions elsewhere, when Nasser could not sell his cotton in 1956 and had to make a bilateral agreement with Czechoslovakia to sell cotton, get factories, get arms which the United States would not give because the United States was backing Israel against the Arab world – that was bilateral aid but in the interest of national economy, in the interest of sovereignty of Egypt, for that reason, incidentally, aid for the Aswan dam was called off. That was multilateral too. Britain, United States, France had all agreed to jointly finance the Aswan Dam but because Nasser pragmatically wanted to get out of the vicious position he found himself in, he could not sell cotton because America was then dumping all kinds of agricultural products, food butter, rice and everything else. Egypt had to make a bilateral deal to save her economy and to transform it. So she was attacked. Incidentally, Soviet aid came to her rescue, military aid, which resulted in the attack being called off and the resignation of Anthony Eden, then Prime Minister.

I mention this because we must put things in a proper frame otherwise we will end up in a position where the Government claims to be socialist and it gets help from the United Force which we know is capitalist and pro-imperialist. They are on the same side. It happened before in this House during the foreign affairs debate in 1970 when the United Force voted with the Government. Why? Because while the Government talks about socialism, in practice, it is not moving.

I should like therefore Sir, to show that the Inter-American Development Bank has not solved the problems of those Caribbean members who have joined. Mr. Barrow has just been thrown out but Barbados was an old member. Mr. Barrow has bewailed the fact that he did not pursue socialist policies while he was Prime Minister. Let that be a lesson to this Government.

The fact of the matter is that during the war when there was no Inter-American Development Bank, Latin American countries were having a rate of growth of about 6 percent and in the last ten years, the average rate of growth in Latin American countries have been even below the rate of growth of the population. Take all, the Inter-American Development Bank aid and put it together. First of all, the aid is limited. Out of Latin America is flowing about \$2 billion in profits and interests, Latin American countries had to spend about \$2 billion for arms, military aid to prop up the American puppets. You want the statistics? I will give them to you. Here is a release:

“Mexico City, February 24, (PL). – The daily El Dial stated that the military budgets of the Latin American countries were raised from 1,549 million dollars in 1961 to 1,980 million in 1967.”

The Mexican paper pointed out that in Peru the increase has been 62 percent; in Brazil, 57 percent; in Paraguay, 61 percent; in Columbia 45 percent; in Nicaragua, 43 percent; and in Bolivia, 42 percent.

The relevancy of that is in the following: What this House must be told is that the Inter-American Development Bank should be put within its context that it is operating in Latin America and that is, within the context of imperialism and imperialist domination of Latin America, to perpetuate that domination and, as a result of that domination, we have capital outflows in the form of profits and interests much greater than the inflows.

By 1971, more than one billion net outflow of capital was taking place out of Latin America, taking into consideration all the capital inflows through the Inter-American Development Bank and everything else, private investment and so on. Then we had the arms expenditure; then we had trade losses. Let me quote from the monthly *Review* to show the position in Brazil:

“Between 1957 and mid-1969, Brazil lost 2,600 million dollars (US) because of the fall in prices of raw materials exported to the U.S.A. However, over the same period, Brazil received US aid amounting to only 1,700 million dollars.”

The period is between 1957 and 1969. The bank was set up in 1959. You are Minister of Information. I assume as a lawyer you have the power of logic. If that was the trend, that trend has not changed. In fact, it has got worse. The trend is that there were more losses in trade than capital inflows into Brazil. He says it is transitional. Brazil today is so much up to its neck in debts that the dictator, Geisel, went to the United States to renegotiate loans and he was refused. He then went to England and to France, and I understand now he is in Japan to negotiate more loans.

I would like comrades in this House to understand what we are trying to get at, and that is that development will not come about within this framework and we must tell the Guyanese public clearly what the position is

otherwise, first of all, the Government will be fooling them, secondly, like a dog chasing its own tail, the Government will get nowhere. The Minister and the Government will be able to get capital for this, for that, and the other, for agriculture. We have just read where in the United States they are talking about stopping imports of sugar from outside. I see the Minister of Agriculture is winking. We want to know whether the Inter- American Development Bank is going to finance agriculture here. A little while ago we were in a food surplus situation when there was spoil bank and everything in the United States. Through imperialist manipulations, we had some prices rising astronomically and soon again we are going to find a surplus situation. This is how the imperialists and the capitalists manipulate the whole international market for their own profits at the expense of the hungry people of the world and we are going to depend on these people to tell us which project they will agree to give aid to.

Let us examine the situation. Cde. Lalbahadur made a significant point. Did the Inter- American Development Bank give any help to Cuba? Instead it blockaded Cuba. Did the Inter-American Development Bank give any aid to Allende's Government? Even aid that was promised and committed was cut out in the case of Allende. Why? Because these two countries were going on a road different from the one charted by U.S. imperialism for all Latin American countries.

We are told that this capital will help us. Let me read you a statement made by one of the arch-imperialists of Western Germany, Franz Joseph Strauss in a book he wrote called *The Grand Design*. Listen to this:

"Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the other Eastern European countries are as much members of the European family as Italy, Belgium or Switzerland. We therefore need to think of a United Europe and a free Europe and not only a United Germany."

It goes on:

"During this period, we must attract the Eastern and Southeastern European nations more closely to Western Europe by cultural and economic ties, tourism, sporting events or any other suitable means. As far as economic cooperation is concerned...we must be careful not to assist the communist regimes to consolidate their power or to overcome too readily the weaknesses and deficiencies in their system. Economic assistance should be based on specific projects, each designed to tie these countries closer to the West than the East. We must support the process of a slow dismantling of these communist regimes and the adaptation of these Eastern European countries to the life and standards of Western Europe."

We understand that Brzezinski is expected to be one of the persons likely to be Foreign Minister to Carter, if he wins.

The basic assumption of the new approach was that mere verbal hostil-

ity would not throw the communist regimes and that even in East Germany and Hungary had demonstrated that the West did not have the will to use force. Instead of waiting for the communist regimes to collapse, the United Force would henceforth bank on promoting evolutionary changes within them and within the bloc as a whole.

What applies to imperialist strategy for communist countries and socialist countries applies with even more force for Third World countries, because in Third World countries there is greater leverage. And if one would take Bolivia as an example, the Paz Estenssora Government nationalized the tin mines of Bolivia in the 1950s. It carried radical land reform essential for economic development, but between 1952 and 1964 with aid, investments, it created not development but a new bourgeoisie which helped to overthrow the Government in a military coup in 1965. So we must not live in a dream world and make the illusion for the Guyanese people that the Inter-American Development Bank is going to help us to solve the problems because the problems of the people cannot be solved unless you go to socialism. You have to make a determined effort but we have seen from this week's *Newsweek* that the Government is still pragmatically moving without being guided on the basis of certain fundamental principles and analyses which can make it take certain decisive steps.

The Prime Minister went to the Non-Aligned conference. What did he say? As I understand it, he said: analyses are good, theoretical propositions are very good, sympathizers are very good – meaning from the socialist countries – but what we want is more material assistance.

The Soviet Union and the socialist countries have shown practically wherever people were determined to fight, Vietnam and Angola, to maintain their freedom, they were willing to give them aid. Cuba has shown that if you are willing to fight against imperialism you will get aid. Egypt has also shown it. Billions of dollars went into Egypt but Egypt has now reverted to capitalism and Sadat has reversed Nasser's policies and is now conducting a campaign inside Egypt against Nasserism. This is an established fact. The Soviet Union has helped Syria, has helped Iraq to transform their oil industries to give them economic leverage against imperialism. Syria now, we see is playing a very peculiar role in Lebanon to give it the best possible colouring. Socialist countries are not going to take chances and spend their money on people who vacillate, people who, as has been demonstrated in Egypt and now in Syria, moved from one side to the other. People in the socialist community are not only are concerned with what you say, they have been through all of that already, fighting rightist and ultra leftist revisionism and all of that. A lot of them talk about socialism, Marxism, Leninism and so on and others have exposed them. They have these unfortunate experiences and, therefore, do not think that you are going stop simply say, "*Look, we want money*" and they will give it to you. You have to show that you are serious about this thing called socialism. In practice, there is unity of theory and practice, not revisionist theory, but even if

it is a little revised let us see it in practice.

Aid has come to Guyana, plenty of it, but we do not have much to show for this in terms of people's welfare. Instead, we are up to our necks in debts. The Minister says that he feels fairly confident that we will get significant assistance and this assistance in multilateral aid. I do not understand how on the one hand the Government tells us that because it is not imperialist and socialist, the United States is blocking it in the World Bank and different places and, at the same time, it is telling us that we are going to get aid from the Inter-American Development Bank which is under the control of the United States and the other imperialist states.

Do you see the contradiction? On the one hand, you say imperialism is pressing you and on the other hand you are saying that you are going to get substantial aid from an imperialist controlled organization. Forty-one percent. Cde. Lalbahadur had given the names of the Latin American puppets which controlled the I.D.B. apart from the 41 percent. We have seen it recently. The Andean pact had the position on foreign capital. Recently because of the change of Government in Chile, they had to revise and relax on the role of foreign capital in the Andean continent, so I do not see that there is any consistency in the presentation which was made in this House. What we want in real development – because western bilateral, mainly U.S. bilateral aid was exposed, the United States itself moved towards multilateral aid and set up these agencies as a camouflage so that the United States government will not be discredited and it will act indirectly through its puppets and the dominance it has with the 41 per cent.

Even Peru which was taking a positive turn a few mornings ago has now gone back into the camp of the imperialists. If we want real development we must make up our minds. You have to take those steps, otherwise we will continue as we are. Look at the present position today. We are importing 'Bhusi'. Cde. Speaker, you know what they call 'Bhusi'? Here it is. There are 120,000 bags of one hundred pounds each, 2 billion pounds of 'Bhusi' imported from the United States. We cannot buy food. We banned sardines, we banned potatoes, but we are importing 'Bhusi'. Listen to the composition: crude protein – not less than 6 percent, crude fat – not less than 5 per cent, crude fibre – not more than 30 per cent. Look where we have got today. Guyana was an exporting country of rice. As a result of the fact that we produce so much rice we had to open a market in Cuba and the P.P.P. Government got into hot water with the American Government for breaking the blockade against Cuba, for which we were never forgiven and for which C.I.A. intervened in this country with the aid of our friend. This year we have already had a shortfall of rice. An amount of 70,000 tons was expected but 48,000 tons were reaped.

Cde. Speaker, I can appreciate the embarrassment of the Cde. Minister of Finance. He is like the Speaker once was in 1963 when the warship was outside. He sat in the Chair here and said "*I have not seen it.*" We have a Finance Minister the same way turning his Nelson's eye in the same way

because of his embarrassment.

[At this stage a bottle with "*Bhusi*" was shown to Minister of Agriculture]

Dr. Jagan: Send it to the analyst. It is "*Bhusi*" Maybe the Minister will tell us how much foreign exchange was spent for that and whether it is imperialist aid we are getting for nothing under the Inter-American Development Bank, whether the aid is coming through already.

I think I have said enough. All we are saying is that we are not going to vote against this measure. But we want to make our position quite clear to the public at large. The way to go forward is to decisive steps not to wobble and vacillate. You will not get out of the rut. Some countries have tried it and they have suffered and therefore, as I said we do not want the Guyanese people to have any illusion about this step which the Government is now embarking upon, and it is for this reason we take this position. Let them scramble; they are going to scramble all over the world, change the Israeli policy because they are looking for odd dollars. We do not feel that such pragmatism is going to solve the problems of this country. You talk about your ideas being based upon Marx/Engels and Lenin, let us have a principled position and in that way take us out of the rut in which we are.

Sabotage of Cubana Flight No. 455: 24th November, 1976

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, on behalf of the Members of this side of the House for whom I speak, we wish to express our outrage at the events which led to the sabotage of the Cuban Airliner and the loss of 73 lives. This indeed was a tragic blow to the people of Cuba, Guyana and Korea who suffered in that plane disaster. To the relatives of those Guyanese who have suffered, go our deepest sympathies. This is a loss to them which no doubt was very keenly felt and it is also a loss to the country as a whole.

We have to look at this thing, however, not in the context mainly of loss of personal lives, but in the context of this barbarous scheme to destroy those who want to take a new course, those who want to determine their own affairs, those who want to build a future, independent of foreign manipulation and control. It is in this context that we have to view this barbaric act. The Motion presented by the Member, Cde. Thomas has put it in a form which perhaps, is not as wide as we would like to see it because, for one thing, it is not only now, as the "*whereas*" Clause points out, that attacks have been made against our country. If we go back to 1953, we will find that Guyana was one of the first countries which became the victim of the cold warriors, when troops landed here sent by the Churchill Government. It was not only because there were a few communists or Marxists in the P.P.P. Government, but because this country was choosing a path of self-determination at that time, and the cold warriors, led by Churchill along with Truman in 1946/47 decided that communism, socialism and national liberation must be stopped all over the world. Churchill sent the gun boats to Guyana and removed us from the Government after suspending the Constitution.

Later, in 1963, we had the C.I.A. intervention in this country. That is more recent and more detailed and I will not go into that at this time. The exploitation, the sabotage, was directed against imperialism, what they regarded as No.1 and that is socialist Cuba. This started many years ago, beginning way back in 1960 in the San Jose Declaration in Costa Rica when Governments decided that Cuba must be attacked and must be blockaded. It ultimately resulted in the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961. After the failure of that invasion, it led to a blockade. The Organization of American States, no doubt with the prompting of the United States, broke off relations with Cuba and pressured all the other states in Latin America to break off diplomatic relations with Cuba. Before that, there were six countries having diplomatic relations with Cuba but after that pressure only Mexico continued to have diplomatic relations with Cuba and even this had a very nominal level. Trade was cut off. A shipping blockade was imposed. The Americans told all the ship owners that if their ships went to Cuba they would

not be allowed land at American ports. Airlines, such as KLM which used to fly to Cuba were persuaded that they should not continue to fly so that that country could have communication with the outside world. Even supplies of spare parts to factories, to motor cars, to buses were all cut off. The American Government instructed the oil companies to send a message to the then American Ambassador in Cuba and this is now admitted in the memoirs of that Ambassador that the American Government will back the oil companies and that they must not give in to the demand of Castro to refine crude oil coming from the Soviet Union. It came out in this autobiography of the dead American Ambassador that the oil companies which were willing at a stage to refine the oil were given instructions by the State Department to stand firm. This is the kind of pressure which was put against the Cuban Government.

We have seen that, in spite of all this, because of the indomitable will and the unity of the Cuban people, they are prepared to die rather than surrender, and the act of solidarity by the Soviet Union, the help which came from that country in all forms, military, economic and otherwise, that Cuba stands today still a socialist bastion in this hemisphere.

More recently, what has happened? We saw in Angola where Cuba, along with the Soviet Union, gave solidarity to the N.P.L.A. the National Political Liberation Movement of Angola. What the Americans say about this? They were willing to send troops – Kissinger and Ford. Fortunately, because of the traumatic experience of the American people because of the Vietnam war, Congressmen who were coming up for elections and so on, recognising the mood of the people, refused to further commit troops to Angola. And so we did not have another massive genocidal intervention as we had in Vietnam by the American Government.

But what did we hear afterwards? Kissinger said that the Cubans were the Russians Gurkhas, who are doing the bidding of the Russians in the same way as the Gurkhas used to be the soldiers for the British, to save the British Empire. And Kissinger threatened once again that they would attack the Cubans and Cuba, if there were any more, as Kissinger put it “*Excursions*”. And so we saw the heightening of the attacks. Because the Cuban Government was doing its international duty and giving solidarity at great sacrifice to itself and the people of Cuba, the American Government began the campaign of renewed aggression against the Cuban people and Government.

The mover of the Motion read the incidents. Therefore, I need not repeat them. They started from April 6 of this year leading to the airline disaster on October 6. One thing he failed to mention, however, was what Castro said in his speech on the occasion of the memorial service that a bomb exploded in a cart carrying luggage to the Cuban Airline’s flight to the Jamaican Airport, moments before boarding time. This happened on July 9. In fact, as he stated in his speech, had the plane not been late on that occasion, it is possible that the bomb which blew up on the luggage carrier

would have blown up right inside the plane. There would have been a disaster before this one. It happened that the plane was a bit late and so it blew up at another point.

In this situation, as I said, we have seen all these acts of aggression. Cuban citizens have been killed. Cubans have disappeared in Argentina and so on. I think it is important that this country should not only mourn our own losses but also express the deepest solidarity with Cuba. This is important. This is why I propose to move an Amendment to this Motion at the appropriate time.

It is not enough, of course, merely to mourn, to express our sympathies to the relatives of those who have lost their lives and to express our solidarity, but also to learn some lessons. Clearly, as the Hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs pointed out, there were acts of sabotage also against Guyana and there will be. This is the line which the P. P.P. took, in fact, since August last year. We did not wait on acts of sabotage. We knew that if a country takes an anti-imperialist course, it will be attacked some time or the other. And this is why our party took a change in political line to what is now well known as critical support.

The fundamental question now is what must we do to meet the challenge which Cuba faces? Cubans have been living with this kind of thing since 1960. Fortunately, they have survived. Fidel Castro asks in his speech on page 27 of this booklet "*When an energetic and forceful people cry, injustice trembles*". He said:

"We might ask ourselves what is the purpose of these crimes? To destroy the revolution? That is possible. The revolution emerges more vigorous in the face of every blow and every aggression; it becomes more profound, more aware, and stronger. To intimidate the people? That is impossible. Faced with the cowardice and monstrosity of such crimes, the people are inflamed, and every man and woman becomes a fervent and heroic soldier prepared to die."

It is not just rhetoric. Fidel Castro is expressing a reality. A reality of a united people, a united people who came out, for instance, to defend their country when aggression took place in 1961 at Bay of Pigs. At that time the Americans, on the assumption that the people were divided, did not worry to launch, as they did in the Dominican Republic in 1965, a vast military force on the assumption that the people were slaves as they put it.

They said a small force will be enough. So they disguised it and made it appear that Cuban exiles, trained in Guatemala painted some planes with "*Cuban Air Force*" to make it appear that there were people who had defected and who had started the bombing, on the whole assumption that the people would welcome this invading force. But they learnt to their horror, when they were mopped up like flies, that the people were united. It is this we have to understand. We have to see what are the ingredients for success. Ho Chi Min did it. So it is done in Cuba. The people were educated in

ideological development, not just the rudiments of ABC.

Let us have this kind of education, free scope, so that we can debate and discuss the principles of Marxism/Leninism. We heard the Mover of the Motion talking about the struggle and principles based upon Engels, Marx and Lenin. If we are to build socialism, there must be unity of theory and practice, scientific theory and revolutionary practice, without which we will never be able to defend our country or indeed build socialism. And this is what, perhaps is more germane to this whole question, the disaster or the sabotage has brought to focus the urgency of this question. The time has come when those who have the power to do so must take the necessary steps to see that the country is united. National unity is the greatest essence of the hour, but we cannot fool the enemy that we have it.

Cde. Fred Wills referred in his speech to the need for more vigilance and efficiency and he talks about some of the slackness, malingering and what not. We have to analyse what are the root causes of these things, not just to see the symptoms but examine the root causes. We cannot get people to get on the radio, like a man named Vaughan-Cooke goes on the air and attacks sugar workers and attacks rice farmers. We are not going to build unity in this way; we are not going to build unity by framing up people, by subverting the judicial process.

We have now a crisis. The Prime Minister a couple of weeks ago spoke about breaking even in sugar; rice production being 40% down. If you go in Berbice you hear people talking openly, even in official quarters, that had it not been for the negligence of local authorities more spring crop rice would have been reaped and more land in the autumn crop would have been ploughed -25,000 to 27,000 acres were ploughed out of a total of 75,000. That is destabilization, because if the economy is affected, more burdens will be placed on the workers. Already we see eggs have gone up to 21 cents, and we are hearing now that the subsidies will be cut and maybe the people will have to tighten their belts and buy Defence Bonds, ten percent of salaries and so on. We have to ask. The Minister in charge of local authorities addressed a GALA meeting and said they are not doing their work. The Minister of Economic Development makes a statement that local authorities are vitally necessary to have development but two days after we heard an announcement in the press that "*Local Government Elections are postponed*" again. I was just having a talk with my friend, the Regional Minister for Berbice who went to Cuba. We were talking about the recent elections in Cuba to democratize what was already a democratic system. Elaboration of democracy – we may put it that way.

The point I want to make is this; mere pleas, mere words, are not going to produce the results that we need and if this disaster, this terrible crime, is to have any reality then it means that we have to put our own houses in order and not just blame the workers and the peasants in this country. We have to put our houses in order, we have to see that those things which divide the people such as discrimination are ended, such as lack of democ-

racy, whether it is at local Government level, factory level, or school level, at whatever level it is. Nobody must be afraid that should they criticize the Government some Minister will call up a judge or a magistrate and say "Fix him." If you do that you cannot tell the people to defend the territorial integrity and independence and sovereignty. That is a concept which we are telling them about, at least so far as we are concerned.

But they cannot see concepts as well as they see what is in front of them, and if they see what is in front of them, which is oppressive or tyrannical in any way, then obviously they are not going to respond. In that sense, I wish to say that a grave responsibility rests on the shoulders of the Government of Guyana and the Government of Guyana must not put its head in the sands, it must deal with the reality of Guyana and grapple with it and try to find a solution to the problems which divide our country at the moment.

We also need to strengthen our links with the socialist world headed by the Soviet Union because we know that it was the firm position taken by the Soviet Union as regards Cuba that ultimately caused the United States not to move as it did in the Dominican Republic, to blow up the place to smithereens, it was the firm position taken by the Soviet Union.

We are fighting against powerful enemies. They may not come directly. The international climate today is different from what it was a decade ago. They will not send their troops directly. They have their sub-imperialisms through which they act and there are always the internal forces through whom they work. Fortunately, in this country, unlike Chile under Allende, unlike Jamaica today, the rightist forces are not strong enough to take to the streets to riot, to burn, to loot and the P.P.P. has made it quite clear that we do not intend to join with all and sundry just because we may have differences with the Government. But the Government cannot close its eyes that there are now slogans in the streets and on the sea walls calling for partition. These are some of the realities which you have to deal with. Free Arnold! Free him! Because when the judicial system is manipulated, when you keep a man in jail for over two years – I do not want to go more into that. The man was supposed to be tried in Berbice, after a long prison sentence.

I wish to say that the Government of Guyana – I am not saying this is just a critical manner because I do not think that the time is now merely for us to throw punches. The time has come for the Government of Guyana to take a serious view of the situation. We know that the economic situation is bad. See not just the surface symptoms but the root causes and try to bring solutions to problems which are deep-seated and deep-rooted.

I would therefore in conclusion, having posed the problem the way I did, say that the defence of Cuba is vital. In the same way, we see that the defence of the Soviet Union is vital. A strong socialist world community is essential for the security of Third World countries which want to take a nonaligned course, which want perhaps a better course, a socialist oriented course. In view of this, we would like at this time to propose an Amend-

ment to the Motion. This will be an amendment by way of an addition to the last clause at the end. It will read as follows:

“And gives unequivocal support to all the states in the Caribbean which are fighting against colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism, and also to the Cuban Government in its decision to renounce the agreement with the U.S. Government on air and maritime piracy and other crimes.”

Cde. Speaker, in his speech, Cde. Fidel Castro observed that unilaterally, the Cuban Government proposed this agreement, without engaging in discussion with the United States for any *quid pro quo* in order to create better relations between Cuba and the United States of America.

Further, in his speech, he pointed out that \$2 million which were brought by some of these hijackers were eventually returned to, I believe, the owners of the hijacked planes. But, in view of all those acts of terrorism which have been referred to already, the Cuban Government has taken a position that it can no longer continue to support, continue to honour that Agreement and so the Government of Cuba has given notice that this Agreement will be wound up when it ends on April 15th, 1977. We know that when this statement was made or even before it was made in this formal manner, threats were issued by the American Government against Cuba and therefore, I feel that it is important that every country should express its solidarity with the Cuban people and the Cuban Government on this question. Today, international solidarity is a very important question and while we may not be able to send troops as the Cubans have done in Angola, at least it behooves us to do whatever we can, whenever we can, to show our acts of solidarity. So, Cde Speaker, with these remarks, I beg to move the Amendment which has been circulated.

We on this side of the House will not raise any objection to the Suspension of the Standing Rules and Orders so that this Motion can be taken at this time. Indeed we feel that the House should have been summoned many weeks ago to deal with this question. Further, I wish to point out that I had not only to speak but to write to the Minister in charge of Parliamentary Affairs, not only about the convening of this House but also to deal with this question which we consider to be of great importance to this country, the Caribbean and elsewhere. So I repeat, we regret that this matter was not brought here earlier and we hope we will not have lapses like this again. We certainly will support on this occasion the request for the suspension of the Standing Order.

Broadcasting of Budget Speech and Debate: 12th December, 1976

Dr. Jagan: I rise on a matter of privilege. I note that in this House at the present time there are microphones and other accoutrements, one of them marked Radio Demerara. I assume that during the course of the Budget Statement by the Minister of Finance recordings will be made and, as I understand it, broadcast will be made live to the nation. I wish to say that I am not aware that any arrangement has been made in this House with your consultation or approval, for these microphones to be brought into the House at this time.

I rise on a point of privilege on the following ground that the Budget as we see it is a review of the state of the nation's economic health – it is not very healthy at the moment.

As I was saying, the Budget Statement is an opportunity to review the state of the economy, the health or otherwise of the nation, and for the Government to present in the Budget proposals that it proposes to do to resolve difficulties if there are any, the economic problems, the financial problems and so on. It is my contention that if Members on the Government benches and, on this occasion, the Minister of Finance is going to be allowed the opportunity of broadcasting to the nation, then the Opposition, in its major contribution, should also have a major opportunity to put forward its point of view to the nation.

In a democracy under a multiparty system, a parliamentary system, it is assumed that there should be a battle of ideas in the marketplace, in the population at large, in the nation. As such, we contend that if only one side of this House is given that opportunity and the other....

Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join the last speaker in expressing thanks to you for the wishes that you have expressed for the coming year. We should hope at this particular time that we not only conventionally get up and express good wishes for joy and happiness and wellbeing for the New Year. In some quarters for centuries they have been moralizing and hoping for the best. I hope that we will especially from the floor of this House, do more than express wishes, that we will try to implement the ethical values, the moral values and the good wishes that we may want for all Guyanese including all the Members of this House, yourself and family, members of the staff, and that we will take the practical steps which will realize our aspirations.

We too are unhappy that more burdens will fall on the Guyanese people. Things are very tough for them right now and will be tougher. All our wishes are not going to be realized just by pious declarations, hopes and slogans. What we have to do is seek to attain those objectives that we all want, especially from the floor of this House, for all Guyanese. We have to see that there is mutual cooperation, mutual goodwill, so that we can iron

out many of the difficulties, many of the obstacles which are in the way to progress and prosperity. I, too, would like to hope that things will be better and I hope that we do not only dream but that we can perform so that all Guyanese can truly say "*A Prosperous 1977*".

I would like to join my colleagues on this side of the House in expressing to you, to the Members of the Government, and to all the Members of this House and the staff, the Press and others who are associated with our work, a very Happy New Year. Let us hope that we can work together to make it truly happy for all the Guyanese people.

Budget Debate: 1st January, 1977

Dr. Jagan: On September 16, 1973, *New Nation*, page 1 said "P.P.P. in Shambles." I think it is more true to say today that it is the P.N.C. which is in shambles and it has brought the economy of the country into a state of shambles as I will now proceed to show.

The Prime Minister not too long ago in a speech indicated that sugar will have a break- even point so far as profits are concerned- the word **not** used was "surplus" - that in bauxite there will be a fifty per cent reduction in surplus and rice production will be fifty per cent down. The Minister of Finance, of course, in his Budget Statement reiterated some of these same figures and then proceeded to tell us about what should be done.

We are today facing in this country a grave economic crisis, a balance of payments deficits, budgeting deficit financing and huge almost chronic year after year development by deficit financing and huge loans from outside, resorting to loans perpetually, cuts this year in development expenditure, cuts in imports and cuts in subsidies. What this means is that there will be more pressures on the working people. The cost of living will inevitably rise. No one can doubt this.

What is the Government's position on the crisis? As usual, it attempts to externalize the crisis, to cast the blame on somebody else.

In 1974, it was the oil crisis. Today, it is the weather. And, apart from these, we are told today that we are caught up with the economic recession in the developed countries, inflation coupled with the recession, a fall of prices for exports like our sugar and the rise of prices of our imports. And, the general political line which the ruling party gives goes something like this, "Hold on! Things are going to get better. Don't worry if you have to bear a little more sacrifice, a little more burden. After all, all the Third World countries, most of them in fact, are in the same position. Even some socialist countries are faced with these problems. So, we are not unique. Bear your chafe." And, of course, a rosy picture is painted: "Hope for the future. Things are going to get better." There is everlasting hope from our Minister of Finance, Cde. Hope, perpetual hope but, unfortunately, this does not square up with reality. One has to excuse the Minister of Finance. He is a technocrat, he is not a theoretician, and he is not a Marxist / Leninist. I hope he is reading something but it takes a long while to absorb all of this.

What is his presentation? "The capitalist world is in trouble but it is getting around that problem, things are changing for the better and within this context, our position will be better too. Yes, because when things begin to get better outside we will get better prices, inflation will come down, we will get more markets, we will get aid and so everything will turn out right." The fact of the matter is that capitalism is in permanent crisis and it cannot solve its problems. It will not. They juggle the prices around. Today, in one capitalist country, the

problem become more acute, in other places, the next day it rises like a see-saw. But, the crisis nevertheless is there. Therefore let us not build any false hopes. What we should be talking about is reorganization, transformation and new relationships, completely new and permanent.

Why is it that many Third World countries are having problems? They are having problems; they are in crisis, because by and large they have been following the same economic strategies, the same domestic and foreign policies that were the basis of this Government's policies in the early period. This is the reason, so it is no use just generalizing and saying, "Well, all of them are in trouble, therefore there is no harm in our being in trouble too. It is justifiable."

We don't know that the majority of socialist countries are in crisis. The USSR, GDR, Cuba, have no crisis. They have no crisis which means taking it out at the backs of the workers. They have no rise in the cost of living. Prices in the socialist countries have been stable for many years. Poland had troubles recently but the price of meat, for instance, in Poland had been stable for 29 years. I will come to what you can get right here. Poland is not blessed, incidentally, with all the resources that Guyana is blessed with, which can and should have been mobilized. In the USSR there is no crisis, there are no cuts in subsidies, and prices are stable and more importantly even if they have, as some say, a crisis in agriculture.

My friend Nascimento is asking: Why are they buying wheat? I will explain. It is not done, I repeat, at the expense of the working class. The Soviet economy is strong enough that it can buy millions of tons of wheat. We haven't got any money to buy anything. We have to go begging. Three Ministers went abroad recently. Tell us how much you got. And it comes from these Benches too, that socialism is not working in countries like Russia. Let me just quote the Deputy Minister of Agriculture. He said:

"Before the collectivization (1926- 29), 55 million tons of grain were gathered in an average year. In 1971- 75, despite the fact those four out of five years were climatically unfavourable; the average annual harvest topped 180 million tons. Thus in the lifetime of one generation of peasants the grain output more than tripled."

He goes on to say that the "...targets set by Rome under the FAO programme for agriculture production, to satisfy the growing demand for bread, the world grain output, which now stands at about 1,200 million tons, should grow by about 25 million tons a year. At such rates the world grain output would double in 48 years. The experience of the USSR, as you see, shows that such rates can be considerably outstripped."

So they started out 1926- 1929 with 55 million tons of grain per year. In a very difficult period they had 180 million tons a year and now the target for the next five year plan is 220 million tons a year. But what I want to say

is this: They buy grain not for themselves only but for other socialist countries like Cuba, but what is important, they have the money. The economy can provide not only the cash, but also the foreign exchange to buy the wheat. This is not only to feed themselves but to feed, in the interest of international socialist solidarity, other socialist countries and Third World countries. So let us have no more of these excuses: everybody is punishing and so what is wrong with Guyana punishing too.

In Guyana, what is the reality? You have the slogan: "*Free milk and cassava.*" We had, under the last five year plan, the slogan "*Feed, Clothe and House the Nation by 1976.*" We have here a clipping from the *New Nation*, Saturday, April 8, 1972. Here it is headlined: "*Agricultural Revolution 12 million pounds of corn to be grown.*" We are importing bhusi now and corn and everything else. Where is Mr. Mittelholzer, the "*aloo*" expert, the potato expert? Where is the banana project on which \$100,000 was spent in the Demerara River? Gone down the drain.

This clipping is from the *Guyana Graphic*, 6th October, 1973. It was an imperialist paper but look at the headline: "*Our own wheat by 1976, says Burnham.*" We can't even grow rice. We can't even grow potatoes, not white potatoes but sweet potatoes, cassava, plantains and eddoes, which we know to grow, which were growing in abundance.

Miss Cox of the Consumers Association wrote an article a few weeks ago in the *Sunday Chronicle*. What did she say? Yams are selling at price between \$1.20 and \$1.50 per pound and other root crops and plantains are selling on the average of around 50 cents per pound. She said the prices have doubled since 1972. What she omitted to mention is that there has been a ten-fold increase from Pomereroon to Trinidad. We then have markets for pumpkins and all kinds of things outside this country. Where has this production gone? Tell us, Oh Lord. Where is the agriculture?

This is the reality. This has nothing to do with import prices and inflation. This has to do with a lot of other realities which we have to come down to if we are really to find a way out of this mess. Before there was the oil crisis which was the excuse given in 1974 for our then economic crisis – of course, we got out of that crisis because of the fortuitous high price of sugar, almost a miraculous increase.

Even the Government was caught. When they introduced the levy in mid-1974 they expected to get only about \$30 million. They got \$130 million. In 1975 they got \$225 million and last year it was nearly \$200 million. Now they are belly aching that they will get only \$426 million and they are complaining about the price of sugar. But the price of sugar, low as it is at \$120 a ton, is far higher than it was even at mid June 1974 when the levy was to be introduced.

Let me make this point too: The crisis was there before the oil crisis. Let us read from the Central Bank of Guyana Report and see that the malaise was there. I was quoting from the Central Committee Report of the P.P.P. which is found in the *Thunder*, July to September, 1974, page 27. It states:

“The summary of the Central Bank of Guyana Report for 1972 referred to the ‘disappointing performance of the export industries . . .’ in physical terms, sugar declined by 15 per cent. And the real growth of production in 1972 was evidently well below the average 94 per cent of the past five years.”

It goes on to the following year:

“According to the Bank of Guyana Report of 1973, the value of exports and of goods and services fell further from the depressed level of 1972 – by about 4 per cent, despite an increase in the average price of exports by about one-twelfth.”

Cde. Speaker, it is not just the oil crisis. In the early part of 1974 we were not concerned about the sugar price. Now we hear about excessive rainfall. The record in the last ninety years is 62 per cent increase. If Ptolemy was still in Agriculture we probably would have done a little better. He was moved and was placed in National Development. You didn't see this headline. This headline said *“Our own wheat by 1976.”* What about the weather? What is the excuse that is given? Both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture tried to use this. The Prime Minister says that our country can plan for the kind of excessive rainfall that we had this year, and the Minister of Agriculture puts on the finishing touches by saying that even Russia, a socialist country, is affected by weather. So why complain if we have a fall in production? I have already dealt with Russia. They have been increasing production steadily. If you go to Cuba today you will see micro-dams, what you call conservancies, built all over the place to have water control. The fact of the matter is surely no Government can be expected to plan for excessive rainfall. But we have not even planned for normal rainfall. That is the problem.

What of the Mahaica/ Mahaicony/ Abary Scheme? What happened with the Tapakuma Expansion Scheme? For the last twelve years the sum of \$9 million was spent on the Mahaica/ Mahaicony/ Abary Scheme. Had the Government done that in the early period it would have cost \$32 million. Now we are told it will cost \$90 million. What did the Government do with all the money? It has a lot of money. Let me name some of the places where it has put the money.

The Linden Highway cost \$17 million. The former Development Minister, Henry Thomas, said that it is a super highway. Sea Defences, Greater Georgetown Project, will cost \$50 million. Public Buildings- the new Cultural Centre alone cost \$6 million. Telephone – a contract for \$14 ½ million was signed with Plessey Telecommunication for distance dialling equipment when a modest but more satisfactory one costs about \$5 million and would have been sufficient. We can go on mentioning projects. This is what is called displaced priorities.

I seconded the Motion moved by Coglan in the 1940s for the bridge across the Demerara River. Any intelligent persons knows that in planning one

has to go into the question in allocation and giving priorities, first thing first. Is the bridge more important than some of the things which are vital to food and to agriculture? That is why I referred to the Mahaica/Mahaicony/ Abary Scheme because every year there is not only danger from floods, but also droughts. Look at the contradiction facing the Members of the Government. They say that the fall in production was due to heavy rainfall when we suffered from a severe drought. Why? It is not only that you did not plan for rainfall, but you did not plan for water control. So you got rid of the water and when you needed irrigation water because you had a drought, you had no water. That is why you are in this mess. Don't blame it on others; it is a mess of your own making.

If we take the totality of production and see it in a global perspective, what have we achieved? I referred to wheat, potatoes, bananas and so on which are by the way. But let us take the traditional things. Roots crops are very scarce. Let us look at the production of rice and sugar. Not only must we deal with it in terms of what the Government says – rainfall this year; let us take a ten years perspective. What has the Government achieved? In ten years, 1964 to 1974, rice production dropped by 8 per cent. Sugar increased only marginally by 5 per cent. Even in the colonial days, working under different conditions, production of rice doubled during a period of ten years, during the seven years of which P.P.P. was in Government. Under the P.N.C. Government it dropped in ten years by 8 per cent. And sugar production increased by 33 per cent in the previous ten year period. Those are the facts. We took the average 1961 to 1964 and an average of 1971 to 1974 to arrive at these statistics. They can be checked. What do we have? Cde. Speaker, not only did we have a drop in exports, and in our local supply to consumers of this country, but we cannot supply export markets. But we would like to look at development not only from a quantitative but from a qualitative point of view and in this respect the Bank of Guyana Report was mightily critical of what was going on when it disclosed that over the period 1969-1973 the output of Government services has raised from 13 percent of the G.D.P. to 20 percent while that of agriculture and industry had together declined from 60 percent to 53 percent. It is not that we are not spending money or that the people are not working hard. Incidentally, we are very far away from the impression given that we have a negligible unemployment rate.

What is wrong is the economic and financial structure, the sole dependence from colonial times on three primary products for export. We have a huge debt and big debt payments and a huge bureaucratic apparatus. The debt payments have jumped from \$10 million in 1964 to \$119 million last year. We have a huge bureaucratic apparatus which rose from \$27 million in 1964 to \$128 million last year.

The Government is accustomed to saying now that nothing is wrong with all these huge debts because our debt service ratio is still small, from 8 to 10%. Another one of our comrades will deal with the fallacy of that

argument and show up the fallacy of it. I don't have the time.

I would like to deal with it in respect of the Budget, the Current Revenue and Expenditure, and then we will see that percentage rise it is imposing a tremendous strain on the Budget. \$128 million today and since production has not increased, from out of which you can get income to pay for those debts, you have to resort to taxation. So it is in no use talking of debt service ratio. That has to do with balance of payments and other questions. And it is no use making comparisons with the Soviet Union and so on because that question also is dealt with partially in the presentation which is given.

I mention these things not because I wish to rake up the past and spill political dirt. I want that to be clear. We are not doing these things because we want to make political capital. I am doing it so that Members of this House and the public can have an understanding of why we are at this position today, and what must be done to guide us for the future so that we can get out of this economic mess.

In our view the present problem is that we had a confluence of the economic base and the political and ideological and cultural superstructure all working in the same stream. Unfortunately in those early days both domestic and foreign policies, both economic planning strategies and trade policies, for instance, were geared to suit the interest of imperialists and capitalists. We now have a change in direction at the economic level. Major enterprises have been nationalized at the economic level. There are still some more to take over to wind up foreign domination and control. However, we know we are still saddled with - I see in the Budget statement - \$15 million for compensation. We understood - at least so one of the big boys in the P.N.C. put it out at the T.U.C. Congress - that banks and insurance companies will be nationalized before the end, with the fat and big financial moguls saying "*Look boy if you want money watch out. Don't worry to touch banks and insurance companies*" - and now the time table has been set aside.

The problem today, therefore, is qualitative; it is of a different kind than a few years ago. In other words, there is no corresponding shift at the political, institutional and ideological superstructure level to synchronize the economic shifts at the base. No! No! you won't understand this, Comrade. I am sorry I shall paraphrase. I said that there was a confluence between the economic base and the political and ideological superstructure; you shifted the economic base but now the political and ideological and cultural superstructure remains where it was and acting as a log jam and therefore things cannot move.

You talk about socialism on paper but it cannot move. It cannot be implemented. That is why there has to be unity of theory and revolutionary implemented. Scientific theory. No hocus pocus or obeah story and so on. Let us deal with the ideological superstructure first.

You know in 1970 they said '*Cooperative Socialism*'. They move to saying

now that the ideals are based on Marx, Engels and Lenin. But they must know – I am sure that some of the boys are reading the books - that the two things don't go together. So we are not talking very much now about '*Cooperative Socialism*'. They face another difficulty. I don't know how they are going to wriggle out of that. They name the country not just the Socialist Republic of Guyana but the Cooperative Republic of Guyana. You will have too changed the name too. Let us introduce an amendment next week.

Since they say that their ideas are based on Marx / Engels / Lenin, if they mean it and since they have told the nation in the Sophia Declaration that the Government is the executive arm of the Party why then does the Government not implement these ideas in practice, Marxist/ Leninist ideas? Instead of that what do we have? The press, the radio and the schools are not used for this purpose. How is it that people with little or no idea of Marxist/ Lenin theory and revolutionary practice are still in leading and important positions all over the place in the superstructure? For instance, we have Mr. Kit Nascimento in his strategic position in the Prime Minister's office .

This man is dealing with communications. The subject of communications is not merely of question and electronics. It is a question of importantly dealing with ideas, communicating ideas. How can a man be in charge of communications when he has a history of anti- communism and anti-Marxism? He has changed? You believe he has changed?

Let us take another anti-communist and anti- Marxist, Lionel Luckhoo of '*subversive literature*' fame. He is allowed great access to the press and radio. Note the recent spotlight given to him as chairman of a radio symposium on education involving the Prime Minister and Minister of Education and other big wigs. Imagine that. Are these people our youths should emulate? Is this how we are going to build the ideological superstructure? You cannot build socialism like this. Socialism cannot be built without socialists.

These people must be cast aside if the revolution is to go ahead. The quicker the better. And incidentally if we must import teachers, let us also realize that education is not just a technical question but also we are dealing in the realm of ideas. The P.P.P. when it set up the University of Guyana was able to get Marxists to come and hold leading positions at the University and you can do it too, if you want to. Let us see you do it.

And what about national unity? It is admitted on all sides that national unity is essential. It is essential for production and productivity in building a sound economy so as to better able the resist imperialist pressures, especially in financial affairs. Right now I understand in Jamaica the I.M.F. is trying to put pressure on the Government to devalue its currency by as much as 30 percent to 40 percent. In other words, to retreat and put pressures on the working class.

If national unity is important, why then is the ruling party in Government is failing to remove the obstacles to national unity? The ruling party

claims it is a working- class vanguard party. If so, why is the Government afraid of the workers and the farmers? Why does it refuse to enrol them in the People's Militia and to train and arm them?

We come to another, point, democracy and socialism. Lenin said that socialism cannot be built without democracy. Many of the Ministries in the Government talk about the need for people's involvement. Constantly we are reading this in the press. The Minister of Economic Development at a recent Think- In of the Clerical and Commercial Workers Union said, and I quote:

"The essence of a socialist society is democracy. Democracy premises the active participation of workers in all sectors of national life. The political sector is unarguably vital."

This is sound theoretically. But why is it not being implemented in practice? The results can be seen all around the place which in fact has helped to undermine the economy. For the fall in production of rice we heard about the weather, but we know that other things affect rice and production.

It has been admitted in Berbice that because of the negligence of local authorities all spring crop rice which could have reaped was not reaped. The Minister is here. It was also admitted in Berbice that because of the negligence of local authorities as much land was not ploughed and planted from the autumn crop. Seventy five thousand acres could have been ploughed and planted only about 25, 000, a third, was ploughed and planted. Democracy has to do with socialism. This is a practical example of looking at how democracy affects production.

Another democratic principle is the recognition of mass organization, truly representative organizations that the people want. The R.P.A. is not recognized. When it comes to production, it is not recognized but when it comes to raising money for defence bonds the R.P.A. and not the Rice Action Committees, is put on the Defence Bonds Committee. But when it comes to dispensing favours, the Rice Action Committee is allowed to dispense them with the money of the farmers through that Committee. That is the democracy which is now practised in Guyana.

Let us take another example. At the bauxite industry mention was made about rain, that heavy rainfall flooded the mines. But we had a recent strike there. Surely the strike also disrupted production. That is to be seen. If we have discontented workers that also could lead to production problems

What happened in Guyana? You do not have democracy at the trade union level; you do not have democracy at the industrial level. This has nothing to do with the Opposition; this is the base of support for the ruling party. Early this year, a union election was rigged. We heard a little while ago about morality. Nomination was fixed at 5:30 in the afternoon, the change of shift. The same day it was announced over the air - not even there - that the nomination would take place at 2:30 p.m. When the Mem-

bers who were in the Opposition, the “rebels” so-called, went at 2 o’clock for the nomination the doors were closed and they were asked: “What are you here for?” When they said they came for the nomination, they were told: “Nomination is over since 1 o’clock.” This is why also you do not have production in bauxite; it is not only because of rain flooding the mines.

Let us take the other question of workers’ participation. Cde. Joseph Pollydore in his report to the T.U.C. Annual Conference has this to say on Page 22, para. 23:

“It is a matter of concern to the T.U.C. that the workers’ participation in management has not been implemented at GUYBAU. This is one of the firm undertakings given by the Government to the workers at the time of the nationalization of the Demerara Bauxite Company.”

It goes on:

“. . . It is understood that workers’ participation in discipline would be introduced shortly at GUYBAU instead of the model in which discipline is one of its integral parts. In an industry such as GUYBAU, production and other committees comprising representatives freely chosen by the workers themselves must form the real basis of hope for the successful development of workers’ participation”.

Then on Page 21, para. 22:

“...The TUC is not entirely in agreement with the model of workers’ participation...”

Now this is a broader framework. This is speaking of workers’ participation which the Government is advocating and it goes on. So, we want to make this point again that you need workers’ participation; we need workers’ involvement; we need democracy for developing a sound economy which is necessary for national security and also laying the foundations of socialism. I repeat:

“The T.U.C. is not entirely in agreement with the model of workers’ participation being developed by the Ministry; nevertheless, it believes that orientation and education must form the basis of workers’ participation regardless of the model being developed.

The T.U.C.’s model of workers’ participation provides for the establishment of joint committee beginning at the plant level leading to the Board of Management.

Unlike the Ministry’s model which restricts selections of Board Members to persons actually employed in the concern, the T.U.C.’s model allows the workers freedom of choice to elect union officials as their representatives on the Management Board.”

Today, it is clearly therefore not the P.P.P. in a shambles. The P.N.C. has brought the economy in shambles and, as we can see from GUYBAU, they themselves are now in shambles.

We have an article here from the *Caribbean Contact*, January 1977 where a leading Guyanese journalist Hubert Williams said:

“The chickens came home to roost last month in hinterland Guyana, and the impact of their action was to emphasize the complexities of the industrial, political and social problems which the Cooperative Republic faces. In this case, the chickens were hardy bauxite miners, with grim faces under shiny safety helmets...”

Further, he says:

“Targets were a new collective bargaining agreement on working conditions and wages which they said had displeased.”

And it italics it says this:

“But surely, the target was also the union executive. The target was the locally-run Guyana Bauxite Company (GUYBAU). The target was the surviving capitalist-colonialist structure of the company. The target was the ruling party (P.N.C.), and thus the Government. The target was the continuing deplorable social conditions in the mining district which nationalization has not automatically eliminated.”

I will now like to read from one of their own, Dr. Fred Sukhdeo, who is now Economic Adviser. In the *Sunday Chronicle* of the 19th October last year he wrote the following and I quote:

“...Unless there are revolutionary changes in the state sector and the remainder of the economy, there is a possibility that state capitalism would be the dominant form of relationship in the society: although this may be considered as an advancement on private enterprise, it cannot solve the increasing demands of the society...”

It goes on:

“Many enterprises fail ignominiously to socialize their operations because there are no radical changes in the atmosphere of these institutions. The social problem that is inherited from capitalism limits the workers’ effective productive capacity.

This cannot be solved by mere judicial abolition of private ownership. The solution implies revolutionary and not a replacement and the progressive abolition of the social division of labour. Furthermore, it implies rationalization between production and accumulation and the progressive alienation of labour, so that work which is carried out on orders is for the benefit of the enterprise and society...”

More recently, in an article in the *Sunday Chronicle*, the following is stated
It says:-

“...the present temporary financial crisis requires maximum utilization of the production resources of the country. It appears that Guyana has an adequate stock of machinery to satisfy the existing production targets...”

He should have added, *“natural resources of all kinds.”*

“...Perhaps it is because of the excesses and the readily available replacements that vehicles and equipment are ruthlessly destroyed, stolen or poorly maintained and incompetently utilized. The spate of recent fires on public property cannot be allowed to continue.”

The public sector is not producing the goods and services that are compatible with their resources. Many of the public utilities such as bus transport, telephone, electricity and water along with service enterprises such as the Guyana Marketing Corporation and many established Government Departments have declining performances.

One of the solutions to this pathetic situation is public accountability of the bureaucracy. Management in the public sector seems to be reduced from a science to a manipulative art with an entrenched crimplene shirt and long and wide side-burn mentality. The functioning of this elite group is not compatible with socialism.

One of the economic advisers of the Government has been putting in the papers the points which we have been making for a very long time and unless this advice is taken we are not going to find a way out of this economic crisis. The cure, therefore, for the economic crisis, ills, headaches, and frustrations of the Guyanese society is to rid ourselves of illusions and hocus pocus, to remove the obstacles by changing the superstructure at the political, institutional, ideological, and cultural levels.

In this regard the P.P.P. has published a 17- point Programme of what we consider needs to be done so that the economy can proceed forward, so that it can be put in a sound position, so that the foundations of socialism can be built and laid. I would like to refer to these seventeen points because I think they are very important. I hope that the Government will take due heed of these points and put them into practice so that we can move ahead.

“(1) Completion of the anti- imperialist process by the nationalization of foreign banks, insurance companies and other monopolies.

(2) Ending semi- feudalism by revolutionary land reform.”

There was a Land Reform Committee appointed some time ago. Every day of the week I have to speak to the Minister and the Ministry of Agri-

culture about problems which the people face in the countryside at the hands of the landlords. But nothing is done. We have not seen that report. We don't know what action is taken and so on. Why can't we get a move on, on that important question?

“(3) Centrally-controlled planned proportional development of the economy with emphasis on industry and agriculture.”

We hope that the priorities will be better assessed from now on. We learn from the Budget Speech that the Government is now talking about concentrating on forestry and agriculture. We were doing that. I remember I negotiated an agreement with Che Guevera for a \$10 million wood pulp scheme but British imperialism, backed by American imperialism, blocked that at the time. Let us go ahead with this emphasis on industry and agriculture. And we must look at this whole question of Caricom. We have to buy fertilizers from Caricom at inflated prices. We have to buy oil at inflated prices. When the prices went up in the 1973-1974 period by 28 per cent in the United States, it went up for us by 147 percent. We must do something about that.

“(4) Embarking on a non-capitalist road to socialism through the expansion of the public and cooperative sectors.”

This is being done, but whilst it is being done we have a new breed of middlemen, a new bourgeoisie, developing under the public corporations. Let us stop that. You are talking about destabilization today, when there is little danger, tomorrow, when this capitalist breed becomes entrenched; there will be a real danger to Guyana from this new bourgeoisie that is developing. That is how military coups took place in so many countries. They were not invaded from outside. They are being built up now under the P.N.C. That is why they do not want to arm the people. We will come to that point later.

“(5) Massive education campaign at all levels for imbuing the people with revolutionary scientific socialist (Marxist- Leninist) ideological consciousness.”

Let us open the newspapers and the university. Give Rodney a job. Why are you afraid of Rodney? Give the people in the schools the opportunity to hear what scientific socialism is all about; don't give them a distorted form.

“(6) Training of administrative, scientific, technical and diplomatic personnel in the socialist states.

(7) Respect for, and observance of, the fundamental rights laid down in the Constitution.

8) *Substitution of peaceful, democratic methods in place of bureaucratic- administrative, police- military coercive methods of political struggle.*"

Cde. Jack knows what this means.

"(9) Separation of party, state and mass organization; and maintenance of a multi- party system of a de facto and/ or de jure authoritarian one- party state."

The Ministry of National Development will close down in the name of austerity and principle. We need political morality.

"(10) Cessation of harassment and victimization of members and supporters of the P.P.P., removal of all obstacles to its moral democratic functioning."

You cannot defend Guyana without the P.P.P., you cannot build socialism without the P.P.P., whatever the P.N.C says.

"(11) Recognition of truly representative mass organizations (workers, farmers, social, cultural, religious, professional, sports, etc.); industrial democracy; workers and farmers control.

(12) Implementation of legal and institutional measures to provide for equality of opportunity for all Guyanese - enactment of equal opportunity legislation and establishment of a Commission to administer the Act; substantial representation of the Opposition in service commissions like the Public Service Commission; Police Service Commission, etc. and Employment Exchanges.

(13) Special treatment for Amerindians to permit accelerated development.

(14) Democratization of local government. More power through (devolution and decentralization) to district and regional councils.

(15) The creation of a democratically-run and people- managed national People's Militia with branches in every city, block, village and settlement.

(16) Enactment of Integrity Legislation and a Commission with 'Watchdog Committees' to probe corruption and theft of public property.

(17) Development of the closest relations in all aspects with the world socialist community, headed by the Soviet Union."

Cde. Speaker, only by the implementation of these measures will the crisis be resolved. And it has to be resolved if we are to solve the grave problems facing the people today. We hope that the Government will heed and study carefully this 17-point Programme that we have put forward because we feel that it will help to ameliorate the present situation.

So far as the Budget proposals are concerned, we are opposed to any reduction in the level of subsidies because the Guyanese people are already overburdened by taxation. The Minister said in his Budget Statement that we had subsidies last year to the level of around \$47 million to \$48 million and now it is proposed to reduce subsidies to \$26 ½ million. In other words, a big drop. Clearly, Cde. Chairman, taxation has been steep in this country from 1964 to the present time. Indirect taxation increased by 774 percent. In 1974, when the crisis was on, my friend the Prime Minister said something about the Kaldor Budget.

I am not talking about last week. But the Budget of 1974 was four times the Kaldor Budget as it turns out. They got the sum of \$19 million in the 1974 Budget. All the Kaldor Budget sought to get was \$10 million and when it was cut down we eventually got \$4 million.

We repeat – and the official statistics will show this – the cost of living has been going up rapidly. A trip to the market or a trip in the shops will convince any Member of the Government, if he is really, sincerely interested in the working class, that the working men cannot bear any further burdens. We feel that moneys can be obtained by other means which are open to this Government and the Government will be asked to do so. One of my colleagues will deal with the Budget Proposals and what suggestions we have for raising money, be it to balance the Budget or be it for defence, security or whatever else the Government feels must be done.

We think that the outlook presented in the Budget- I do not know how it got through the Cabinet since now we are hearing that they are Marxists/Leninist. We can forgive Cde. Hope. He is a technocrat. But the Budget must have gone through Cabinet where we have ideologues, and so one would have thought two things would have happened: that they would have had a better political, ideological framework presented in the Budget and not the usual technocratic presentation and, secondly, that these politicians, ideologues politicians, who are different from technocrats – because the technocrat has to go back to his job but the politicians have to heed the views of the man in the street – that they would have been more considerate of the interests of the small man. But in this situation we find political ideologues and technocrats all merging together and so we have a hopeless Budget. We would hope, despite the fact that it has been introduced, that the Government will give reconsideration to this whole matter and remove the penalties which they have now put in place.

The Minister says it is a tax free Budget. What is the difference between calling an animal a jackass or a donkey? That is what they are doing; trying to use respectable language to say there is no tax, but they cut the subsidies from the working man. Whatever name you call it by, it is taxation.

And we cannot agree with further impositions, further taxation, \$19 million in 1974, over \$20 million now and who knows where it will go in the near future.

Sympathy Motion on Death of Winifred Gaskin: 30th March, 1977

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, I wish to express on behalf of the People's Progressive Party our support for the Motion moved by the Deputy Prime Minister and to take this opportunity also to express our condolences to the family of Winifred Gaskin.

She started out, as the Deputy Prime Minister pointed out, in giving service to the nation, to this country, in the very early period of her struggle when she joined with women such as Mrs. Stafford and Mrs. Jagan, the Women's Political and Economic Organization, and she has in recent times been, as we heard, playing a role in the International Department of the ruling Party. The ruling Party now has a good position at international level and no doubt she must have helped to contribute.

We do not go into the period when she was Editor of *Booker News* and when she did take some positions which we did not agree with. But having started out well and having ended up well, I think it is a great credit to anyone. Sometimes, there are lapses but those have to be forgotten.

I think this must be a great loss to the ruling Party and also to the family and we certainly remember her when she was Minister of Education and tried to tackle the very big problems which we then faced and are still facing today. The country certainly will miss her presence and we wish her family in their period of bereavement all the sympathy and support.

Bill – Second Reading

Constitution (Amendment) Bill: 19th May, 1977

Dr. Jagan: Mr. Speaker, since there are so many sections of this Bill we would have hoped to have an opportunity to deal with them in separate Bills because there are some matters which we clearly support and others which we disagree with completely and this will present a procedural problem so far as voting in this House is concerned.

We have said already that we think that the time is long past for the merging of the two sections of the legal profession. On the question of the amendment of the Constitution we think so far as the judicial service is concerned that great care must be taken in this regard.

I remember making a statement some time ago that justice is bought and sold over the counter and there was a great deal of objection to this statement coming from me. I regret to say that as it has turned out one can point a finger of accusation and with a great degree of justification at the way in which the judicial system is functioning.

A country, especially a country which is supposed to be moving to socialism, must have, above all, an atmosphere where there is freedom from fear. Apart from the other freedoms, during the last war there was appended "*freedom from fear and freedom from want*" because we knew that in Hitler's Germany under fascism, people were not only picked up at random but the courts were not courts at all. In such an atmosphere we see all the other freedoms of the people banished and indeed one saw that system ultimately leading to dangers not only to the people of Germany but to the people of the whole world.

In our country, above all, we need an atmosphere of freedom and democracy because if socialism is to be attained, if production and productivity are to be achieved, then it cannot be done in any other atmosphere. In this regard the system of legality is very important. And it is no use simply asking: "*Does it work like that in any other place?*"

I remember when one Comrade was speaking about an independent judiciary there was a comment across the benches; does it work like that? In bourgeois systems, we have bourgeois. We know that under bourgeois legality there are constitutions which set out the right to private property, and those who own private property the right to a plot and that system basically tends to protect itself. But we have seen also in bourgeois legality, in the process of time, that there have been inserted in Constitutions, Bills of Rights, fundamental rights, and illegal systems built around those rights. I am not talking now of the capitalist system; I am talking about the right to speak, the right to a fair trial and things like that. These are ensured by even bourgeois legality.

Before the tea break I made the point that even under bourgeois legality there was provision for fundamental rights, for a Bill of Rights and an in-

dependent judiciary functioning to ensure that those rights were preserved. We saw that this to a very great degree was established during the Watergate incident in the United States of America, when a President was forced to resign because of the fear that if he did not do so the Supreme Court might have intervened to impeach him. But I think this speaks of the kind of independence that one should aspire to in Guyana.

If we look, however, at the other side, that is, socialist legality, in this system you do not have to have legality founded on a system of private property but rather on a system based on class rule, working class power, founded on the proposition that man must not exploit man, that the exploitation of man by man is the scent of all evil.

And even here, however, socialist legality does not necessarily mean legality in the interest of the Party. For under socialism the workers and Communist Party do not make up the whole country, the whole community. Indeed outside of such parties there are millions and millions of others who are nonparty members, nonparty individuals, and so the system has to operate in such a way not simply to dispense 'justice' to party members but justice to the people as a whole under the definition which I have enunciated. And to see that this happens one has public accountability.

Basically, judges are elected by the people. They are subject to recall and as my colleague said even the United States of America under bourgeois legality you have, in the case of High Court judges, congressional review when it comes to their appointment by the President.

The Hon. Member Mr. Felidon Singh, in his contribution to this debate referred to the fact that since in England there is no age limit then there is nothing seriously wrong with the fact that the Government is now seeking to extend the time from 1965 to a further period. But, Sir, there is one difference, in that in England, as it would seem to me, the judge continues until such time as it is felt that he should retire. If there is no age limit presumably he continues while he has with him all his mental faculties and he can perform satisfactorily as a judge.

The age of 65 is given here and in the case of the category under (iii) there is a lower age. What is being done here is to extend this in certain circumstances, and this is where the essential difference is. Either we say that the age of retirement of judges must go from 65 years to 70, or 75 years, or we have no age limit. This system is subject to a certain amount of manipulation, in that those whom the regime favours can be allowed to continue and those whom it does not favour would not be allowed to continue.

And not only that. Because this clause is here it means that some people who want to continue can do so on condition that their behaviour has to play well to the gallery, play well to the boys who will have the power. And this is what is very dangerous about it. One cannot, in any circumstances, fail to see that party influences can be brought to bear in the appointment of judges, one has seen this. As a result of this some lawyers

have left because they had been given a raw deal.

But even if one would concede that the ruling Party will have preference in giving an appointment to one it favours, surely after he gets the job then one would assume that he becomes free from Party control in the interest of legality. We have seen in this country numerous examples, unfortunately, where judges have not behaved in this manner. We have seen where special judges have been selected for special cases. Some who are called flying judges are flown from one part of the country to another part to try particular cases, especially of a political nature. Clearly we are not talking here either of bourgeois legality or socialist legality. Junior judges have been put above others to try very important cases. We have cases listed for hearing which had precedence when they should not have had if one were to take all the cases into consideration. Because of political influences these manipulations took place. Reference was made to Mustapha Ally, formerly a Chairman of a Village Council and a prominent P.N.C. member. Not because he was able to get postal votes and proxy votes should he be favoured and when he is sentenced by a lower court he should be allowed not to go to prison but to sit in hospital to serve his sentence and then the appeal case is heard very soon afterward because of manipulations. Surely this is not either bourgeois legality or socialist legality, for all, as citizens of this country, must be treated alike. I refer to these cases not because we want simply to score political points but to show that if this kind of situation continues it can only affect the country in the long run. Short-term advantages will certainly produce bitter fruits in the long run.

Only yesterday I heard a five minute commentary over Radio Demerara I forgot the name of the individual who gave the broadcast; he spoke of gross managerial inefficiency in the country today. Surely this is having its toll on the economy of the country. We are facing an economic crisis; we have been in it. How are we going to get out of it? Managerial inefficiency is a result, we have been saying it over and over, of political and racial discrimination, of the kind of judicial system that we have where judges are told what to do, judges are assigned to particular cases. Some cases can be heard very early, others defendants are allowed to rot in jail illegally.

Why is it that a man is arrested by the police and kept for two weeks before he is charged when he should be held for only 24 hours? He is kept in goal for two years. Still his case cannot be brought for hearing. How can you convince people in the country that you have under this system a fair system? How can you convince them to cooperate? Clearly, if you continue in this manner, you are going to have bitter consequences later. The commentator yesterday said all categories are leaving. The gentleman who did the broadcast yesterday. The gentleman yesterday in a broadcast said that many categories were leaving; only two categories were not leaving, lawyers and priests. Well I am afraid that he has not done his research well, because if he had done his research he would have known that many lawyers have gone out of this country too. Maybe that is why they have to

extend the limit now. But we have to see whether we are extending the time just for those who are marking time or whether they have the ability and so on.

I will therefore conclude by saying you cannot build socialism on a system where you are constantly resorting to some form of corruption. You cannot do it. This system that is now provided for in this Bill can lead to a form of corruption. Therefore, I say that the Government must make up its mind not to allow the system to be manipulated. If it wants to have the age limit extended or, if it wants no age limit or wants it to be of unlimited duration, let them come here and say so but not put it in such a way that some people will be preferred and some others will not be preferred and those who are not preferred will simply leave the country or get discontented and dissatisfied. This will have an effect on the country as a whole.

So, Cde. Chairman, we will ask the Government to reconsider this matter because we want a system of legality where all Guyanese will feel proud of their judicial system, knowing that they can have fair trials, that they can have impartial judges and knowing, indeed, that the judiciary will not be used for political purposes.

Sugar Industry Special Funds (Amendment) Bill: 1977

Dr. Jagan: The position as revealed so far clearly discloses the rotten state in the affairs of the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Fund, the allocation of the money which is supposed to be used for and by sugar workers. We have two aspects in this Bill. One dealing with the Rehabilitation and Price Stabilization Fund and the other dealing with the question of the Welfare Fund. What we see being done today is to virtually duplicate what was being done in colonial times, that is, to put in control of these Committees official spokesman and representatives of the producers, that is, the owners.

We have been told over and over again that this country is moving to socialism. Sometime one reads the newspapers. You hear about the socialist Guyana; at other times we hear we are in the transition to socialism. Be that as it may, if we are to say that we are moving towards socialism or we are at the state of socialism, then surely socialist principles must be employed if we are to attain the objectives of socialism.

I read a copy of the *New Nation* the other day and I saw a cartoon of myself with two faces, one saying eggs at 54 cents each, the other one saying eggs at 21 cents each or something like that. Perhaps, I should correct the record. What I said was that an egg in Guyana was costing 21 cents. I said it in the United States of America but I went on to say – and the reporter did not seem to have the mentality to put the two things together – that it was 21 cents in a wage structure of \$5.50 a day. That was not put so the *New Nation* went on to make Jagan a liar in this respect. I don't care what the *New Nation* says. I did not say 54 cents. What the reporter and your editorial staff have probably done is to relate 21 cents (US) with 54 cents (G). That is what they have done.

It has a lot to do with it. If we are going to arrive at socialism you cannot either sell eggs at 21 cents or 54 cents apiece. It has a lot to do with sugar because sugar has to do with production. If you don't produce, then the eggs are going to keep going up in price. You now have a serious economic crisis and you cannot have the money to buy even essentials. You don't have foreign exchange. This is the link which I wanted to develop. That is all I say. It is not extraneous.

I come now to sugar. We have two aspects here: one has to do with our reallocation which has to do with production. Now, whether you call it workers' participation or whether you call it workers' control they are key aspects of the practice of socialism.

The good lady from the U.F., the Hon. Member Mrs. DaSilva, said that even under capitalism you have it. She was trying to show why you should not have it more so under the socialism of Guyana. Even in West Germany they are talking about workers' participation. They are coming here every

now and then and giving lectures. During the British time, colonial times, in the Rice Marketing Board, they had 8 members from the Government side and 8 members from the producers side in the management of the Rice Marketing Board. Yes, they had one of theirs as Chairman. The P.P.P. changed that to five to give the farmers a majority. If we are going to accept socialism not only in theory, that is, to nationalize the foreign companies, in practice how are you going to build it? Through workers' control. You may want to call it participation where they can sit around the table equally with management. As the Cde. Minister of Foreign Affairs said, we are in the transition period and we have a peculiar situation in Guyana. If they cannot resolve it there then let it be sorted out at a higher political level because the crisis will not be solved either at the sugar estates or around whatever Fund or whatever Committee you have; it will eventually be solved by the two parties.

These are the realities of Guyana but if you go on packing all these Committees and if you run them in the old bureaucratic way as in colonial times, then obviously you are going to have the same kind of problems, the same kind of bottlenecks, the same kind of effects on production and then the eggs selling for 21 cents in the context of a wage structure of \$5.50 per day. In America they earn \$5.50 an hour.

The Price Stabilization Fund is an important fund. In many countries, large sums have been put. For instance, the sugar levy in Jamaica does not go to revenue, a lot of it goes to the Price Stabilization Fund so that when the sugar price goes down, as at the present time, money from that Fund is used to keep the wages of the workers at a certain level so that they can maintain themselves in keeping with the increased cost of living.

Therefore workers must have a big say in these questions. But what do we find? We find the Government, by this manipulation of using the old designations of "*company*" and "*public officers*", packing the thing to get a majority and then putting a cane farmer representative also to give them a further representative. Again this is done through an undemocratic structure, so we heard Cde. Dalchand say. It is an undemocratic structure which does not bring out the views and wishes of the cane farmers. He mentioned how it was done in the Ministry of Labour. Well, Carrie boy, remember it does not pay to work for these fellows, you see what they do?

I would say, therefore, in these two Committees, one would have expected that at this stage of our development, first of all, you should have true democratic procedures to elect the farmers' representatives and the workers' representatives. The farmers' representatives today will not be properly chosen because the Government willy-nilly has decided that one cane farmer association is supposed to be the body. What did they do about the floods last year? They went around and told people if you want loans you have to join. Is this the kind of democratic procedure we are building in the country? Clearly you are not going to succeed.

Now we come to labour. The point has already been made so far as

trade unions are concerned. We saw that in 1975 two very long strikes ultimately led to the recognition of the union. All right, the union is recognized. Why do you want to subvert it? Why do you want to bring in people like Harry Lall, who is dead and buried, and resurrect them? Why do you want, as was stated already, to get the union to name the people and then the Minister should decide? The Prime Minister used to say in his good old days that we should have the right to name the individual and that is how it should be under this present situation.

We come to the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Fund. This Fund is a Fund primarily for the welfare of the sugar workers. This is what it was created for. In all socialist countries Welfare Funds and Funds associated with welfare are administered by trade unions. If you do not want workers in a majority in the other areas why is it you want to have a majority in a matter which has to do with the welfare of workers? Do you want it to carry out the kind of manipulations we just heard about? Are you going to get peace in the sugar industry if you have such manipulations? This Fund is a Fund set aside for the welfare of sugar workers including housing, including other matters. Why is it that the Government does not trust the workers, does not trust the trade unions? You have Government people, you have accountants, you have all of that to see how money is spent, you prescribe what should be done, and why is it that you don't want to trust the workers?

You cannot build socialism without trusting the workers. Socialism is built by the workers. You are talking about workers' powers. A lot of Public Officers may say they are socialists; a lot of them necessarily are not socialists. We just heard in great detail about a public officer, head of a Fund. What happened to him in the case of a house lot for a sugar worker? Is it that we want to have a majority so that the Sugar Workers Fund should be used not for their benefit? Is that the purpose? We are always hearing how sugar workers cannot expect to get everything. I received three Bills today from Barbados. They deal with these same very questions – levy, welfare and everything else, out-of-crop work, guaranteed work - \$5 a week. They don't call themselves socialists, but they give more to the sugar workers. We are hearing all the time that sugar workers want to take everything. Ask them how much ex - gratia payment sugar workers on pension are getting. My father when he retired was getting \$2 a week.

Cde. Speaker, this is no time for levity. The Prime Minister raided the Fund of the sugar workers and he wants to pack the Committee with his colleagues and then he talks about socialism. You do not build socialism like that: you don't build socialism without workers: you don't build socialism without workers' involvement: you don't build socialism without democracy. But what has been happening is that the sugar workers cannot get house lots, we just heard about it; the sugar workers' pensions, ex-gratia payments, find out how much they are getting: yet we are told sugar workers are taking all.

What about the levy? In Barbados, Jamaica and Trinidad, sugar workers are getting twice as much as here. So now they have been forced to recognize the union; but now they are using their majority in the Parliament to pack the Committee since the union now has a say there to pad it up, to run it in the same way. Where are we going to get like this? I seriously ask. Again I repeat: either you begin to trust the workers, either you begin to involve them meaningfully, recognize democratic procedures, or you will fail. Even if you do not want to accept them at the top level, at least you can accept them at the lower level. Let it function from the grass roots so we can get the workers satisfied and, as the end result of that, they will put their shoulders to the wheel, they will produce the sugar and they will produce the other things which we need.

We have been talking all along about house lots. Since 1975, the strike was on for Community Centres. Up to today, that matter has not been settled. Community Centres which the sugar workers had have been taken away from them and they cannot use them. Before they were run by the Welfare Fund. The Welfare Fund, even in colonial times, had elections among the workers to have what they called Centre Councils and all of that has been scrapped by a so-called "*Socialist*" Government. Socialist!

Cde. Speaker, I do not raise these questions just to be difficult and just to be exceedingly critical but, as the P.N.C. editorial said, we must give constructive criticism. But there is no use giving constructive criticism when the things are not being implemented. You make constructive criticism and what happens? The basic political line which we take today is that we are not going to solve the problems of this country, the budgetary crisis, in the conventional way – by putting more pressure on the workers. The consequence of that is the Prime Minister was booed for the first time on May Day. Economic crisis – by trying to borrow more money; by getting Teekah to become an economist and write that the economy is so sound it can borrow more money.

We have to look at revolutionary solutions and revolutionary solutions today demand structural changes. Unless you get down to recognizing some of these basic principles which deal with structures, you are not going to get out of this mess. I tell the Government again: this proposal that you are making here is completely not in the spirit with the practice of socialism, even with the transition to socialism; building is another matter. In the transition to socialism you have to take these steps: to have workers' participation; to have workers' control; to have workers assuming responsibilities and then we are going to begin to get somewhere. I hope the Government will accept the amendments proposed by us so that we can get along with the business of building the nation.

Bill - Second Reading **National Insurance and Social Security** **(Amendment) Bill: 3rd June 1977**

Dr. Jagan: Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the Minister and my colleague Narbada Persaud I realize the shortcomings of the workings of our National Assembly. By that I mean that the Minister in piloting this Bill which seeks to reduce the pensionable age from 65 to 60 years indicated that there is likely to be some increase in the contributions which contributors have to pay.

My colleague Narbada Persaud indicated, in great detail, the many inadequacies of the working of the National Insurance Scheme. It is unfortunate that our procedure does not permit us to have, as you have in the United States, Great Britain and other places, the Committee system where Bills like these can be referred to Committees so that they can be gone into in great detail. Because here it is, we are told on the one hand how much money was accumulated. We are also told of the very small amounts which have been given to the beneficiaries. We heard about actuarial reports and investigation. But we have not had the benefit of that.

We tried to find out from the Trades Union Congress whether they had any information on that but they had no information on that either. I remember I sat at the Annual Conference of the T.U.C. when it was suggested that the age would be reduced but that the contribution will have to be increased also. Surely, if we have to make a proper contribution to such a debate to put forward a rational position then we need to know all about this. But we cannot do so except to point out certain things as we have done and then the Minister will tell us perhaps in his reply, *"Well, you don't know all about these things. The actuaries have told us so and therefore this one must be kept in abeyance for some time in future."*

And this is why sometimes I think the House should be given more latitude. I know, Sir, your tendency to restrict the debates. But when the Estimates come we have to deal with the Estimates. If I put in a Motion to debate a question, the Motion is not brought up. You take the view that you cannot deal with that. When I take it up with you, you say that this is a matter for the Government. When I call the Government, the Government says you will have to consult the Minister. The matter is with the Minister, and so we never have a chance to discuss.

All I am saying is that you can very well see that the present procedure frustrates the whole question of full and adequate discussion in this House on any question. In view of what I said I will suggest – because I understand that this will not to be implemented until the end of this year – that the Government, after the Minister has replied, should not proceed with this Bill and let the matter be sent to a Select Committee of the House. The Trades Union Congress should then be asked to come before this Commit-

tee and Government should be able to present all relevant information.

In the meantime, since the Government says it is going through a process of self-criticism and so on – we heard the other day that they are not opposed to having vital suggestions – I would suggest that the radio and the newspaper columns be opened as you have, for instance, in a bourgeois democracy like Britain with the BBC and so on. Therefore, I would suggest that the Government newspaper columns be opened to views of the Opposition on this question. I would also suggest that the radio stations be allowed to have discussions on this with the Government and the Opposition participating fully so that the public can become apprised of this whole situation and we do not have the inadequate information which is going out to the public at the moment where they cannot know whether they will have an increase and so on or, if there is an increase, how much more they will have to pay.

This is unsatisfactory, I was hoping that we would have had today a National Insurance Scheme which would approximate what countries like Cuba and other socialist countries are giving to people. This is what one would have hoped for. One of the things which workers are supposed to have is security in old age. Clearly, they are not going to have it. Even if the age is reduced to 60 we cannot say they are going to have security in their old age under the provisions as they are at the moment. Therefore, I suggest the procedure which I mentioned just now, that the Bill be committed to a Select Committee and that a thorough examination be carried out involving the Trades Union Congress and other interested organizations so that we can know whether it is possible, not just to reduce the age but to give the workers more benefits so that it can be in keeping with what a just and fair society should be doing to those who have contributed all their lives to the country and to the economy.

Maritime Boundaries Bill: 3rd June, 1977

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, on this question there is absolutely no disagreement between the Government and the Opposition. This matter has been discussed far and wide and many battles have taken place on the issue. The most heroic of them has been the one of the Icelandic people who have stood up against the mighty British and in a way humbled them and succeeded in their battle to extend their territorial waters. No doubt, from the struggles of those heroic people, others have benefited and it seems we in Guyana are also now joining in that benefit.

What I would like to ask the Hon. Minister is a question relating to our own fishermen who every now and then get arrested by the Surinam Government and occasionally the Venezuelan Government. It seems we not only want to extend our jurisdiction, that is, outwards, but also to clearly define where the limits are on both sides of our borders and to see that there is some give and take on this question so our fishermen's boats and accoutrements are not seized willy-nilly from time to time and the fishermen find themselves in jail.

I think there is some provision in the Bill for discussions to take place between this Government and the neighbouring Governments and I hope that this will be done expeditiously because this is the more urgent problem so far as Guyanese are concerned. I do not think that anyone is threatening our territorial waters except the time in 1968 when the Venezuelan patrol boats decided to patrol our coastal waters and even though we and taken a stand that not an inch of our territory, and not a blade of grass would be violated, we did take the limited step of even protesting to the United Nations. That is why I said that I am glad that the Icelandic people put up a great fight and we have benefited from that.

But be that as it may, as I have already said, I would suggest that the Minister should deal with this matter expeditiously because on several occasions we have had to make representations to the Government and to him personally about the fate of fishermen and their fishing boats, really to no avail, on the ground that the explanation being given is that this matter will be looked into and generally it is never solved. The quicker this matter is taken up and clearly defined, limits placed and some amicable agreements made between ourselves and our neighbours the better, then, if at times, through accidents or otherwise, the fishermen stray across on both sides, there would not be the harsh treatment which is generally meted out to them and the loss would not be incurred which poor people cannot afford.

Caribbean Food Corporation Bill 1977

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, every now and then, not only in Guyana but in the Caribbean a new rainbow is painted which points to a silver lining in the skies for a solution and a new utopia. Historically, we have had the Puerto Rican model which was going to solve our problems; the Federation was going to be the solution to the problems of the people of the Caribbean; then Carifta came along. After that it was transformed to Caricom. A year ago, the Caricom Secretary General said that it was facing unprecedented difficulties and now we see that the Food Corporation will save us.

This question of Guyana, for instance, being the food basket of the Caribbean was mooted many, many years ago. In the 40s it was said that in the Caribbean as a whole, looking at Guyana and Belize as part of the Caribbean, we must see the intensification of agriculture, the surplus population in the small islands should be put into labour-intensive industries and the surpluses must then go to the land masses, Guyana and Honduras, now called Belize. All these dreams, what have they come to?

The Minister gave us the figures, \$1 billion good deficit, in the Caribbean as a whole not to speak of \$2 billion industrial goods deficit. And this brings us therefore to a more serious examination. Why is it that agriculture has been failing? Is the Corporation going to save us? We have led a lot of things like this before. Go to Argentina; go to the other countries which have practised the policy of import substitution both at the industrial level and the agriculture level. This thing is going to be a Corporation.

Now, if we look at the terms of article 5:

“The Corporation shall have the power to amalgamate, enter into any partnership or any arrangement for sharing profits, union of interests, cooperation, joint venture, reciprocal or otherwise with any person, partnership or company where such amalgamation, partnership or arrangement may seem conducive to any of the Corporation’s objectives.”

We have other clauses which I will refer to. Article 3(c) says one of the objectives of the Corporation is *“organizing and a facilitating the bulk purchase of agricultural inputs, as well as the marketing and other services associated with agricultural production schemes.”*

The Hon. Minister told us that the share capital eventually will be \$100,000,000. The aim is to move from \$4 million to \$10 million and then to \$100,000,000. The first question we ask ourselves is: Where are all these millions going to come from?

If we look at the Caribbean itself what do we find? Practically every country is in deficit at the moment. All of them are hustling; they have balance of payment deficits. They have foreign exchange deficits, except

Trinidad. All right where do we get the money from? The Caribbean Development Bank, perhaps the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank.

Cde. Chairman, we note also that these ventures will be set up not necessarily as State Enterprises. Recently we saw a State Corporation set up jointly by Guyana, St. Kitts, and Trinidad. This Bill is going much further. In other words, we know now it will not be at the level of State Corporations. My understanding is – and I am subject to correction – that what is being set up here, the Caribbean Food Corporation will be establishing enterprises all over the Caribbean. As the Minister said, we have so much potential etc., it is likely that we will benefit a great deal. This is not likely to be only on the basis of State Corporations, then it follows that these projects will also have private enterprises playing a big role, perhaps on a partnership basis, with some state capital thrown in because, as I said already, West Indian states have very little capital to put into this thing. If they borrow money from the Caribbean Development Bank, the bank itself is borrowing money from the big international banks.

We have a statement here on the *“Spectre of Imperialism in the Caribbean”* by Dr. Ralph Gonzales, UWI, Cave Hill, Barbados. He said, and I quote from page 37:

“Then its first President, Sir Arthur Lewis, informs us that the C.D.B. spent much of its first year establishing links with imperialist finance organizations such as the World Bank, I.D.B., U.S.A.I.D., UK. Overseas Development Administration, C.B.C. and Japan’s Eximbank.”

If we are to get money from the Caribbean Development Bank, the C.D.B. also has shares put in by the imperialists’ states. They themselves go to the imperialist controlled banks, like World Bank, Inter-American Bank and so on. What is the role of those banks? Again I quote from this book, page 29. This is a statement by Dr. Michael Hudson:

“The bank is thus relatively autonomous and allocates vast amounts of capital for large-scale infrastructure projects in order to clear the way for private investment flows.”

It goes on to show that:

“By June 1970 of the \$5.4 billion (US) which the World Bank lent to Latin America (which includes the Caribbean) 78 percent went towards infrastructure projects – electricity, power, transport, telecommunications – while only 19 percent went to industry, agriculture, forestry and fishery.”

What I am merely saying is this. We have seen that the Governments of the Caribbean who will control this Corporation are not of a like-minded

ideology. Indeed the vast majority of them are pro-imperialist, anti-socialist, and anti-communist. Therefore their ideology is bent on the promotion of either the downright pro-capitalist model of development or the reformist model which you had in Latin America with the policy of import substitution but which failed both at the industrial level and at the agricultural level.

If you take countries like Brazil, Argentina, they went in for import substitution. The principle of import substitution is bad, but if it is tied up with foreign domination then you have had it. We have only today had an increase in the price of oil. My colleague Cde. Lalbachand Lalbahadur will speak about this aspect.

Cde. Speaker, I was making the point before the adjournment that while we in Guyana and the comrades and colleagues in the Caribbean want to have development, at the same time we have to ensure that the steps we are taking will ensure that development. I made the point that this Caribbean Food Corporation which will be set up is not necessarily going to be run primarily at the State level, nor is it suggested that it has anything to do with the question of building a socialist Guyana or a socialist Caribbean. The Government of Guyana, the ruling Party, has declared that it wants to build socialism in Guyana and it is in this context that I wish to speak about this setting up of a Caribbean Food Corporation going in for extensive development in Guyana. With regard to the Caribbean, my colleague will deal with that when he speaks at a later stage.

In an article written recently and published in the *Guyana Chronicle* of the 11th Independence Anniversary on May 26, Dr. Sukhdeo, who I believe is a Government advisor and who holds very important positions – for instance, he is a Director of GUYSUICO – speaks of the Government control of over 80 percent of the economy, indicating a move in the socialist direction, but then he went on to say that there is so much inefficiency that something needs to be done. He speaks of the new shirt-jack elite; he speaks of the State sector not being an efficient producer of wealth and says it is likely to continue to experience complex transitional problems. Now, he went on in one part of this conclusions to say that what was needed was a thorough shake up. To quote him:

“The country is now entering the phase where the bureaucracy needs to be shaken-up so that every person, from manager to cleaner, relates to each other as a worker in a working class atmosphere that provides for functional authority and high standards of production and productivity.”

Now, this is the point which we have been making; that the reason for the mess in this country, the agricultural shortfall, is the fact that at all levels of the Guyanese society, there is no real democratic involvement by the people. Well, this adviser of the Government recognizes this point and at one stage he sees the problem from a scientific point of view ... theoretic-

cal, ideological, scientific point of view ... but then he goes on towards the end and he says this:

“Foreign private capital should be encouraged to invest with incentives that are even more favourable than in similar developing countries. The local capitalist and the petty bourgeois class should also be provided with the opportunities to enhance the developmental process.”

Now, what does all this mean? No doubt, this is what is going to be passed on as Leninism, a corruption of revolutionary practice. After the Soviet socialist revolution of 1917, working-class power was established. The economy was socialized; workers took control of everything. There was a counter revolution; the economy was hurt; there was intervention, destruction. It was in that context that Lenin said in the late 1920s that the country can afford to encourage a capitalism under what it called the New Economic Policy. This is what these half-bred Marxists are now trying to relate and import into the Guyana situation. But we do not have a parallel situation. We have a petty bourgeoisie, nationalist elite whose life style and salaries and so on- what Sukhdeo calls the shirt-jack elite – need to be shaken up. Lenin shook them up at the time of the revolution. So they are importers of concepts and ideas which have no relevance to a situation. What it means here is that they do not want to solve the problems of Guyana.

We cannot relate the New Economic Policy of the Soviet Union; we cannot import it here. The two situations are entirely different. Indeed, to do this would be a positive danger to this country like Guyana where you do not yet have working-class power, where you do not have working-class ideology, where you do not have working-class culture. It is dangerous to open the floodgates to a capitalist form of development because anti-imperialism does not necessarily lead to socialism. The nationalization of enterprises can, indeed, go in the direction back to capitalism as it has done in so many countries, in Egypt, in Mexico, in Bolivia.

I have another one of these useful N.A.C.L.A. publications, N.A.C.L.A. being the North American Congress on Latin America, and I would urge all the Members of the Government who talk every day about socialism to read, study and digest the contents of this magazine. What does it say? There was a revolution in Bolivia in 1952 when the workers and part of the progressive revolutionary army made a revolution and took power. They brought in agrarian reform; they nationalized the property of the tin barons. The extraction of tin was the main form of industry in the country and land was held by the latifundias. They took them over. They put workers in control and the workers were indeed armed. The guns that they used to get power were left in their hands. What happened? That was in 1952 at the time of the Korean War. Let me just read this section on page 4 of this magazine called, *‘Bolivia – The War Goes On’*.

“But the cold-warrior syndrome of Eisenhower-Dulles was tempered by the far-signed advice of Milton Eisenhower, the President’s brother. US Ambassador Edward Sparks convinced Milton during the latter’s trip to La Paz that Bolivia could only be recaptured if a moderate, long-term strategy were planned.”

Then he goes on:

“Three crucial manipulations were necessary: (1) the division and demoralization of the proletariat; (2) the destruction of the petit-bourgeoisie – proletarian alliance by the creation of a reactionary petit-bourgeoisie; and, (3) the construction of a new bourgeoisie to replace the one travelling downhill since 1929.”

Because,

“ ‘Workers’ control’ in the COMIBOL mines led to the creation of a trade union bureaucracy, thus dividing each mine from the others and the miners from other labouring sectors. Revolutionary workers’ control should have encouraged the realization that worker control of all enterprises was necessary before worker control of any could be assured. ‘Co-government’ schemes without a proletarian party leading the government meant that the worker-ministers were used by the M.N.R. to win mass support for bourgeois goals.”

Eventually, through aid, a part of the country was built up, was developed. It says:

“And, while mining generally occurs in the highlands, the eastern regions have abundant reserves of oil, natural gas, and wood, and present optimal conditions for the cultivation of rice, sugar, cotton, and the raising of cattle. The United States turned its energies to this region, centred around Santa Cruz, in the hopes of cultivating yet another cash crop: a bourgeoisie.”

And this was the bourgeoisie. The account of this relates in detail, methodically, how the new bourgeoisie eventually succeeded in overthrowing the Government. So we have learned some lessons, historical lessons.

If the Government is serious about building socialism, then in the transitional period, in this period, what is necessary in Guyana is the taking of what is called the non-capitalist path, which means emphasis on the State and the cooperative sectors, and private enterprise playing a very marginal role. We are not saying it will not play a role.

If we follow what has been said today by the Minister and if we follow carefully the new strategy of imperialism when force can no longer be easily used as in Vietnam and against Cuba, when more subtle methods of domination are being resorted to, then we have to look carefully, apart from the economic aspects of exploitation, that is, countries like Guyana being

forced to buy from a Caricom market where all kinds of goods are dearer either industrial or agricultural, generally speaking.

The more important question so far as Guyana is concerned – because Guyana has taken a decision to go to socialism but before you can go to socialism you have to ensure that you have the working-class power; that our friend is lecturing about now in Critchlow Labour College. Working-class power and the direction of the economy must be in such a way that capitalism is not allowed to become a dominant force in the country.

This Bill therefore opens the floodgates to this form of development, a similar parallel like Bolivia. We know that there are always in Parties, such as the ruling Party in this country, different tendencies, the great majority tendencies in most Parties like these having started out with anti-communist, anti-Marxist positions, has a great tendency is towards the reactionary petit bourgeoisie.

Always a battle develops as in this period. The few revolutionary democrats who want to take socialist courses are always dragged back by those reactionaries like the petty bourgeoisie because it can be some revolutionary petit-bourgeoisie. But if in the country as a whole you start building up in the private sector or even in joint enterprises, a new bourgeoisie develops, then you will have, as in Mexico, the revolution stopping. In Mexico you had peasant wars in the early part of the century; you had nationalization of oil in the 1930s. But the revolution has stopped. The landlords and the capitalists are now hand-in-glove with the American capitalists. In other cases we have seen this in Egypt, where the revolution has gone backwards and in Bolivia where it has been overthrown. For this reason, while we want development, we cannot accept the road which now clearly the Government strategists are thinking about...bring back the capitalists; bring them back if necessary through corporations such as these.

We who want socialism in this country realize that the path will be difficult. We realize that. We realize that people will have to undergo suffering and hardships. But people are prepared to make sacrifices and undergo hardships if they know that they are going ahead. They have done it in Cuba. People have tightened their belts, people line up with their ration cards, but they know that there are no more exploiters, they know that everything belongs to them: they know what they are building will go to them. Therefore they are prepared to endure.

But nobody is going to endure. Let us learn the lesson from India. India not too long ago wrote in the amendment of its Constitution that India will be a socialist State. When the Constitution Amendment came before the House, Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister, said this was nothing new, "*We have been Socialists all along*" and she quoted from her father the great Nehru, all the utterances he made about socialism. But what happened? Because the Indian Government did not move fast enough and far enough and did not solve the problems of the people, it went in for a lot of things like forced sterilization, Government's denial of democratic rights of the people and

so on, the consequence was that in the end the people in frustration moved, threw them out and moved to the right.

In Guyana, the Government must look seriously. Why is it we have to have such great shortages of food? Why it is our country with all its resources is not able to make long-term steady progress accreting the economy in terms of production of let us say, the basic products. Over and over we hear comparisons, as we are doing now, as we heard during the Budget debate, with statistics from now and 1964. Let us see what the Government has achieved in the last twelve years, what rate of growth there was in agriculture generally the main hub of production, and then we will see that we are not going anywhere. We will see that basically we have stagnation in production if we take our two major crop sugar and rice.

This brings us, therefore, to what we said during the Budget debate and we wish to re-emphasise it: you have to get down and solve the political problem of Guyana. All these schemes which are generally the brainchild of imperialism have been tried elsewhere. In Central America the common market is in ruins. Who controls all the agro-industries and all the other things in Central America, in Guatemala and other places? These Banana Republics, who runs them? It is the Americans who put in money. Is that what we are going to get in these, the joint ventures and so on?

We clearly want development but we want development in the full sense of the word. We want development which is going to lead to social progress, to equality, to social justice, not just to produce, workers producing as slaves for the multinationals who now are prepared to have even minority holdings but yet carry on the exploitation. Import substitution policy alone must not be thought of as bad. We have to think in terms of a balance of agricultural and industrial development and not shift like the seesaw. One time when they were in Opposition they cursed the previous Government for agricultural development, for emphasizing agriculture. Now they are moving helter-skelter in that direction but still we do not see the results. Clearly, we must have a balanced industrial agricultural development. We are glad to see that now it is envisaged to establish a Planning Commission so that the whole economy can be looked at in an integrated way. But we cannot see that in the development which will go on in Guyana that the major sector – of course I do not know if the Government still has this in its mind about '*Cooperative Socialism*', that the coops will become the dominant sector in the end and within this coop you will have multinationals from outside too. If that is the philosophy, then perhaps we are going to end up with production, but not into socialism.

Yugoslavia started under Marxism with the Communist Party under so-called "*self-management*" and so on, cooperatives. But they have not yet solved the problem of unemployment which the other socialist countries have solved.

We wish to have cooperation with our friends in the Caribbean. However, this cooperation must be of a kind which is mutually beneficial to all

the members. We have such cooperation within Comecon under relations of socialism, where multinational corporations, foreign enterprises are not involved and if they are involved they are operating for the benefit of the socialist States, because they are many and their know-how is used. In this situation we have a new thing. The opposite, where multinationals and foreign capital have complete rein, complete freedom. We have a middle course between the two in what is called the Andean Pact.

I am winding up now. In the Andean Pact, the Governments of those countries which came together when Chile was under the Presidency of Allende and when Peru had a left revolutionary Government. The Andean Pact countries came together and decided to put some control on foreign capital, not completely by shutting them out but controlling it. Up to today some efforts are being made to make a new list to stop apple juice and other things being regarded as having originated in the Caribbean.

They cannot succeed. Since January, this list which should have amended the Caricom Treaty that has not been passed up to now. It is held up. Why? Clearly because imperialism still wields a lot of influence in the Caricom area among the Governments ... some of them like Gary who has the fascist Pinochet of Chile who is now going to arm and train the Grenadian army, we has got Southern Korea, he has brought Mafia type gangsters and given them almost extraterritorial rights in Grenada. In other words, we are now bringing to the Caribbean what China had in the early part of this century where the imperialists carved out little parts of their country. Go to Dominica, you have the same thing. Some islands are being sold out to capitalists from outside.

This is the kind of influence which the imperialists has in the Caribbean, so much so that then is a glaring case which requires an amendment of the Caricom Treaty so that all goods coming in bulk and passing through these plants will not be regarded as having originated within the area. That even cannot be done.

How are we going to stop the imperialists who are looking for cheap labour and to exploit in every possible field? Not just in industry, but in agriculture too. Because there are big multinationals operating in the capitalist countries which are now moving in all fields including agriculture. Can we reach socialism in this way? Can we preserve the sovereignty and independence of Guyana? If you do not do that you cannot build anything much less socialism. Therefore we cannot support this Bill.

Let the Government sit down and talk seriously with the Opposition to find a solution to this country's political problems. Then and only then we are going to get out of this mess, this crisis, that the country is facing and will continue to face. Merely looking for foreign capital to bail us out is not the answer and all these high-fluting names and schemes will end up as they ended up in the past.

Our Party will be on the forefront to expose imperialism in this area. When we said the Puerto Rican model would fail, they laughed at us; when

we said the Federation would fail, they laughed at us; when we said Carifta would fail, they laughed at us. Today it is cracking at the seams and now we have another so-called "*panacea*". This will also fail. It will not succeed. It will only lead to the further exploitation of the Caribbean peoples and also pose a danger to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Guyana.

Bill – Second Reading

Regional Development Authorities Bill: 15th June, 1977

Dr. Jagan: This Bill goes under the name of Regional Development and thus we have to consider the creation of an authority in the context of development. The Hon. Minister who moved the second reading of the Bill said that this is another aspect of the experimentation process which is going on and this is a question of trying to bring about the development of Guyana.

I think enough has been said from the Government ranks and the evidence is all there to see the financial, economic and social crisis facing the country today. We need not go on in the same old way under the highfalutin name of experimentation.

What do we have so far? We have Regional Ministers: we have Regional Officers; we have Community Development Officers. Community Development Workers are all paid out of the starvation wages that the workers are getting and the miserable prices that farmer's get which is half that they get for instance, in the West Indian Market in the case of rice. That has been responsible for the chaos.

We had in the old colonial times a system of central authoritarian rule, a Local Government Board. Now we are substituting for the Local Government Board the Minister and we can see no difference between the colonial regime and the present situation. The only difference is the Minister. Before they did not call them Ministers but the system by which they got in the seat of power is about the same. They put themselves there.

In the colonial days, which we all decried, what did they have? Nominated Local Authorities, nominated Central Government, a Local Government Board, a nominated Legislature. In the Ministerial system what did we have? Even then they had food to eat. Now with the Ministerial system, with big salaries, with big allowances, the country is bankrupt; it cannot pay the population, it cannot pay its bills; it cannot pay back its loans; it is asking people for more time to pay. Goods are piling up on the wharves. The Government cannot pay for them; it does not have the foreign exchange. It cannot buy fertilizers; it cannot buy food; it cannot buy lots of things.

This is not divorced from the system of administration that has been set up in this country. We have to look to see the connection between the top-heavy administration, the administration from above dictating and even slandering the people and that is why the country is in this hazardous state today and it is going to get worse.

I think the time has come when the Government should not only just think of maintaining itself in office and putting people in prestigious positions with lucrative salaries and allowances in the hands of Party supporters and members. We are in a serious situation today. And one would think that the Government would try to deal with this matter very seri-

ously to see how we should get out of it.

The Hon. Minister in a speech which he made at the C.C.W.U. "Think-In" at Sophia on 18th July referred to workers and trade unions. This is what he said:

"Trade unions cannot isolate themselves from the main stream of political life in the country; otherwise the workers would continue to remain outside the sphere of decision-making with all the adverse consequences to themselves and to the nation which such alienation brings into it.

The essence of the socialist society is democracy. Democracy premises the active participation of workers in all sectors of national life. The political sector is unarguably vital."

This is the Minister speaking in front of workers at a 'Think-In'. Here is another vital statement by the same Hon. Minister. This is quoted from the *Guyana Chronicle* of 1st December, 1976, page 9:

"Each one of us got to understand that we must be activists in the area of production and productivity. Socialism is not a theory, it is a practical thing. We can talk from now until Doomsday and people are not going to take us seriously unless they see the thing happening on the ground. It calls for more agricultural production, more bauxite production, so as we face 1977 let us understand that we are facing a new era in the history of our country."

Brave words, wonderful words. But where is the translation of words into practice? Where is the democracy in this Bill? We are hearing now about appointments. The Minister in his judgment will appoint the people. Having had enough appointments from the ranks of the Government, from the ranks of the P.N.C., from the ranks of the ministerial front bench we can bring statement after statement to show that the local government setup is not functioning. That is the root of the problem, the base. If the local government does not function at the district level simply superimposing a structure at the regional level on the same basis is not going to make any difference. How is it going to make any difference? They are the same people. Last year during the floods many people who formerly used to belong to local authorities, many who were members and leaders of the Rice Producers Association, they went to the Vice-Chairman of the Rice Board at Skeldon, and they were told that they must go and see the Regional Minister. This is what we have now. All we are doing now is legalizing it. The thing is a little confusing to me because from what I read in the press and what I read in the Bill, the Bill says we are going to set up regional authorities and a newspaper clipping...

Cde. Speaker, if I want to seek clarification and the Bill says one thing and the Minister is quoted in the Government newspapers are saying something else I want to refer to show the contradictions or the difference so

that we can get a clarification. That is all I am raising it for; I am not trying to be irrelevant or superfluous.

I don't follow that logic. All I say is that the Bill says that the Minister will be empowered to establish district authorities. By that I understand that starting with one authority which has already been established the Matthews Ridge/Arakaka/Kaituma area, there will be others established. But, at the same time, from what is alleged to have been said by the Minister and reported in the *Chronicle* it seems that these regional authorities will be established in areas where there were no local authorities. That is why I raise it. It would seem to me that the object of this is to establish all over the country a regional superstructure over the district or village superstructure. That is why I ask for clarification, whether it was intended, since the two things do not seem to be saying the same thing. This is why I ask the Minister to clarify that.

Our point is this, we are told that this country is moving in the direction of socialism, and the Government's aim is to move in that direction. We have seen what was the direction in colonial times, superimposition from above, and it did not produce the results apart from other aspects of colonialism. Recently, for instance, this Government has been sending a lot of people to the Socialist Republic of Cuba. Parliamentarians have gone from here. They have gone there, no doubt, to see how institutions are functioning within a country which is building socialism. What is done? You have local government which is equivalent to our district councils, what they call municipalities, and you have regional councils. The municipal assemblies are elected by the people, not only elected by the people; every three months those who are elected have to go back in little assemblies of two or three hundred people and give account of their stewardship. They are subject to recall. And over those municipalities you have a higher tier of regional authorities.

I hear a little voice saying you have one party there. Whether you have the principle where the people elect the authority directly in the case of the municipality – the lowest level – and indirectly in the case of the regional body. This is the structure no doubt which the Government wants to set up in Guyana, a structure based from the top to the regions, to the districts or the villages. There is nothing wrong with this structure from a planning point of view, from an execution point of view. We see in a country like England where there is talk of devolution, there is a big debate and discussion going on whether to give more powers to Scotland, to give more powers to Wales, even to have a Parliament for Scotland. They already have in those countries County Councils with a lot of powers given to them. But under devolution they are going to get more powers. But nobody suggests, even in bourgeois England, that they should be nominated by the Government. Even there under bourgeois democracy you have elections for County Councils; you are going to have elections at the other levels.

In socialist Cuba, you have elections; you have the democratic principle

of recall where those who are elected will have to give an account of their stewardship, every three months apparently. That is how you are going to get answers. Otherwise you are going to get on the one hand – the Government knows it; I have said it here before – where “big boys” of the Government are saying that because of the negligence of the Local Authority, in Berbice, for instance, they lost about half of the spring crop. Spring crop rice which was to be reaped could not be reaped. Autumn crop rice ready to be planted, out of 75,000 acres, only 25, 000 acres were planted. Why? These things are told to you every day and yet you are coming back to set up another superstructure on the same old basis. How are we going to get out of this?

The Prime Minister is now going all over the place, no doubt because of the booing at May Day or perhaps in anticipation of another election or referendum. Like Eric Williams, the Prime Minister now has a new gospel: “I did not know all these wrong things were going on; we need a cleanup”. And so, poor civil servants, all of them are now becoming the scapegoats. I heard on one of the broadcasts from the Meet-the-People tour in Mahdia, one man said: “Mr. Prime Minister, do something about this: the Transport and Harbours vehicle which used to take one day from Bartica to Mahdia now sometimes takes as long as three days.” Why? How many miles is that. A hundred miles. Three days! That is progress! What the man says? The Transport and Harbour vehicle has no lights. When night comes, the truck has to stop. Women with babies are told to get out of the truck. Why? Because the truck driver is afraid that when something gets stolen in the truck at night he will have to pay for it. This is voiced on the air, the man said: “I am tired with the Regional Minister.” He went to the Regional Minister over and over. He said: “That is a good Regional Minister; he listens very well. But every time he says he puts it to the Minister of the Government at the top and he hears nothing more about it.” He said: “Please, Mr. Prime Minister, do something about it.” Why? They have not got people who are directly involved; they do not have people who can relieve people. And so, we add up one apparatus over another and what is this costing the country today? \$128 million for the Government apparatus, \$45 million for State Corporations.

The latest pronouncement on this by one of their advisers to the Minister of Economic Development, Mr. Fred Sukhdeo, is that the State sector is inefficient, unprofitable. Therefore we must encourage the capitalists and give them even more incentives than other Third World countries are giving. This is the advice which the Minister is getting now.

What did we hear about this kind of apparatus we have at the moment? I quote from the *Sunday Chronicle*, 12th December, 1976:

“The present temporary financial crisis requires maximum utilization of the production resources of the country. It appears that Guyana has an adequate stock of machinery to satisfy the existing production targets. Perhaps it is because of the excesses and the readily available replacements that vehicles and equipment are

ruthlessly destroyed, stolen or poorly maintained and incompetently utilized. The spate of recent fires on public property cannot be allowed to continue”.

“Resources:

The public sector is not producing the goods and services that are compatible with their resources. Many of the public utilities such as bus transport, telephone, electricity and water, along with service enterprises such as the Guyana Marketing Corporation and many established Government Departments have declining performances.

One of the solutions of this pathetic situation is public accountability of the bureaucracy. Management in the Public Sector seems to be reduced from a science to a manipulative art with an entrenched crimplene shirt-jack and long and wide side-burn mentality. The functioning of this elite group is not compatible with socialism.”

Fred Sukhdeo has been talking about this before but they are going on and on. Now he is following their new philosophy of encouraging the capitalists to come back and no doubt that is why they put Minister Nascimento to conduct the Mazaruni project while my dear friend Cde. King is exhorting the police and other people *“Do not steal so much.”* Where is the public accountability?

I come back to the point of public accountability and that brings us to the whole question of workers’ control which the Minister told the C.C.W.U. *‘Teach-in’* about. At the regional district levels it obviously means involving the people by democratic processes through an election. But their dilemma unfortunately is there. If you come to the P.P.P. and say, *“Man, look, we can’t win the seats”*, then we can tell some of our voters to vote for you. But do it legitimately. *“We can give you some votes to let you win.”*

Their fundamental dilemma is this; that they cannot win because they do not have a majority. Because they do not have a majority, they cannot win an election. They had fraudulent elections in 1970 in local authority elections. Now I notice even a union, the Public Service Union – yesterday’s paper had it – is talking about fraud, proxy voting and all kinds of things. It seems the fraud from the top is infecting the whole society now. All over the place. The position is this: they cannot win, that is why they keep postponing the local government elections.

They are talking a lot about majority rule in South Africa. That is why when I sent a telegram to the Commonwealth Conference and said *“P.P.P. condemns minority rule in Guyana and also racial and political discrimination”*, when I put that to them, when the telegram went on Wednesday night to the cable office, they manufactured a letter which was published the next day in the *Chronicle* that we want to create violence and trouble, suggesting some kind of X13 plan – X13, they are the masters of it.

What was it intended to do? Cde. Wills has gone and no doubt Cammie has gone as a showpiece. When people begin to question the contents of

my telegram, they will say, *"You see, them boys are out to cause trouble. We are going on a socialist course"* as McDavid said on the Peace Council platform in Poland, *"we are going in a socialist way."*

You have to get the complete picture, Cde. Speaker. All I am saying is this. They are creating the impression abroad that we are aligning with all kinds of forces to create trouble for a Government which is going in a socialist, revolutionary, progressive direction.

The people who did that should not throw stones at us. We made our position very clear in August last year that we will always fight against imperialism. Always! That is not just words. That is practice too. Theory and practice go together. Announcements, pronouncements and implementations. So we are asking the Minister to forget this Bill. I want to warn that if the Government continues to go in this direction, this country is going to be in a serious state of chaos caused by them. Right now they are going to be faced with a big bill for wage increases amounting to a sum between \$15 to \$20 million. Where are they going to get it from? The economy is not producing enough to get from existing taxation and from production that amount of money. What are they going to do? Print more money. The dollar notes are getting crispier every day in the street now.

But we know in Latin America sometimes when you have to buy one week's ration you have to get a cart to carry all the load – the dollar bills – that they give you. If they do not produce in this country, they will not have any money to pay the increased bill which the workers are going to struggle for this year. They will have to resort to printing more money which will cause inflation, or tax the people more. This will cause a double dose of hardship. When they do not produce, they do not have money to get foreign exchange and then you have no essential goods which are not only for consumption but even for production.

One factory at the moment – I can name several – Lysons, has people on a short work week of three days. One company, Friendship Marine, has laid off over 50 people already. I was talking with the workers, two or three go off every week. If you don't produce how you can get the foreign exchange. This is your trouble right now, to buy not only the consumer goods but the goods which are needed for vital production even in the country, like the fertilizer which my friend talked about just now which is needed for agricultural production. So we get into a vicious circle which means more inflation and ultimately a move in the direction that we have seen so well demonstrated in Latin America. And the political end of it is ultimately rightist dictatorship and so on.

Therefore, we ask the Government again to think twice. It has to democratize the system at the bottom, meaningfully involve the people. Let the Government hold local government elections forthwith. They say the P.P.P. is a sinking ship, the P.P.P. is a shell. Why are they afraid to hold elections? They say they are great democrats. They have the country in a mess. Therefore, I say, as the first step, set up a regional system which is

necessary, we do not deny that. Either, have it elected directly or as in Cuba. The Minister is always raising red herrings. Because the question of the Marshall Plan was not then decided upon and that is why elections were not held and also because of the fact that they were consorting with the CIA in that period, four years of riots! That is the reason, and Nascimento was the chief leader of that CIA fund.

So we say the only way to solve the crisis of the country today is to do what they themselves know must be done. They themselves know it but they are caught in the dilemma that they know what is right but they cannot implement it because if they do that a lot of their people down the line will lose positions and they want to hold on to those succulent positions so that we can continue to live the "*Daimler*" style of living. But I repeat and I warn this Government that it is going to lead this country to chaos and when trouble starts it must blame nobody but itself for the mess which it is now creating.

Motion on Guarantee of Loan to Guyana Stores: 14th July, 1977

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, the Hon. Minister, in seeking the approval of this House for a guarantee of \$50 million had said that this will be needed as additional working capital. He mentioned that this corporation would take into consideration the Government's overall needs. Unfortunately, he did not give this House some more information so that we can be better apprised of what is happening. This is a very vague statement. At one time he said that there have been overdraft arrangements which have been furnished by the banks. But now it is felt that there will be greater needs over a period of time. What are these needs and where does this corporation fit in, for instance, in the total aspect of importation in relation to such other state bodies like E.T.B., Guyana Gajraj and so on? Is Guyana Stores Limited importing supplies for the whole Development Programme, a new Development Programme? If so, what is this new Development Programme and what are the projects in mind? We have not been told anything and thus we are in the dark whether, like so many other corporations, this one is also now in some trouble and thus more money is sought to bail it out.

We have an enquiry, a high level Presidential Commission enquiring into its sister, Guyana Gajraj. Incidentally, on that point, one would have thought that since this is a Presidential Commission, not an inter-Ministerial Enquiry, that the Opposition should have been represented in this Commission. Many people are concerned about the functioning of these bodies and criticisms are coming not only from the public, but from the Consumers Association and others, about malfunction or "*halfway functioning*", if I may produce that word, of these bodies. I think one needs now to look at this not from the point of view that the Government will be worried lest it be criticized and so on. I think we are beyond that stage now. It is a question now of survival. We have people like Sukhdeo, the economist, who wrote the other day suggesting that we open the doors to capitalism, talking about how these corporations are functioning. I have his speech here, published in the *Sunday Chronicle* of the 26th May, 1977, where he said:

"The majority of the working class is alienated from the development process. To them the country now belongs not to imperialists, but to a new generation of shirt-jacks elite whose interests are at variance with the ordinary worker. This attitude has contributed towards declining productivity, inferior work and undiscipline in the work environment. In many places of work, there is evident absence of a cohesive system of management and distinction in functional authority.

One of the results of this cancerous problem is the under-utilisation of productive resources. Valuable machinery and equipment are not producing according to manufacturer's design. With inadequate maintenance, these hardware rapidly

amortise and are written off. A recent phenomenon is the disappearance of parts of machinery stocks and stores even when there is twenty-four hour security."

This morning I heard on the radio someone from the Consumers Association talking about the kind of services consumers get. I raise this because, as I said, we did not have presented to this House, for instance, statements on nationalization of the Bookers octopus. What did we buy? All I remember reading is a statement before the nationalization that Bookers had made quite substantial profits in Bookers Stores. That side of the business was making substantial profits and I was looking for that clipping and unfortunately I did not find it. I remember that distinctly. I wanted to refer to that in the context that if it was making substantial profits under private enterprise, then one would assume - all right, the Minister said we have bettered that. If we have bettered that, give the facts to the House and then tell us why there is need for additional capital.

If other development capital equipment is to be bought and so on and not just equipment to be sold to the public, then tell us what they are so that we will know and not just guarantee money, perhaps in the long run only to pay for deficits. I look at this thing from a broader point of view. That is, we have to go to socialism, we have to proceed through the gate of anti-imperialism and nationalization and we do not want people to get the impression that socialism is bad, that nationalization is bad as, unfortunately, many people are today saying in this country because of the way many of these things are administered.

As I said, you do not have to take it from the P.P.P., you hear it from independent sources such as the Consumers Association and that is why I say that when an enquiry is made, a top level one such as the Presidential one, the Opposition should be involved in this process so that its own resources can be brought to bear to see what can be done to put these things right. As I said, it is not just a question of losing money. It is a question of giving these organizations the credibility that there will be public acceptance.

I remember definitely when E.T.B. was being set up, it was said then that when it comes in, prices to the consumers would be cheaper. This was definitely one of the argumentations for the Government to enter into the field of trade. In principle, we had no objection to that. But one cannot say that this is so. One cannot say, despite the fact that the Government has the virtual monopoly in many cases that service is more and we do not necessarily see that prices are going down. This is not always due to inflation and we must not always blame this monster of imported inflation because that can be an excuse to hang your hat on and condone all kinds of inefficiencies. Therefore, I say in the long term interest of this country, Members of the House should be given more information.

I would suggest also that the Government should table all the nationali-

sation Agreements which they have made, so that we can have the facts, the terms and conditions. Do not let us have Agreements which did not exist and then leave it to the American Assistant Secretary of State to tell us that they have now come to an end. Let us have the facts so that the public will know them. And, as I say, there should be public accountability, not only from this level but from the level of the man at the bottom.

This brings me to the question of workers' control. I am sure those who have labour sympathies and those who talk about socialism in the Opposition know that this is a cardinal principle of socialism. In other words, you cannot just talk about nationalization without having this twin to go along with it. Why is it that the Government is afraid of talking about educating workers, educating them to accept responsibilities and so on? I had to tell one Minister the other day as regards the sugar industry, where I have something to do with the Union in the sugar industry, that on many occasions I talked to ordinary workers, they know much more than I do about the day-to-day running of the industry, and you must not underestimate the intelligence of the workers. We must have confidence in them and put them in positions of trust. Once the facts are presented to them they will understand and know.

I was reading the other day on the question of Africa, for instance, where Kissinger had six options put to him on the policy for South Africa prepared by experts. He decided on option number 2 and I am sure we have the same kind of expertise. One is not saying that we do not need expertise. Once that kind of expertise is there and put in properly prepared documents, the ordinary man is not a fool, he can comprehend facts logically and with reason. But you will have the public accountability which is absolutely necessary.

Without workers' control you have a lot of things going wrong including shady deals and so on. Unless we let the workers have a say in these enterprises, we are going to find that not only will the House be put upon to continue to vote money but nationalization will be given a bad name in the end and this will be to the credit eventually of imperialism and the capitalists in this country. I would therefore ask the Minister to be more explicit and put us more into the picture as to what is really happening.

The fact that the banks are coming to Government for guarantees means that they must have some dread about these corporations. Why do so if they have the balance sheet, once these people are in business to protect their investments? They knew before if Bookers Stores were making profits. If Bookers, as we heard, were making profits, why does the State have to guarantee all these loans if they are profitable undertakings on the basis of their own accounts and so on? It may be that some of these, even the bankers, are a little worried. So they want to have a double guarantee not just the guarantee from the institution but also the guarantee from the State so that they would be doubly assured if anything were to go wrong.

It is for this reason that we say not only must we have more information

but over and above everything else, nationalization must be accompanied with workers' control so that we will have the public accountability at that level. Also when we have a Commission of Enquiry and other things there should not be representatives of the Government side alone but the Opposition also should be there to criticize, if needs be, what takes place.

Motion for the Adjournment of the Assembly to Discuss a Definite Matter of Urgent Public Importance - Reports of Near Starvation in the Rupununi

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, reports have reached us of a grave situation existing in the Rupununi Savannahs. It has been pointed out that because of the drought in the earlier part of the year; there has been a grave shortage of production of one of the most essential food items of the area, that is, cassava. Consequently, cassava bread, which is made from that staple, and farine are not available for the diet of the people, most of whom are Amerindian in this area.

We were told not too long ago in this House by one Hon. Member that the price of farine, for instance, has increased from a few dollars per pound to over \$20 per pound so that this is merely an indication of this grave shortage to which we are referring at the present time. As a result of this shortage it is said that residents had to resort to having as part of their diet the consumption of wild cashew, wild palm fruit, and so on, but even these are becoming short. There are reports of such grave problems pertaining to this shortage of food that the case of death of a child has been reported.

Compounding this problem of food shortage is the question of transportation. We know that at a certain time in the Rupununi Savannahs, when the rainy season steps in, it become almost impossible for normal contact to be made between the main centres and the smaller villages and communities. Apart from that, we know also that transportation is very costly. With the recent increase in the price of fuel where now in Georgetown the price ranges from \$2.50 to \$2.71, you can very well understand what this means. Sometimes, the price in the Rupununi Savannahs is nearly double what it is in the coastal area. So that with the cost of transportation, with the floods in different parts of the country, which make it impossible for people to move even by horses, it means that even if food can be made available in the conventional centres like Lethem and other areas like Aishalton, it may be difficult for it to reach small communities and villages. This is why one hears of families leaving their homes, going off for days to get supplies of food and before they get back, children are either dying or left to fend for themselves in starvation.

Further compounding the problem of food shortage seems to be another problem. That is the rise in the incidence of malaria. And, therefore, we would like the Government to tell us very clearly what it has been doing for the unfortunate people of this area. I do not know if there is now a doctor at Lethem. At one time, there was no doctor there. This hospital serves a very wide area and one can imagine, therefore, when there are illnesses, either from malnutrition or from other causes such as malaria,

without proper medical services, what would happen to the residents of this area.

We think that this matter should be treated with a great deal of urgency. In other countries, when such things happen, sometimes a State of Emergency is declared in the area to handle it with all the resources mobilized by the State. I mentioned the question of transportation, in which case perhaps where we would see the helicopter service, and the army, even the Prime Minister's personal helicopter, could be mobilized so that food can reach the remote areas and thus the people be saved from starvation and, indeed, from dying from starvation. I hope the Government will tell this House what is being done so far and whether everything possible is being done to help the people of this area.

Bill – Second Reading

National Security (Miscellaneous Provisions)

(Amendment) Bill: 1st September, 1977

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, Critchlow, the father of trade unionism in Guyana, must be turning in his grave now. If we go before that, the freedom fighters of this country, Cuffy, Accabre and others must be doing the same thing.

Of course, if may be argued by the Government that what is being done is in the national interest. We just heard from the last speaker a treatise on individual rights versus national rights and, as she pointed out, these two things should go together. Unfortunately, it is not always so because when we talk of the state and the national interest we have to begin to talk about class.

In the old days the plutocracy also talked about national interest. Way back we have had endless numbers of shootings of sugar workers in this country and it was always in the national interest that they were shot. But everyone knows that when the slaves' hands were cut off for running away or when their ears were chopped off or when ex-slaves were shot and those who succeeded them as indentured immigrants were shot, it was always in the national interest.

We must therefore be careful in talking about the national interest because anyone can spout out a slogan such as that. We have to consider, as Lenin pointed out in his famous book *The State and the Revolution*, that the state is an instrument of a class. Which class? The capitalist class or the working class? We have driven away the baccraman, the white man, and the foreigners. But we must ask ourselves the question today: Have we supplanted it with a new class which now intends to suppress the working class in the same way and use the name old slogans of national interest? This is the fundamental question which this nation has to face.

Apart from that, another question which this nation has to face is whether repression has ever solved the problem of production and will, in this country, solve it. It was Lenin who said you cannot build socialism without democracy. The practice of democracy is fundamental to the theory of Marxism/Leninism. And if you use force against the workers, be it detention, be it curfews and what not, - you will not succeed, we went through the gamut before in the previous period of this administration. Police dogs were used against workers at Sandbach Parker, against rice farmers who protested, who wanted to see that their rights were not taken away when they were removed from the Rice Marketing Board, when they were de-recognized, although they were a statutory legal body. They went beyond that and used the armed police not only against sugar workers, but against bauxite workers, lithographic workers, who were basically P.N.C. supporters. Eventually, an attempt was made in 1970 to enact an anti-strike law.

They did all of that, they took a turn and now they seem to want to go back to the same position.

But let us recount what has now happened. The crisis we are facing today is a result of those policies, domestic and foreign, and in practice what had to be done at a political level. You had to do that if you pursued a certain economic planning strategy and certain domestic and foreign policies. You had to use those undemocratic measures against the working class. So today, you are in crisis.

When we talk of national interest we must talk of income distribution too. At one time the Deputy Prime Minister was Minister of Finance. I do not know if he made the statement or whether it was made by the present Minister of Development when he was Minister of Finance, but one Minister of Finance talked about an egalitarian rate.

There are sugar workers, rice farmers and other producers of the country. Why is it we do not have enough timber to sell abroad? At one time during the regime of the P.P.P. Government the minimum wage for Government workers and sawmill workers was the same. Ask Ambrose and the others who were in the trade union field. After the P.N.C. Government came into office the minimum wage for sawmill workers made by law, made by a committee appointed by the P.N.C. Government, was lowered. They paid the producers less; they paid the rice farmers one-third of the price they get in the external markets. You pay the sugar workers less than they were entitled to under the Commission which you appointed and whose findings you ratified and so today we have a crisis for production when the workers fight for their rights to maintain their living standards.

What do you do? This has now become the practice. It is not only sugar workers we are talking about; we are talking about bauxite workers, threatened with dismissal; you send in the troops, Georgetown workers, the very workers who were organized within the Guyana Labour Union, the Prime Minister's union. What do you do? They give a dismissal notice and send in the troops. Is this how you are going to build socialism? Who will build it? Is the bureaucratic machine going to build it? Where is the surplus going, the money that is produced by the working people of this country, including the farmers? An amount of \$128 million last year was to pay for the bureaucratic apparatus. An amount of \$119 million last year was to pay for debts. Surely, if you had spent the money which you borrowed wisely and if you had put it into productive schemes, into industry and agriculture, production would have increased to meet those debt payments. But now you can't do that. You haven't got any money from production. Look at the rice report which was tabled today. What is the average? The Guyana Rice Marketing Board's average yield per acre from 1959 to 1964/1965, that is, during the P.P.P. period of six years, was 13.7 bags per acre. From 1965/1966 to 1972/1973, eight years, the average has gone down to 11.7 bags per acre. Add up all the big propaganda made about "*Blue Belle*" and "*Star bonnet*". You forced the farmers to use them. The Yankees dic-

tated that. You have to buy fertilizers now without which "Blue Belle" and "Star bonnet" cannot grow. You don't have the foreign exchange now to buy it in time to give the farmers to throw it in the fields.

I was in Bush Lot two weeks ago, predominantly a rice growing area of 4,000 to 5,000 acres. The people said if one quarter is planted with rice today that is plenty. It doesn't pay. Yields are going down. Why are yields going down in spite of the fact that you have the most advanced varieties and you have put a lot of money into fertilizers? Cde. Ambrose knows about rice.

Why is it we are in this mess? This Bill is going to be passed like so many others. But our concern is not only that it is going to be a repressive measure; our concern is where are we going? Where is this nation going? From all indications it seems that after 6th December, 1964 we were on the Right. And accompanying economic policies, the superstructure, had to be repressive. Then a turn was made against imperialism and some of these undemocratic methods went by the wayside. The same Bill we are now reintroducing was set aside. Why is it being brought back?

We heard the Minister justify it – arson, disturbance and so on. The sugar workers were not burning up anything before; nobody was burning up anything. Two long years they have been talking about getting their share. Read all the background material from Brewster, a well reputed economist working now for UNCTAD. He said sugar workers' wages never kept pace not only with production but even with productivity. What they produced they were not even getting. That was not our statement; Brewster and others have given these figures.

As a result of that, we have all these strikes and so on. The Cummings Commission Report, 1965–1966, was rejected by both the S.P.A. and the N.P.C.A., the then recognized Union. Persaud's Commission came in and made a recommendation. The formula was: give the workers a share out of the profits so they would not strike. That was really the formula. It was almost a strikebreaking formula. Anyway, it was put into practice. Workers would not strike because they would share some of the profits.

Now the propaganda it going around that sugar workers want all. Cde. Chairman, just for the benefit of this House, because this Bill is arising out of this question: under the Guya Persaud Commission Report the first charge on profits is on capital invested, 10 percent on capital invested. So now that the Government is the owner it gets 10 percent. Indeed Justice Crane in the Crane Tribunal raised it from 10 percent to 12½ percent. Then we heard: "*Sugar workers want all.*" Next, the remaining portion of the profits is supposed to be divided between the workers and the employers, now the Government, in a proportion of 60:40, 60 to the workers, 40 to the company or, in this case, the Government. But, Cde. Speaker, we cannot forget that this country has a high incidence of direct and indirect taxation. From 1964 to 1975 indirect taxation has increased by 774 percent. And direct taxation by as much as 400 percent. Therefore, more than half of what the

sugar workers will get will go back to the Government. And it is so dishonest to use the Government's radio, to use the Government's papers to any over and over that the sugar workers want all the money.

Before the long strike of 1975, when this question of the levy came up, it was G.A.W.U. who put up a proposal, when the four unions met including, at that time, the recognized union. It was G.A.W.U. who proposed a formula on the levy: that 50 percent should go to the workers, less than they were entitled to under the Guya Persaud Commission; 25 percent should go to other workers working with the Government so that their wages could also rise and the last 25 percent should go to two funds.

One of these funds is the Price Stabilization Fund and this was to maintain the wages of the workers in case the price of sugar falls. In fact, in Jamaica, there is no levy which goes to revenue; it goes to a stabilization fund for that every purpose. That is how that recommendation came. The other half of the 25 percent will go to the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Fund for welfare activities. So why this dishonest propaganda that the sugar workers want all? And now to put bayonets behind that lie you want to lock up sugar workers, cane farmers and others.

Cde. Chairman, slavery was not abolished only because it was a cruel system. Slavery was abolished because at a certain particular point in history the slave owners decided it was unproductive. It was better to have that system supplanted by capitalism or feudalism. And that should be a little lesson to those who want to embark on this course. They should learn from history. Surely, these facts are known. There are brains in the P.N.C. who must know these things. Why then is the Government going on this suicidal course? Is it because pressures are being mounted by imperialism again? If so, tell the nation; don't gloss it up in big verbiage, in flowery language about preserving national interest.

We had to comment on the fact that on the 26th May, one of the ideologues of the Government said that the way forward is to open the door to foreign capital. I just saw in the *Guyana Chronicle* of August 29, a report of a speech made by my Honourable Friend, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Justice. What does he say? He talks about Guyana accepting all kinds of investments provided they are not inconsistent with national objectives and that the country has control of sensitive areas. I quote from page 5 where he says:

"It must be managed partnership, with the Guyanese people having full say in the destiny of their resources and their development."

And then the article goes on to say that it was within that framework that questions of fears of nationalization or non-fears would be dealt with. Then the article goes on:

"Cde. Wills said the problem with private investment was that it was inter-

ested in production of goods, and not in services or infrastructure except when there was some ancillary production of goods”.

This is the last sentence:

“The need of Guyana today is for infrastructure.”

Infrastructure was the basis of the first Development Plan. Three-quarters of it! And not even infrastructure for agriculture, drainage and irrigation. And that is why we have to squeeze the sugar workers, to rob them of their profit-sharing, to rob the rice farmers, to rob other sections of the working people, producers, by direct and indirect taxation to meet debt payments today. We can have whatever word you want to call it; managed partnership or controlled democracy. Sukarno experimented with some words. The Mexicans, who made a peasant revolution and who nationalized oil in the 1930s, also had a managed partnership but today the revolution has stopped. The bourgeoisie, local bourgeoisie, petty bourgeoisie, big bourgeoisie in Mexico have become interlinked with foreign bourgeoisie i.e. American bourgeoisie in mixed enterprises.

Naturally, imperialism wants a weak working class; capitalism wants a divided, weak working class. And so, as I said, we wonder about all that is being done now. I can go on and add many other things: military missions coming to Guyana. Ministers like Cde. Carrington who can say *“I know fifty things wrong in the sugar industry and you have ruthless employers like Bookers”*, Ministers like this are not liked by imperialism. We have to ask whether the country is going to make progress by going backward.

Foreign capital went to Brazil. At one time they said that they were having ten to twelve percent rate of growth every year, the so-called *“Brazilian miracle.”* It is busted now. Only this week I read an article in the *Guyana Chronicle* written by one of the P.N.C. comrades who said that Mexico and Brazil cannot pay up their debts.

This brings us to the question that you have got to reward the producers of this country. You have to make up your mind for that. And if you do not do that, you can preach from now until doomsday. The church people have done this with the Ten Commandments and never realized them. You have to come down to the factors which are affecting the production crisis in this country, which are, simply put: strategy of economic development. You have all kinds of models: Puerto Rican Model, Brazilian Model, Cuban Model and so on. All right, we are not saying copy, but at least take the roots of the model, the basis of the model, which is anti-imperialist in content and pro-socialist in orientation.

The lack of democracy at all levels of our society; you do not tackle that – at the Central Government level, at the Local Government level, at the social level, organizations that the people want – at the factory level, industrial democracy, workers’ participation. When you have bureaucratic

management, you have rule from above and you have to pay the people more and more because they are your support and you do not want to lose even that little support you have, so you have to give them more and more and you tax the producers more and more. So, you have to settle these fundamental questions. The question of discrimination of a political nature or racial nature how to come to an end. You have to get rid of national and cultural oppression. You have to put an end to praedial larceny.

The P.P.P. is very serious about what is happening here, not only in terms of economic and socialist crises, increasing unemployment, more choke and rob in the streets, all kinds of things, but what we also consider to be a danger to this country, a danger from the right. There are so many countries where imperialism has succeeded in overthrowing revolutionary processes and we must not just live in the clouds and think that it cannot happen here. The Right has been built up, apart from the military. We talked about the Right, the political Right has been built up, we see, in countries like India and Ceylon.

It was in this context, Cde. Speaker, that we proposed that the way forward for this country is a political solution based on a National Front Government of all Left and Democratic parties.

Thank you, Cde. Chairman, I do not intend to be too long. I repeat; (2) to the division in the working class in this country. The P.N.C. not only has rejected this, but has put it in a very abusive manner by saying the P.P.P. wants "*lil Government work*". Well, let me assure Members of the Government that the P.P.P. is not looking for Government work. The P.P.P. is interested in this country. This has always been its position and it is interested in seeing that we have a socialist Guyana because only under a socialist Guyana we can solve the problems of this country.

The problem is that we now have two courses to go and in this a grave responsibility falls on the Prime Minister personally because he has a prestigious position and, apart from the prestigious position, a position of influence in the ruling party.

We know from analysts of the political situation in the country, that in the leadership of such a party there are different sides, that there are reactionary elements and there are revolutionary elements, that many from top to bottom over the last twelve years have acquired positions and privileges and see many kind of national solution in this country as a threat to those positions and to those privileges. This is why I say that a grave responsibility falls on the Prime Minister because the country is at the crossroads today, and he, particularly, who has a great deal of influence, can determine where this country goes. I am not saying that he alone makes the policies but, nevertheless, he has the influence.

As the night follows the day, if this course is followed, there is bound to be confrontation in Guyana. You look up people, you detain them, that has never helped in any country, and it is not going to help here. Are you going to look up and jail all the P.P.P. supporters? Are you going to lock up the

majority? You say you control 80 percent of the economy, but how much of that is production? And so once you start on this road it is a downhill situation. And the Government in rushing through this Bill today is really exposing Guyana to a very serious future, to very grave consequences, and, therefore, at this late hour I appeal to the Government to withdraw this Bill.

The Members of the Government have never seriously talked to the sugar workers. When we talked about a Commission of Enquiry into the whole Bookers Empire, it was rejected. When I raised the levy with the Prime Minister, I said that G.A.W.U.'s first position was: let there be an excess profits tax to catch Bookers. Take all the excess profit they make. The Prime Minister told me that you cannot catch Bookers that way because Bookers is a ramified empire and they can hide their profits, which we all know, and he justified the levy on the basis. We asked, nevertheless, for a Commission of Enquiry in order to ascertain even without the levy – the levy was something else – what are the real profits so that the workers could get their just share. Even on that they have not moved. They moved instead of appoint the Crane Tribunal which was only to examine Bookers' accounts and the Union was told that you have \$4 million more to get. When we went to the Ministry of Labour to get figures and facts, we thought, in the Bookers negotiations they saw where the workers can get more; when we went they could not say anything and now they are blaming the union for not going before the Tribunal.

G.A.W.U. went to the Ministers about the levy a year ago. The President indicated that he went to the Prime Minister too. I went back again this February to the Minister of Finance and discussed the question of the levy. He said he is going to take it up with the Cabinet. It is not correct to say that the union and the P.P.P. are taking precipitate action and this is a political strike to wreck the Government and so on. I repeat: if this country is to go forward, you cannot go forward with divisions and strife among sections of the working class. It is for the Government; it has a grave responsibility at this critical juncture and it must decide if it is going to go through with the Bill and expose this country, or sit down and talk to the producers of this country. It is a fact of life that a lot of them support the P.P.P. Okay you have two-thirds majority here. But you do not have that in the fields, in the factories, even among your own supporters at GUYBAU and at saw-mills and other places. Why does the Minister want to take polls now?

You cannot hold down the workers. You can hold them down for a little while. All attempts were made. We went through detention and everything already. But the P.P.P. is stronger today than it ever was, with all of that. You can jail me. You can jail all on this side. But you jail a hundred; one thousand will come up from the bottom. So just digest that very carefully. We do not want any war in this country because we realize that if there is any struggle between the working people, imperialism will gain.

My last point, Cde. Speaker, imperialism has seen Guyana and the Car-

ibbean as the danger spot in this area. In Jamaica, they were hoping to have an electoral solution as they did in India and Ceylon. So they are going to fight for democracy in Jamaica. Here they know that there is no democracy; there are lots of restrictions on human rights, but they close their eyes to that because they know that if there were free and fair elections the P.P.P. would win. Everybody knows that. So they say there are no human rights problems here. In the face of strong opposition in this country, they have to give political support, economic support, to this Government. But let us not forget; Indonesia has proved it, other countries have proved it. They will support the right to destroy the left even within the Government. In the political sphere, in the leadership, in the army, in the police. It is not our heads they are looking for. They are looking for the working class to muzzle them. It seems the Unions which this measure is out to emasculate; militant unions.

How are you going to win socialism? By hot-mobbing with the capitalists and imperialists? Socialism is built by class struggle and putting the workers in control, workers' power; and workers must reap the rewards of their labour. Form each according to his ability, to each according to his labour.

So this is all I have to say. We come here, we talk, we waste a lot of time, but Parliament is not going to decide anything. In fact, unfortunately, the talks between the P.P.P. and the P.N.C. broke down but we come here, we talk but that is not going to solve the problem and we must get down to the roots of the problems, see what are the bottlenecks to production and try to see how they can be solved. Surely, history has proved that force is not the way, and for those reasons we oppose this measure which was the old method used by the colonialists and the plantocracy and which the imperialists find so useful all over the world.

Summary Jurisdiction (Appeals) (Amendment) Bill: 1977

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, my colleague, Cde. Ramkarran spoke about this measure already, and I would like just to add a few points. First of all, it is a sad commentary that the Government has to bring forward a Bill such as this for the object which the Minister stated, that is, to apprehend those criminals who take advantage of the legal procedures to commit crimes over and over.

Now while we have no sympathy for such criminals and we share the Government's concern that the procedures of the law should not be abused with criminals taking advantage of it, nevertheless, we would like to see the other side of the coin and that is, that there are many people in this country whose rights are denied because of the kind of judicial system which we have at the moment. We have political judges and magistrates. We have an insufficient number of judges' and magistrates' orders. The Chancellor of the Judiciary has on many occasions spoken about this matter. We know that many people are waiting trial for months and their cases are not brought up for hearing. If we have not been able to solve the problem of this backlog, how are we going to now solve the problems when you are throwing more people in the jail without giving them bail? You will now determine whether the person will have a right to bail and if the magistrate or judge decides he does not have the right, he will go to goal. And then he will have to wait while he is in goal for his appeal to be heard. When will the appeal be heard?

It is all well and good to say we want to catch a certain category of criminal, who commits a crime today, makes an appeal, lodges \$50 then goes out and commits another crime. Therefore, you want to keep him in jail. But there are other cases. The Government has just brought a Bill where it will not worry to go to the Supreme Court any more; it will just grab people and put them in detention without trial and so it is quite possible that in the dragnet, while you say you want to get one category, you can also take a sugar worker, or a bauxite worker, because he is fighting for his rights, and convict him on any small summary offence and lock him up and then you can wash your hands and say "*We have not detained him. He is going through the process of law.*" You have not violated any constitutional rights, his political rights or anything like that! He has gone through the judicial process, the rule of law. The rule of law manipulated!

I heard in one case, the Arnold Rampersaud case, that one top official in the legal department said, "*I know he is guilty.*" Cde. Speaker, I will obey your order, but you know there is some place where people have to speak about these things. You can't speak at the street corners now; the thugs come out and break up the meetings. You can't get on Action Line; you can't get in the newspapers. So where are you going to speak if you can't

even speak in Parliament.

That's what you say but then, where can you speak about it when injustice is being done? Anyway, I should say that in one important case, to put it in the language which my comrades over there would put it, one big official says, "*I know he is guilty.*" So what happens in the court is immaterial. Another judge puts the question wrongly to the jury. No doubt he will get promotion soon and so on. He knows the man is guilty and therefore he must roast in jail, so why do we presume that in this law similar things will not happen to workers, not criminals? The procedure at the present time is that, on appeal, immediately you file your appeal, you are free until your appeal is heard. If you are convicted and it is upheld when your appeal is heard, then you go to jail.

We are concerned about this Bill because while the Minister says that it is intended to apply to a certain category of citizen it can have general applicability. Therefore, the first thing we would like is for the Minister to withdraw this Bill and bring another one to suit that particular category of people. I do not know, maybe I am talking outside of my senses in this field, but it would seem to me it would not be impossible to devise a Bill which can meet with that particular type of criminal that the Minister is talking about. That is my first proposal.

The second proposal that I want to make is that this Bill be deferred at least for a few days so that we can look at this matter more fully. I must admit that, on this matter, it is within the last day I have been able to get the necessary advice, to have the necessary consultation, and even the Amendments which I put here are not necessarily in keeping with the whole situation as we would want it. I admit that.

I will come to that in a moment. What I am saying, when I spoke to the Minister today I said: defer the Bill. If you want to catch some criminals, a week would not make that such difference. If they don't want to do it, then we will assume that it is intended to grab sugar workers, despite the assurance of the Minister that it is not intended to do that. So my second point is that if it is intended, as I said, to grab this type of criminal the Minister talked about, let the Government see whether it is possible to make, and we will also look at that, a special type of regulation or Bill or whatever it is, to deal with that category; also to give us more time to put up proper Amendments after we have examined the whole thing after we have talked to lawyers, law societies.

I don't know whether the Minister has consulted the legal societies or the law associations on this. I don't know; he should tell us, because clearly it is supposed to be the practice, that in matters like this you will go to the Law Association, the Law Society, the Bar Association, to get their views and their observations. We would like to say that until this Government can give the assurance that it has enough people, judges, magistrates, who can speedily deal with people's appeal cases then it should not make such a law even though some people may get out of the net, the criminals that he

talks about.

If you are going to abuse the rights of others, and I repeat there are many ways of skinning a cat and in this country things do not only work one way. My friend quoted the Constitution but things work in this country where constitutional rights are violated by administrative acts, by manipulating the administration including the administration of justice and for that reason the Government must give a guarantee that it has enough personnel who can speedily hear the people's appeals. Otherwise you are changing the procedure to keep them in jail; you may deny them bail. All that can happen is a telephone conversation and bail is not granted.

These amendments that we put here were intended to do two things. Number one, to see that the application for bail is heard immediately. I understand the practice is now that as soon as a person puts in an appeal the bail application goes in about the same time and it is in this connection we had originally thought of putting in 24 hours but, in talking to the Minister, he said because of certain factors make it 48 hours. That is the first concern, namely, that immediately after the appeal is lodged the bail application should be heard. Of course, the judge or the magistrate can refuse the bail; then the person has to go to jail.

That brings us to our next concern and that is why we propose that within a week after the bail has been rejected, the appeal must be heard. You can tell me that is impossible, that you have to get the magistrate to write his findings; those have to be sent to the defendant's lawyers, or to the defendant, and so on and so forth. I do not know all the procedures but that will take time.

What we are saying is that you are now going to deny the rights of the citizens of Guyana. This is a fundamental right. He has a right to a fair trial by the law of the land. An appeal is a part of that fair trial and the practice has been that he will not be jailed while his appeal is pending. Therefore, we say it is fundamental wrong, it is going against the system which we have and that is why I ask the Minister to reconsider this matter and see whether he, in all his wisdom – he has a lot of brains – could put this thing in a particular way so that we can isolate this category he is talking about and not at the same time try to make one blanket law which includes everybody and thus deny the rights of the citizen. Your judicial system is not working. Everybody knows that. The Minister knows that, the Chancellor of the Judiciary knows it. I spoke to him about it and nothing is being done. The last time I spoke to him on this matter he said, "*Well you know that I have been trying to do my best*" but early this year he said, things may be worse. I spoke to him early this year because the vote for the Police Department – they have to prepare cases – the vote for the Judicial will be cut. There have been cuts all around so it means that it will get worse. There is the possibility that it will get worse. So how the Minister can on the one hand want to lock up people while he is not giving us the guarantee that the man will have a speedy trial of his appeal? Tell us. We

want to know this.

We do not want to protect criminals. We want to protect the rights of citizens, who are decent and honest, against even administrative acts. This is why, for two reasons as is said, we would like this Bill to be deferred: first for the Minister to consider whether it is possible to make a particular kind of Bill for this category of criminal. At the same time he should consult – if he has not done so – the Law Society and the Bar Association. This will give us some more time so that we can give this matter some further consideration and come up with some proposals.

I realize that what we intend, perhaps is not correctly stated in this Amendment. I should like the Minister to speak explicitly on these points so that this House can have a clear understanding that there is no intention to violate anybody's rights and those procedures will be established and set up so that the rights of the citizens will not be jeopardized. I again appeal to him to defer this matter, at least for a week or even a few days. We see no haste, it will make no difference, from what he said, if the Bill is deferred for a few days.

Mr. Chairman, I have already explained what I had in mind in moving this Amendment. The Hon. Minister has not really replied to the points I was making. He tried to be clever. But we want a little more seriousness in a debate of this kind. I made the point that application for bail should not be unduly delayed.

Yes, I am speaking on both. I am speaking on both because they are related. The first one is the one dealing with bail since the appellant now has to get bail. What I am concerned about, and this has been established in practice, is that, because of the number of cases before judges and so on, the number of cases before magistrates, these procedures will be unduly delayed. And this is why I sought to put a time. But I would like the Minister to tell us whether he will propose something in this Clause that the bail application would be heard expeditiously. Because "*as soon as practicable*" can mean anything. I don't know if "*as soon as practicable*" means two weeks, three weeks. He is telling us that it cannot be done in one week. All right, if it cannot be done in one week let him tell us how soon it can be done and give as undertaking to this House that it will be done. All he has said is that what I had proposed is not practicable.

From experience, we are not happy with the words "*as soon as practicable*" and that is why I am asking him. Would he say that time limit should be put so far as the bail application is concerned? Secondly, the same point was made about the appeal. As he pointed out, the appeal cannot be heard within seven days after the rejection of the application for bail. In other words, he is saying that is unreasonable. Well, we are saying the present system is also unreasonable. When I speak of the judicial system I mean the way the courts and so on are operating, that is, they don't have enough judges to hear the cases. Therefore people have to wait a long time to have their appeal cases heard.

If the Minister is saying to us, as he drew it to our attention, that one week is too short, it is impossible, it is impracticable, then what is the minimum time that should be put here? Because you are interfering with a fundamental right of the citizens. He has a right to appeal but you are locking him up and you are telling him "*Okay, when it suits my convenience than I will try the case.*"

We don't want to leave it to the convenience of the judiciary. We would like a specific time to be put. This is what I am asking the Minister for. That is why I asked for time for this Bill to be deferred so that we can consult also to see how this Amendment can be changed so that it can meet the objects of the Government and not create hardship on the citizen who has the right to appeal. It is in this context that I am again appealing to the Minister to defer this Bill and to give us an opportunity to bring forward, after consultation, the Amendments which will be in keeping with the spirit of what I have said a little while ago.

Now you see, we are getting more information. The Minister is telling us that within seven days the judge will hear the application, that is, the application for bail. What about the appeal? You say a certain period of time is required for the procedures, that is, from what I understand, the magistrate has to write his findings on the case, why he convicted the man, and that will take a certain amount of time and so on. We are not saying that time must not be allowed. What we are worried about is that time, the reasonable time which is necessary, to that is added another unreasonable time and the man is locked up. That is what we are worried about and I would like to hear the Minister on that point also.

Constitution (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill: 16th September, 1977

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, the Hon. Mover of the Bill indicated that this measure of making another deputy in the police department is to provide for mobility. He did not exactly say that this was needed as an efficiency measure, because one can argue that it is necessary to make changes in the structure so as to provide for some degree of efficiency. I would like to say that I am particularly concerned about changes such as this when we do not have any clear indication of why it is being done. If it is a question of mobility does it mean that you just want to promote a blue-eyed boy to give him a chance to rise?

We see in the Estimates provision for one Deputy Commissioner of Police and below him there are six Assistant Commissioners. What worries me more than that is the fact of the expanding vote not only of this Department but generally the cost of administration? The Police Department in 1972 cost the country about \$8 million. Today's estimate has \$18 million. From \$8 million to \$18 million, as the Minister told us, the present structure at the top is incapable of efficient administration. He has not made out a case. He just talks of mobility, to get another man to make him another big boy. That is what mobility would imply to me.

I am wondering whether this is necessary because we are now moving towards the creation of a police state. A little while ago I attempted to talk about the question of the role of the police in denying legitimate organizations the right to have public meetings. On what basis is it being done? Is it being done on orders by the Government? Is it being done to suit the whims and fancies of the Government and, if so, is it then that we have to honour certain people and to promote those people and keep them in line, put them in positions where they will carry out the dictates of the ruling Party?

I remember when the Constitution was suspended in 1953 the British Government, which was very unpopular, enlarged, overnight, the police force. At the level of the bottom, the rank and file policemen, the force was expanded by 50 percent but at the top to buy favours, they expanded by 100 percent so that they would buy loyalty from Guyanese. I am wondering whether this business of creating positions for mobility purposes is intended to buy favours or perhaps for another reason which my friend referred to, but I do not know whether he made it very clear before the House.

At one point in our struggle for independence there was only one Deputy Director of Agriculture. He was local, the one in fact who later ultimately became Director and now is Minister. At that time he was a Deputy. But in order to bypass him when the post of Director was to become vacant, the

colonial administration appointed another Deputy, junior to him. When the post of Director became vacant they did not promote him, but promoted the other who was appointed subsequent to him. One wonders, therefore, whether there are any manoeuvres such as this intended here. Whether there are manoeuvres or not, I am concerned also with the question of cost, because as soon as you create a precedent that you want more than one Deputy in this division of the Government others can justify the same and begin to say that they want more deputies. They will say, the police can have Deputies, why can't we have? And so the bureaucracy expands and expands.

The bureaucracy in this country is too big, too costly. Today, the big debate is going on whether there is enough money to pay the sugar workers a levy from the levy which was taken and which robbed them of the profit sharing which caused workers in Guyana to get about half the wages which they get in Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago. Profit-sharing was one way in which opportunity was provided to sugar workers to get an extra to bring up their wages. What do we see? Because of the levy workers cannot get —

Yes, Cde. Speaker. We cannot speak in the streets, we cannot speak over the air, we cannot speak in the press. The Government paper has now become a party paper. They use the radio to curse the Opposition.

Do not try to stop the House from speaking.

I am not going out of the rules. I have a right to speak. I am speaking on the matter of creating a bigger bureaucracy which is costly and as a result of which we have today a strike in the sugar industry. I is justified on the ground that you have to have a levy in order to pay for so-called "*development*". This is also development. If you want to stop me you can do so. I am saying everybody wants to stop the Opposition from speaking. If you want to do so in the Parliament, go ahead. We might as well close up the Parliament and have not just a *de facto* but a *de jure* one-party State. I thought the Parliament was one place where we could speak.

I repeat, this measure is adding to the cost of the bureaucracy and adding to the cost of administration in this country today. Everyone knows that this is what is killing the country today. We are soon going to have another measure to tax the people again and at the same time we are building up. Why do we have to have another Deputy? The Government has not come forward to this House to say for this or that reason we want it. Mobility jobs for the boys. This is how the country is being run. You have sugar workers, their just share of profit —

You give them half the wages other workers get in the same categories, same fields of employment and then, when they strike, you bring out the army and you bring out the police. You intimidate them, you harass them, and you lock them up. This is what is happening. Is this the kind of country you want to build? Is this how you are going to get production? If you all think you can do it that way, you are mistaken, because you cannot lock

up more than half of the population and you cannot make them slaves and expect them to produce.

Cde. Speaker, we are opposed to this measure, we do not see the need for it at this time of stringency, at this time of belt-tightening, when the Government is appealing to everybody, all and sundry, to make sacrifices, to cut out waste. Why do we have another Deputy? We do not think it is necessary at this time of economic stringency when more and more pressure is being put on the working people of Guyana. We see a Bill before us which is going to lead to further taxation. I am opposed to this and we will at the right time vote against it.

So far as the other measure is concerned, the change in the name from Director of Audit to Auditor General, it does not matter I suppose. But I would have that the Government would have come with something more fundamental to enlarge the scope and powers of independence of the Director of Audit or the Director General. That is what we want; that is what the people of this country want. They want to put an end to fraud; they want to put an end to corruption; they want to see that everything is going right.

Every day you can read in the newspapers about the proceedings at the Commission of Inquiry into Guyana Gajraj. What a disgrace; disgraceful utterances and almost all kinds of interference, corrupt practices, and dirty-handed measures.

Put the Director of Audit in charge of all the corporations. Give him more staff, not the police, to create a Police State. The Director of Audit should have more staff to stop the corruption and the rascality that is going on all over the place. But we don't see anything like that.

We are going to go into the Audit Accounts for 1966 and 1967. No wonder! This is how this country is running. That is why the country is in a mess today. It goes on in the merry old way. They use the police, they use the army.

We can see a lesson in South America. There are many Police States. Even their sponsors who created them have to oppose them. They talk about human rights. They can suppress the people for some time but they cannot hold them down forever. They cannot and they will not.

This is our position on these two questions. We want a good Government; we want an honest Government. Let them take the necessary steps to be honest and efficient so that the country can move ahead.

Teaching Service Commission Bill: 16th September, 1977

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, the Minister, in moving this Bill, referred to the discrimination in the previous era on the grounds of religion. It was this that led the P.P.P. in the early 1950s, when it was started, to include in its programme the abolition of dual controls of schools because it was felt that the system of dual control was harmful to the educational system in that persons were chosen on the basis, not necessarily of their academic and educational qualifications but rather their knowledge of the scriptures, and whether they went to Sunday School or not. They were the ones who managed the schools and they selected the teachers. This was the basic argument, that the system was unsound; it was based on religious discrimination. The very best did not get positions, did not get promotions and that affected the educational system.

It is good that system of dual control has been brought to an end. But, unfortunately, today we have another type of discrimination and that is the political and racial discrimination. The Minister of Education when he was not a Minister, when he sat on the front bench on this side of the House, spoke very strongly about this question of discrimination, promotion and appointment of teachers and so on.

We have the case at the University of the famous Guyanese Dr. Rodney who is not given a job for political reasons, political discrimination. The Minister was one of those who stood up with placards calling for the appointment of Dr. Rodney. Now he is a Minister, and when a question was put in this House and he answered, the Prime Minister, in a very laudatory manner, said "*A googly*". In other words, he has not answered by saying that that is an independent body, the University and its Board of Governors. So we split hairs like that. The fundamental fact is that there is political discrimination and racial discrimination in the appointment and promotion of teachers. Therefore, we are concerned about this question from that point of view. It is no use talking about discrimination in the past and then enthrone another one on it.

These Commissions under our Constitution are supposed to function independently of the Government control. I recall the Constitutional Conference in 1962 in London when the Leader of the P.N.C. proposed that in these bodies there should be an equal numbers of members from the Government and the Opposition. Now, today, what do we have? Before today when the previous Attorney General framed the Constitution he went on the air to talk about the independence of the judiciary, about the independence of the Service Commissions when he was trying to sell the Constitution to the people and when they went to London for the Independence Constitution talks in 1966, it was written in the record of the proceedings

that the Opposition would have a voice in these Commissions. That should be the practice. In fact, I wrote to the Prime Minister the other day and quoted the section of that Constitutional document. Why? Because in other Commissions, even though it says the Leader of the Opposition should be consulted, the practice has been – it is perfunctory, it is done nominally and nobody is appointed from the Opposition. What I am saying is that it is contrary to the spirit and even the letter of the Constitution because the record is there.

What do we have in the original Act which sets out the establishment of the Teaching Service Commission? (a) One person appointed as Chairman of the Commission by the President acting on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, after the Prime Minister has consulted with such bodies as appears to him to represent teachers. The next one speaks for the Teachers Association so presumably (a) means my good friend over there Mr. Sancho and his Masters and Mistresses. Who are the others apart from (b) the Guyana Teachers' Association? I am sure it is not the Corentyne teachers. Which one is it? Even if it is the one headed by Mr. Sancho and Mr. Denny, Masters and Mistresses that is a P.N.C. affiliated organization. The next one, the Guyana Teachers' Association, is a P.N.C. affiliated organization. The third one is the Guyana Council of Churches. Then the fourth:

“one person nominated for appointment by the Minister assigned responsibility for local authorities after that Minister has consulted with the body commonly known as the Guyana Association of Local Authorities.”

G.A.L.A. is also a P.N.C. – affiliated organization. Then we come to (e) in this Bill. Instead of two persons as stated in the Bill there will be three persons as *“appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Prime Minister.”* This one does not even call for the consultation with the Leader of the Opposition as other omissions do.

It does not matter if we are there or not, but what I want to say is that what is being done is to have a P.N.C. controlled organization which is not in keeping with the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. And it is because of this that we are having problems.

We cannot forget that not too long ago the Minister of Education went abroad to recruit three or four hundred teachers. We cannot forget that. Why? Because a lot of teachers who have been discriminated against on political and racial grounds have left the country and gone. What do we do now?

You are recruiting people from outside and in the process we are getting all kinds of people coming in. In fact, I understand an attempt is now being made to get C.U.S.O. to come back here. Maybe, the American Peace Corps will be coming too to fill the gap, to bring the teachers and the skilled people who have been driven away a result of this policy, control by the P.N.C. and thus politics of patronage. Jobs, scholarships, promotion, eve-

rything is being done according to political considerations. The end result is not only that we don't have enough teachers, we have plenty of failures. For instance, nurses and, in other areas, more failures. How many are passing examinations?

Right now in the Essequibo there is a big strike on at a school, there is a sit-in by some teachers. Is this the way we want to go? Why are you afraid to put P.P.P. people on the Commission? In 1962 they talked about equality. It is not done even in a minority position. They cannot argue on the grounds of ideology and say *"The P.P.P. are Opposition people. They will go there and influence people, give wrong content and select wrong people."*

On this score, let me remind the House that the General Secretary of the T.U.C. in his Annual Report last year indicated that sugar workers were the most ideologically developed of all the workers who went through their educational courses. Everybody knows sugar workers are cutting cane most of the time, they never had much formal education because brawn was needed, not brains, in the days of slavery. But even though they are less formally educated, ideologically they are the most developed. That goes right through the P.P.P. No doubt that is why they had to raid the P.P.P. to get Mr. Teekah, to find a good Minister. But, unfortunately, for all that he learnt, he is not sticking to them now. One thing with the Prime Minister, he has the facility of turning people upside down.

This, therefore, brings us to a very serious position. This hot and cold business cannot work in this country. They are going to get results. If the Minister is true to his conscience then he must read back some of his speeches in this very House and hear what he had to say about these questions. The only way to put that correct is that the Opposition must have a voice on these Commissions. And not only a voice, but the Commissions themselves must set independently of political control.

I have mentioned the question of ideology already, Cde. Speaker, for those who talk about socialist content, putting the P.P.P. Members on the Commission does not mean you are going to get capitalist ideology propagated there. What you do get is a hop scotch of one another who is now in charge of an ideological school giving eclectic ideology. That is what you will get, an eclectic ideology.

What we want is an ideology which is in the interest of the working class, the working people of Guyana, which is going to result in fair dealings, in equality of opportunity which is not at the moment in this country. In this field of education, particularly, it will also have an effect on the whole question of resolving our crisis and so on because education is important not only from the point of view of making people literate but also to add to the whole process of development.

This is the age of science and technology and we need, therefore, not merely technocrats, but people who are going to be educated in the very broad sense of the term. And this means, therefore, that we have to have people who are not simply optimistic, people who want to climb and peo-

ple who will even go to classes and go here and there simply to qualify themselves for a job.

Cde. Speaker, this is why we propose this Amendment and we hope that the Government, in keeping with its pronouncements, will agree to this Amendment whereby the Opposition will be permitted to have two members, a minority in a Commission which, as I have said already, will be completely dominated by the P.N.C

I wish to speak in support of the Proposal. I do not think the Minister was logical and consistent in his argument. What he said was that the other Commissions are stated in the Constitution and therefore provision is made for consultation, but this thing has nothing to do with the Constitution and therefore we need not worry with either consultation or representation of the Opposition. That is the sum total of his argument.

What we are arguing on is the principle which obviously had to do with all these Commissions, that is, that they should be neutral, they should not be under the control of any single political party, they should be functioning neutrally in the Guyana situation. This is the principle we are talking about. And therefore the argument he gave was neither logical nor consistent in keeping with that principle.

I would ask the Government, since it cannot say, on ideological grounds, that the Opposition will influence in a negative direction, since it cannot argue that, then we cannot see what fear there is for not putting Members of the Opposition on this Commission. If they have any such fear, then it can only be on the ground of discrimination, that they want to discriminate and they do not want to have Opposition Members in such a body so that Opposition Members can see clearly whether or not there is any discrimination going on based on the yardsticks that are generally used for giving jobs, for promoting people, that is, acceptability, qualification, suitability, experience, and so on. That is the only reason that we can see why the Government does not want to have Opposition Members.

If it is not a question of ideology then clearly it must be a question of discrimination and, therefore, let the Government prove its *bona fides* because this is a matter which is affecting the people of this country. It is affecting the development of this country and we cannot blow hot and cold we cannot talk about racial discrimination in Rhodesia and South Africa and minority rule and all of that and have it right here in Guyana.

Cde. Chairman, the Minister was again illogical. First of all, he says that he did not want the form of words in the Clause where it says "*consultation with the Leader of the Opposition*" because it would lead to the same kind of bickering as with the other Commissions. It is precisely for that reason that we did not put it in that form of words. We put it in the form of words which is, in fact, right here in the case of the Guyana Teachers' Association where it says "*one person appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Prime Minister after that person has been nominated for appointment by the Guyana Teachers' Association.*" That is why it was put there. So that we do

not have to waste time and go through all this motion of consultation. We are putting it in the same way. This has nothing to do with two Governments in the country, as the Minister said.

This Commission, like other Commissions, is supposed to function independently under certain yardsticks laid out by one Government. What are the yardsticks for promotion and appointment and so on? Those are well known and that is what the Commissions operates under. So I do not see where the question of two Governments come in, if the Opposition were to have two Members here out of a total of nine and the P.N.C. – affiliated organizations have the others. What we are talking about is the major principle of the independence of these bodies. If the Minister is saying that they do not accept that principle let him say so. Say that you do not accept the independence of the Service Commissions or the independence of the Teaching Service Commission which is on parallel with the others. It is the same job they are going to do.

If you say you do not agree with that principle, then okay. If you say the Government must control them, then let the Guyanese people know that clearly. But I repeat: that is not in keeping with what has been enunciated at Constitutional Conferences. The Minister is arguing legalistically but he will be the first to argue on another occasion dialectically. He will argue that the same principle will apply in the case of this because it is doing a similar job except on another front. So we cannot follow the argument. What is he talking about? Okay, we must genuflect, we must say yes, even though we do not agree with what is done. What he is asking for is impossible because we are not crawlers and we are not looking for Ministers' work, as somebody said.

We are talking of the rights of Guyanese people for equality of opportunity and, in this sphere, teachers must, as Guyanese citizens, as taxpayers, have equal opportunity with anybody else whether they are P.N.C. members or not and that, unfortunately, is being violated here and this is the reason why this is put here. There is a proposal for two Members to be appointed by the Leader of the Opposition.

Confirmation of the Travel Voucher Tax (Amendment) Order: 16th September, 1977

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, the Minister of Finance told us about the necessity to conserve foreign exchange. That was the motivation behind the Bill but considering that our problems are so complex, sometimes I wonder whether that is the only justification for this measure. True, we have foreign exchange problems but we also have budget problems. We also have brain-drain problems. Which one really is it? The comrade says he told us. It is not always so, we believe. What people have come to realize is not always to take things at face value.

The fact of the matter is that if you look at this foreign exchange question, how is the Government trying to solve this problem? I have here set out – it was not intended for this debate but I just picked this up in my papers – nine problems which have led to this problem of foreign exchange. These are nine policy questions: stagnation in production and fall in exports – rice and sugar; closing down of railways and importation of more buses and hire cars, and the consumption of more gasoline and diesel.

An expert, Smodlake, came to this country during the P.P.P. time. He advised them to keep the railway from Georgetown to Mahaica as a commuter railway. They closed it down. What is happening now? Look how many buses and trucks we have to buy, foreign fuel, foreign spare parts. To save a few dollars, they stupidly close down the railway. This is now a foreign exchange problem. They thought they would save a little money by saving on the railway losses; they jumped from the frying pan into the fire.

Next, the big elitist bureaucratic apparatus, more cars and conspicuous consumption of imported consumer durables went through the imports last year and the year before. All the foreign exchange they had has been squandered. Those at the top do not have to spend 90 percent of their money on food like the ordinary man at the bottom, conspicuously consuming foreign imported goods. We don't produce them here. Don't shake your head, Minister Nascimento. It comes from Caricom or elsewhere.

Number four: The Americans forced them to grow Blue Belle and Star bonnet, that when food surpluses occur, you will encounter difficulties. I just read *Time* magazine – America is full of grain, wheat and everything. In that period since they have the same produce and they want to capture the markets, your market can be taken away too because you produce the same grains like them.

Finally, now we are importing more fertilizers from Grace Federation Chemicals. Ask Ambrose about rice, he is a rice man. We never used to have so much importation of fertilizers, now we are buying more fertilizers today. Their own Rice Marketing Board showed last week that from

P.P.P. time to now the yield per acre has dropped by 15 percent, that is, two bags per acre. They are importing more fertilizers that are causing foreign exchange problems.

I mentioned already the squandering of foreign exchange. My comrade was talking about that hydroelectric project. They are now saying: Which hydroelectric project?

The road is being built, correct, in anticipation of the building of a hydroelectric plant. Finally we will have a smelter. That was the idea of the road. If they were thinking of growing food on that road and not of a hydro-plant, then their heads need to be examined because, on the coast, everybody knows the soil is most fertile. Forestry, you try to do something which you can do. Why are you chasing after a bird in the bush and destroying those you have in your hand?

There is squandering of the foreign exchange because they have no brains to plan properly, ranting for a global thing without knowing where the money will come from, for a \$2 billion scheme (that was the projection of the financing). And so they threw the money away.

I just read the *Trinidad Guardian* and an article mentioned what happened to the other road to the interior, from Mahdia to Lethem. How much foreign exchange you spent on that one, bringing students for publicity, paying their passage from all over the world to go and work there? Bush is growing on it. Now they are building another road. Soon we will hear that bush has taken over that one too, the one they are now building. Those kinds of lie they spread.

Unfavourable compensation terms are resulting in payments of \$28 million in 1976. Facts for Fighters, it is called. I prepared it, we told them of the high compensation, and when they went to argue with Bookers they put one dollar down as compensation. When the pressure mounted on them they changed it to \$102 million. Last year compensation payments were \$28 million, the total debt payments last year was \$119 million, the total balance of payment gap is \$125 million.

Cde. Speaker, look at those figures again. The balance of payment gap is \$125 million, the total debt payment last year was \$119 million of which 30 percent, according to his Budget statement, was for compensation. You pay high compensation and now you have to tax the people to stop them from travelling. This is because they spent all the money they borrowed on infrastructure which my friend talked about. They did not generate enough production in the country, constant exports and revenue, direct and indirect taxation from increased production to pay for the debts. If they had generated production we would not only have additional revenue but additional exports from which to earn the foreign currency to pay for the foreign debt. That is where they are. It is their own folly and so now the poor people have to pay. There are high prices for Caricom imports. Everybody knows about gasoline, fertilizers, cement and soap. Even they themselves were quarrelling about the soap prices from Unilever who manufac-

ture in a monopoly position. They said they can buy cheaper elsewhere. But they have this country yoked up to Caricom and the people have to pay not only high prices but foreign exchange is going down the drain there too.

There has been improper care, repair and maintenance of vehicles necessitating more imports of buses and cars as a result of political patronage, political and racial discrimination. Square pegs in round holes. They destroyed everything. So you have to import more. You cannot even repair and maintain them properly. This is where political and racial discrimination is leading. If we add up all these there are foreign exchange problems. Not only that, it is a vicious circle. The foreign exchange problem has us so bad that they cannot release enough foreign exchange to buy raw materials for production. Look at Lysons Knitwear. We saw the other day where they retrenched two-thirds of the labour force. Friendship Marine could not get steel plates. They retrenched their people. That affects production and foreign exchange also. So where are we going?

This morning I read in the newspapers where a Soviet trade unionist came here and apparently gave a press conference. He said the man at the furnace gets more money than the man who is the Manager of the plant. This was in the *Guyana Chronicle* today, this was under socialism. They talk about socialism. I wonder how much cane the Cde. Minister Teekah cut the other day. Listen to this:

"Many Guyanese are not aware that on the average day a cane cutter sweats twelve pints, his hands, feet and wrists are deformed and a permanent scar is formed on his neck."

That was Fred Sukhdeo in a little book he wrote. The Prime Minister on May Day last year at Enmore said the same thing. He said he was looking at the cane cutter and while the man was sweating twelve pints a day he was sweating six pints, just looking at him, without working. Now they are sending Cde. Teekah to go and cut cane, honestly! They think the Guyanese people are fools. But the Guyanese people know that is why they do not want us to get on the radio; they do not want us to get in the newspapers. If we send them a letter they do not publish it, they attack. If we go in the street corners they send their thugs, to break up the meetings. They cannot stop the people from knowing the facts.

Let us get down. The Minister of Finance has to understand that politics and political economy are a complex set of things. It is not a little thing to put on a little tax here because that has its own channels of eventually defeating your purpose.

Look what has happened. The Minister said in his Budget Speech that this year the Cost of Living will only go up by 3 to 3½ percent. The first three months alone it went up by 9.9 percent and here they are going to heap more taxes on the poor people of Guyana. Indirect taxes rose from

1964 to 1975 by 772 percent and direct income tax by over 350 percent. This is why they are having problems today. From 1970 to now the cost of living rose by about 72 points, but probably it was more than that because these are March figures. Wages from December 1964 to now, 12¼ years, increased by 38 percent, these are facts and that is why there are strikes everyday and you all are trying to close your eyes to take the strike of the sugar workers and make it into a political question. What about the Flour Mill? What about the other places which are striking and where you are dismissing the workers?

These people really have to come to their senses. They are wrecking this country. They sent troops to bauxite (Linden) workers in December, threatening to dismiss them, using troops against Town Council workers, using troops against sugar workers. At Guyana Food Processors Ltd., the other day, a man talked for his rights and they dismissed him and a whole lot of them. Is that how you are going to solve the economic problems of Guyana? Is that how you are going to create socialism using force against workers? Teekah knows theory; let him tell you that it is impossible. Putting on more taxes is creating a vicious circle. More taxes will mean that the people will strike more. There are many people who are travelling and they are not all rich people; they are students, sick people. There are many people who visit their families who have had to leave this country, not because they were wealthy and were running away from socialism as they say, but they left because they could not get jobs here and for other reasons they were discriminated against. Do you mean to say that a parent has no right to and visit his children? Is that what you are saying now? All right, that is why I asked the question. Is this measure a foreign exchange saver? Is it to make more money for the Government to solve Budgetary problems? Is it to stop the brain drain?

Cde. Speaker, I take the point which my colleague made. If you do not grapple with the realities of the Guyana situation, politics and economics, intertwined, interconnected, interlinked, you cannot solve these problems. I come to one final point: Jamaica which was faced with serious economic problems first opposed the I.M.F.'s proposal. It had that same balance of payments problem. In April Jamaica accepted it. Cde. Speaker when these comrades are finished I shall continue.

Chowritmootoo is getting a big job now, getting plenty of money. He was a P.P.P. member when he was at the University. When the Government changed, he changed. So he can afford to talk. He says I want President's Work.

Cde. Chairman, in Jamaica the Government was forced eventually in April to go back on a proposal which it had rejected in February that was to accept the I.M.F. proposal; to the credit of the Jamaican Government, even though they bowed to imperialist pressure, they made a double rate of devaluation.

Therefore, I would say that if the Government is solicitous of the wel-

fare of the people, some are students, some are sick people or people who have to visit their families and so on, they must make a differential rate. For those who are going just on holiday, like civil servants who have recently been given five thousand dollars and over for their leave passages, that is a different thing.

What I am saying is that we must make a distinction. We are so solicitous about Guyanese abroad that we go out of our way and give them the right to vote. The Government is solicitous of their welfare. They are Guyanese, full blooded patriots, and they must have a right to vote but they must not have the right for their parents and their relatives to visit them. They must not have that right. It is really hypocrisy to the extreme.

I merely warn the Government that these things are not going to solve the crisis; they are going to worsen the crisis in the long run. All the measures they have taken were going to help. The crisis is going to be solved right around the corner. There is a silver lining and every time it gets worse. Well that is understandable. They have to make an industrial into a political strike so that they can use that as an excuse next year either to rig the elections or to postpone the elections. That is what they are doing, making a political noise about it now so that they can use that as an excuse. But that is not going to fool anybody nor is it going to solve the crisis. It is going to get worse. Using these measures like this bankrupt, short term means of solving the crisis is going to make it worse in the long run.

Affirmation of Travel Tax Regulations: 16th September, 1977

Dr. Jagan: The Minister told us a little while ago that the problem was one of foreign exchange, and I, when I got up to speak, raised the question: was it foreign exchange, was it budget deficit to raise more money, or was it brain drain? Now we see another reason being given.

I would have thought that on this occasion they would have been consistent and that they would have said the same thing on both questions, for they are related. To leave the country you have to pass through the airport and you need to have a ticket. Therefore, both are intended to conserve foreign exchange.

As I thought, money is short too. The Government is bankrupt. It cannot pay salaries at the end of the month. He may say that everybody is getting paid. Three weeks ago I was in a Government office, and the people were quarrelling. That was the second week of the month. They were quarrelling that they did not get their pay for the previous month.

We know they are bankrupt and therefore they are now trying to raise some money from poor people. Trinidad has a tax of \$2. The United States has no tax. England has no tax. I travel to many parts of the world. I pay tax at very few airports. Why should Guyana quote places like Brazil and Egypt? The fact is that when the Minister was speaking on the other measure he said that it is a worldwide problem, but what we also have to see is that certain countries like Egypt, like Brazil, follow pro-imperialist economic planning strategies and, as a result of this, they are in this mess.

I quote capitalist countries to show that even in capitalist countries they do not have these obnoxious taxes. The Members of the Government claim to be socialists, or moving on the road to socialism but if they want to quote justification for it, they quote Brazil, they quote Egypt. Everybody knows that Egypt in the last few years has gone backward from the policy laid down by Nasser, gone back to the embrace of imperialism and practising capitalist development. Anybody who has any knowledge of Brazil, of what is happening in international affairs, knows that Brazil has embarked on a so-called road called development, its so-called "*miracle*". It has been busted. It cannot pay its debts today. Don't quote those examples, the worst things, to us and justify what you are doing here in the name of socialism.

What is Jamaica? Jamaica has only since 1974/1975 introduced a levy to attack the imperialist. And because Jamaica made a statement favourable to Cuba, imperialism decided to put a "*belt*" on them. But over all policies before 1974 were not pro-imperialist or socialist oriented so that their economy would be any better off.

What I am saying is on this occasion he is not justifying foreign exchange. Now he is talking about revenue to maintain the airport. What happened

to all the taxes this country has paid? Where are the taxes going? You had anti-socialist propaganda just now, that people cannot travel. Which socialist country has airport tax and road tolls? Is this the way you are going to socialism? Socialism is giving people free services. If they do not allow them to travel at least let them build resorts in the country, then subsidise their travel to the resorts and all kinds of things workers get. All you hear is that they would like to do that. Instead of liking to do it they are putting more pressure on the workers. When it suits them they make anti-socialist propaganda. They do not follow what is done in socialist countries and when it suits them they quote from some of their pro-imperialist friends. Now because they are in the Third World, automatically they are angels.

We saw what happened on the Angolan question. Twenty-two of them sided with imperialism including Egypt. Arab socialism of Egypt lined up with African socialism of Senegal, China, South Africa and C.I.A. So do not quote that to us; quote that to those dunces who follow you. Here you are supposed to talk sense and talk intelligently and logically so that you can convince this side and those you have behind you, those boys who cannot talk.

The Government is saying that this is a tax measure. This year was supposed to be a tax-free year even though we know that removal of subsidies is virtually equivalent to imposing taxes. The Hon. Minister said we do not know to read. The Englishmen did not teach us to read very much. We came from the cane fields. That was the impression they created when they introduced the Budget. Soon after that what happened? Transportation fares went up, electricity fares went up and now airport tax. What next? They said new salary increases will cost \$40 million. Show me where the production is increasing. Forget the sugar strike. Even if there was no strike they would not have been able to find the money to pay. They would have had to resort to taxation. They are trying to fool people. I want to understand where the country is going with all this taxation. It is going to lead to more strikes in this country. Try to solve it. You are not going to solve it, you are fooling yourselves and every year you are getting worse.

Yesterday a man showed me a paper from Canada. It stated that one hundred Guyanese soldiers have gone to England to be trained. So we are back into the arms of the imperialists, military, economically, politically and if you think the Guyanese people are going to accept all of this, you are sadly mistaken. That is all I have to say. If you want to run the country in favour of the elite and keep the elitist structures going in times of hardship squandering the money, okay. But you are going to have to answer to the bar of public opinion some day in this country.

Request for leave to move the Adjournment of the Assembly on definite matters of urgent public importance - Matter relating to the strike in the Sugar Industry: 15th December, 1977

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, I wrote you this morning informing you that I propose to, at the appropriate time at the sitting of this Assembly, request the adjournment of the Assembly in order to raise a matter of urgency and public importance. This pertains to the strike in the sugar industry which is now in the fourth month. We have heard two Ministers having press conferences, where were broadcast and reported, stating the great loss to the economy of nearly \$80 million or \$1 million per day in foreign exchange and no doubt this will have repercussions on the working class at some subsequent stage. In addition to this, there is great suffering not only of those who are striking but also we see long lines of people having to queue up for kerosene and so on. In view of this, one would have expected that we would have had a debate in this House instead of Ministers getting up and holding big press conferences and going on the radio; this is the forum, the Parliament.

This is said to be a parliamentary democracy. Permission to hold public meetings at one time was refused by the police. I referred to that already in this House when at one time I wrote to the radio station, it was agreed, and then it was called off, to have a debate on this issue. On one occasion, Cde. Speaker, I tried to raise this matter in this House and you ruled that it was not a matter in your opinion, if I put it correctly, I hope, of urgent public importance...

On the 6th of this month, I think it was, I wrote the Leader of the House suggesting that the Parliament should meet to discuss this matter. In fact, in that letter, I pointed out to him that when there was a threatened strike in England of the Fire Brigades Union of Firemen; the Parliament met on the eve of that strike and debated the issue for three hours. This is how the Minister of Economic Development is going to develop the country, by using the Army. Let them cut cane.

On the eve of the strike, because it would probably have repercussions on the economy, loss of property and so on, the Parliament met and debated the matter for three hours. This is what I pointed out to the Leader of the House. As we all know the Parliament of England is very busy, works night and day. This Parliament hardly meets and these people are either ashamed of debating the issue in this Parliament, refuses, ashamed again, to have a public debate on the radio, and they take their steam roller, use the police to deny an opportunity to the people to have public meetings. And yet this is a parliamentary democracy.

I spoke to the Leader of the House today and he informed me, when I asked him if the Motion which I had appended to my letter – a copy of

which was sent to you, to which you kindly made some alternations and to which I agreed, and which was today put on the Notice Paper – whether that Motion will be put on the agenda for a debate at an early meeting, that he will have to consider it.

Cde. Speaker, knowing how the Government behaves and how it seems that this Leader of the House is not Leader at all, he has not got any power to put anything which is reasonable in keeping with his responsibility as Leader of the House, he has to take orders, consequently, I do not think that Motion will see the light of day in this Parliament.

The Minister of Consumer Protection – what is his other title? and Trade, he knows how bad things are. The Government does not have dollars, does not have pounds, does not have foreign exchange to buy the necessities for Guyana and soon in this bankrupt position not only internally but in terms of foreign exchange we will have all kind of pressures from the I.M.F. and everybody else, budget deficit, and they do not want to debate. Why they don't want? Because they do not want the public to know that they are violating a trade union principle, they are employing scabs contrary to the normal practice of recruitment in the industry. A universal trade union practice contrary to I.L.O.

Yes Cde. Chairman, I would like, therefore, to request that you allow a debate so that the public can be informed that GUYSUCO is violating a trade union principle, recruiting scabs and does not want to remove them. That is the only thing which is holding back the strike. The strike could have been settled three months ago. This Government has signed an I.L.O. Convention on the Freedom of Association and that Convention is being violated at the moment. On those grounds I request from your permission at the appropriate time for the Adjournment of the Assembly to debate this matter.

Budget Debate: 8th March, 1978

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, as we listened to the debate we saw coming from the Government benches, first, self-praise about the wonderful achievements which have been made particularly in the different sectors of the economy and, secondly, with the presentation of the Budget we have glorious plans projected for the future, but, I think we have to be quite realistic. In the words of the Minister of Finance, the economy is facing a very grave crisis. While this is true, it is not strictly correct, for the economy was in crisis many years ago. One has only to go back to the Bank of Guyana statement beginning with the years 1972, 1973, 1974 and one will see that from that period we had a production crisis, production stagnation, and it was only because of the fortuitous increase in the price of sugar that the economy was rescued from collapse.

It is from that stagnation in production and productivity that we have the current problems, budget deficit and a short fall in revenue. If you don't produce, obviously the economy does not earn enough; the Government cannot collect as much and if we do not produce we do not export and, consequently, we do not earn foreign exchange and this, in turn, leads to a shortfall in import of consumer necessities and also raw materials for industry. That in turn has an effect on the budget situation and so we have a vicious circle, balance of payments problems, balance of payments deficit and budgetary deficit.

A rosy picture is being presented now giving a four-year perspective. But, did we not have this kind of perspective before? In 1966 we had a \$300 million plan, nearly three times as large as the previous P.P.P. plan of \$110 million and that was for ushering in the millennium, to bring the free milk and the free cassava, the promises made in 1961 and 1964. And on the eve of the last election, another rosy picture was painted, with a one billion Development Plan, 1972 to 1976. That was to have fed, housed and clothed the nation by 1976. Lord! Lord! Look where we have got today! Starvation, long lines, malnutrition! Of course, they would say we have no starvation, people are not dying from starvation. But you don't have to die by dropping in the streets one day. Malnutrition is equally a scourge which leads to all kinds of problems including low productivity. It is a slow death. And so now in the face of chronic balance of payments and budget deficits another projection is made that in another four years things are going to be better.

Just to put the record straight: We have the crisis because of stagnation and we are now projecting big increases in production. But on the basis of the performance in the past can we assume that the projections in the future are going to be realized? In the 1964 to 1974 period, that is, in the ten years of P.N.C. Government, rice production increased by .6 percent. I will

give you the breakdown: in the period 1948/1949 to 1954/1955, that is, seven years before the P.P.P. Government, you had 501,934 tons; in the period 1958/1959 to 1964/1965, the seven years of the P.P.P., you had 873,742 tons, an increase by 74 percent; from the year 1968/1969 to 1974/1975, you had production increasing from 873,742 to 879,359, a 0.6 percent increase under the P.N.C. Sugar in the same period increased by 5 percent; bauxite didn't do very much better. On what basis do we assume that the millennium in production and productivity will be realized in the near future?

We have to go deeper and we are going to begin to examine what is the root of the present problem. We have said over and over in this House that it is a combination of factors, not just one. It is an incorrect development strategy linked with imperialism, lack of democracy at all the levels. People are not meaningfully involved in the developmental process and there is racial and political discrimination, cultural suppression. These are realities in our communities and it is to no use to put the rug over it and present another rosy picture and hope for the best. Hopes are not always realized but we have seen in the last 12 or 13 years, things getting worse.

And what is the strategy which we are now pursuing? It is all stated here on page 51, the new Plan - the \$1,122 million Development Plan in the next four years. In this Plan 33 percent will be devoted to agriculture. Forestry and Fisheries will take 7.8 percent, Mining and Quarrying 12.9 percent, Manufacturing 3.9 percent, power 6.5 percent, Education and Social Development 3.9 percent, Health and Housing 3.0 percent, Roads 6.8 percent, Sea Defence 1.9 percent, General Administration and other services 19.9 percent.

For the past 12 years we have had production stagnation because three-quarters of the money borrowed by this Government was devoted to infrastructure not pertaining to the public, the directly productive sector, and that has led to a big burden today, not only to pay debts but to pay them at the expense of the people. Had they been allocated differently to the productive sectors, increased revenue would have paid for those debts. But now it has to be taken off the skins of the people: cuts in subsidies, cuts in social services, cuts in employment, retrenchment called "*redeployment*". Public relations fellows always find new names to cover up things.

Now the development will be in a new direction, Infrastructure for Agriculture. We are not against this but what we say is this: there has to be balanced industrial agricultural growth because otherwise we will find ourselves moving within the new strategies of imperialism and working within their ambit of merely producing raw materials, minerals, with a concentration on forestry and mining and quarrying to satisfy the needs of the imperialist and, in this period of food deficit, to produce some agricultural crops. But let us note, as in the early 60s or mid-60s, when there were overseas surpluses of industrial goods and agricultural goods, they were not allowed to move in those sectors.

They used to criticize the P.P.P. Government as a rice government and

use other derogatory names. Now, perforce, they are supposed to shift to agriculture. Did they now tell us that the cost for the Mahaica/Mahaicony/Abary Scheme, the infrastructure was too high? They used to tell us that. But now they have to do it. Let me repeat: we do not say don't do agriculture. We have been calling for those schemes. The Mahaica/Mahaicony/Abary Schemes would have been finished by now had the P.P.P. continued in Government.

At that time it was to cost \$32 million to be realized in terms of capital input/output ratio, that is, how much money you put in and how much you get back, in seventeen years. We would like the Minister to tell us how many years it is going to take to pay back this amount. I am speaking not of the global sum but the total income which will be generated from this Scheme, the net revenues.

Let me again repeat, we are not against drainage and irrigation, infrastructure and agriculture but they have to go hand-in-hand with industry because the capital/output ratio in industry is much better than in agriculture. Within two to ten years you can realize the investment. For instance, for the Mahaica/Mahaicony/Abary Scheme, as I told you before, the feasibility study said we could recover the money to pay back in seventeen years. But the feasibility study for the smelter which the Hungarians gave us was that you could pay back in ten years. And it was by this method of development planning that the Soviet Union was able to develop and become one of the biggest nations today, the most powerful, because while it sold grains without loans, without grants, it concentrated its industry both for defence and also for more rapid growth.

They tell us *"Everybody is borrowing; even the Socialist countries are borrowing. So what is wrong if we borrow?"* Who is giving us all these loans? The World Bank, headed by McNamara. They used to call him the butcher of Vietnam. Arch-imperialists are now telling the people not about an advanced development strategy but *"Limit your population, carry out birth control programmes. That is the way out"*. Socialist countries do not worry with that. They pay family allowances, perhaps there is shortage of labour, to have people produce more children. Who else? The Inter-American Bank, controlled by the United States.

How is it that these banks are giving loans to a revolutionary Government when in Chile the same banks cut down the aid which was promised to Chile but when Allende got in they decided to hold it back and as soon as Allende got out they multiplied it several fold to help the fascist Pinochet? How is it that on the one hand they went against the revolutionary Government? I make this point because these people always try to compare themselves with Allende's Chile. How is it that the World Bank and the Inter-American Bank refused and cut down loans which were committed to Chile, refused to give aid to the Allende Government, but gave it to Pinochet and now are holding out the money here? Where is the logic? The answer is clear. They can boast about their 80 percent control of the

economy. But, imperialists are getting compensation payments every year, whether they lose or make money. They get money for technical services, for sales agencies and so on. They don't have to worry.

Be that as it may, what is the plan now? You can see it in the Development Plan. I gave you the figures. Concentrate on agriculture and not on industry. You have tied us up to CARICOM where the imperialists hold sway. I have a magazine here with a big article on what is called the '*Point a Liseas*' scheme in Trinidad. Do you know how much money it is projected to spend? \$4.5 billion is to be spent in Trinidad. Under the imperialist scheme of things that is where industrialization will take place, and not the kind of industrialization that self-respecting independent countries should go after, but what is called dependent capitalism, dependent capitalism in Trinidad to which we are tied. And so, Guyana and Belize become the agricultural appendages to the economic industrial base in Trinidad, dominated by imperialism.

Here are the schemes: TRINGEN, the Trinidad Nitrogen Co. Ltd., \$363 million liquid ammonia scheme with the Government 49 percent and W.R. Grace 51 percent. W.R. Grace is one of the big transnational monopolies which are exploiting Latin America and Central America, ISCOTT, the Iron and Steel Company of Trinidad and Tobago, \$672 million, wholly owned by the Government with Kort Industries of North Carolina providing management and technical services and Brazil providing some raw materials. Brazil has tied up the South and now is moving to the North, to the Caribbean. It is sub-imperialism. FERTIN, Fertilizers Company of Trinidad and Tobago, a \$600 million project to produce 600,000 tons of ammonia with the Government having 51 percent and Amoco 49 percent. Amoco is the American Oil Company, which has a strangle hold with respect to producing gas in that country. Liquefied Natural Gas Project, \$1 billion (TT) jointly owned by Government and Tennessee Gas Transmission a subsidiary of Tenneco Oil and the People's Gas Company of Chicago. A smaller 75,000 ton aluminium smelter in place of the collapsed Caricom 200,000 tons smelter. Further, expansion of the cement industry, a furfural plant, a petrochemical plant operating with Texaco, a polyester fibre plant and a second petrochemical complex.

Further possible projects are production of a refractory brick, glass, methanol, single-cell protein from more hydrocarbons and more fertilizers can be produced (with the Kaiser Corporation.) Agriculture is good, you have to produce food to feed the people especially when you do not have foreign exchange to buy the food from outside. But you can get foreign exchange by industries too. We will continue to borrow a lot of money, borrowing going on like mad and the debt payments will climb like hell, they are going up and up. This year the debt payment is 33 percent of the budget. In 1964 the debt payment was 14 percent of the budget. He says, "*So what?*" It is taken out of the hides of the workers.

How do you pay the debt? The first charge on the Budget - money came

from whom last year? Taxation was \$19 million in the 1964 Budget. Last year, cuts in subsidies totalled \$26 million; this year cuts in subsidies will total \$14 million, there is another \$42 million in taxes. And these are the people who were running in the streets when the Kaldor Budget sought to get only \$10 million. Look at the millions, and he asks: "So what about the debt?"

We must look again and see whether the imperialists are not lending them so that they can strangle themselves at the same time like some countries such as Brazil and South Korea which are today unable to pay their debts. We are tied to CARICOM. There is nothing wrong with that; we are not against unity, but not an integrated area dominated by imperialism. How can we talk about planned economy in Guyana? How can you plan when you are committed to buying everything from an open door to the Caribbean, when the imperialists are going to have their base in Trinidad? They talk about an oil crisis. From September, 1973 to April, 1974 the price of oil from Trinidad increased by 147 percent when in the same period it increased in the United States by 28 percent. Even they the other day did not want to buy soap or detergent from Trinidad because they said the prices were too high compared with what they could buy from somewhere else.

I have a Caribbean "Contact" here, this is January, 1978. I will read from a paragraph on page 8. It states: "A clear example of this exploitation was been provided by the vigilant Oilfields Workers Trade Union" –

They don't like to hear that name –

"In a published advertisement in the Trinidad Guardian (December 3). The example? Federation Chemicals in 1976 sold to its parent company, W.R. Grace of the USA, urea at an average of TT\$186 per ton. But at the same time it was selling urea to Guyana at an average price of TT\$330 per ton."

It goes on –

"'A similar situation', the O.W.T.U. further stated, 'exists with respect to ammonia, Fed Chem's principal output.'"

Look how much pressure they put on the rice farmers to change to *Blue Bell* and *Star Bonnet* when the people were growing rice before without fertilizers. What yield? I gave the production figures and he is asking what yield. The same acreages costing more to produce because now you have to put fertilizers and you still are not getting any more. Incidentally, those figures will have to be reduced because they say rice is rotating. That is the argument they use. People are buying and selling and bringing it back to the Board. So that means the production is not as high as they claim. It is what they call "recycling".

The main point I wish to make is this they are constantly now putting

their big hopes on agricultural production but with the technology, varieties and everything else, agriculture today depends on fertilizers and look what we have to pay for fertilizers from Trinidad. What is the Minister of Agriculture doing about it? What is the Minister of Trade doing about it? The Minister of Trade was in a socialist country recently, what did he say? We are looking but not at the expense of our traditional markets. We are looking! Thirteen years they have been looking. Maybe less than thirteen years. Since Independence they have been looking.

What is the trade with the socialist countries today? One percent! Have you enquired whether you can buy ammonia and urea? I am following their advice, in my yard I am growing fruits. But the mangoes, if you see them, they are very small; the trees need fertilizers. I cannot afford to buy fertilizers. But you cannot ever get fertilizers because they do not have the money to buy them. The figures are there. They have no control over CARICOM. Even the Williams Government has become prisoner. In fact, I should not say that. Perhaps it is better to say that is in keeping with the philosophy and ideology of the P.N.M. Government in Trinidad to have such an economic base of imperialism. But how does that help us?

Was it last year they went to COMECON? It is that a conflict of interest that has now developed? This nonaligned policy incidentally means different things to different people. Cuba is a member of the Non-Aligned Movement but it takes different positions from Sadat's Egypt, and Leopold Senghor's Senegal. Cuba votes on the side of anti-imperialism, on the same side with U.S.S.R. Not "*of Russia*", but "*with Russia*". There is a difference. Since you call it Russia, I am using the same term to please you.

Cde. Speaker is it that the imperialists have told the fellow "*Look, you want our money? Hold up on this new COMECON thing*" and that is why the Minister had to give assurances that the trade will not be shifted from our traditional friends. Of course, he gave us some statistics, what he calls change from England and United States to Europe and to Japan, but that is still the capitalist jungle that we are talking about. And so we have to ask: is there only grand-standing and, if so, are we likely to come out of this hole that we are in? Over and over these people in the Government say that our problem has been compounded by the increases in oil prices. What did Castro do when he first got in? His first act was to get cheap crude oil from the Soviet Union and ask the refineries to refine it. When the refineries, backed by US imperialism, refused they nationalized them. The Americans thought they would not be able to nationalize because they were threatening that if their nationalized them Cuba's sugar would not be bought by the United States. But he is not a jelly fish and he went ahead. He went ahead. I am asking whether it is at all possible to solve the problems of countries like Guyana, Third World countries, within the orbit of imperialism. This is a fundamental question. They tell us of a New Economic Order. The North/South dialogue has broken down. All the hopes, I say "*hopes*" because imperialism is not going to cut its nose to spoil its face - are

shattered because they were based on illusions. Imperialism will make certain reforms changing from an outright pro-imperialist planning strategy like the Puerto Rican model to more subtle methods, like telling the boys to concentrate on agriculture and cooperatives and community development. Read the development books that are coming from the United States. One is called "*Food for Development*". It is a new strategy. More than that create a dependent type of capitalism. They sold their old technologically obsolete factories to Third World countries to produce for the home market at higher cost or to produce components and send them back to America as cheap prices. They add high prices over there in the capitalist countries and then sell the goods at exorbitant prices.

This is the reality. This is the new strategy for imperialism and don't let us fool ourselves and fool the Guyanese people and talk about the wicked people in the developed countries, that they are not doing this; they are not implementing the New International Economic Order, they are not giving us better prices. They are not going to. This is how they live. Imperialism lives by sucking other countries and therefore you have to make up your mind.

Trinidad, let me repeat, is the imperialist base for the English-speaking Caribbean. And I cannot see this country, borrowing a lot of money for very expensive infrastructural works and concentrating mainly in agriculture, being able later to pay debts and at the same time to raise living standards. Already it is having a difficult time to pay its debts. It cannot be done.

There must be balanced industrial and agricultural development in Guyana. But what is the amount allocated? Look at the figures again. Manufacturing 3.9 percent; Power, 6.5 percent. Lenin said "*Electrification is Communism*" and one of the first acts embarked upon by the Soviet Government was the GOELRO Plan for the electrification of the country.

They tell us a lot about the billion dollar Hydro Electric Project in the Mazaruni and then about the further \$1 billion for the aluminium smelter, but, where in this plan is the money for that scheme? They went like a bull in a china shop and spent valuable financial resources of this country, and foreign reserves, nearly \$150 million, to make a road. The sum of \$30 million was for heavy machinery alone. Most of the machines are rotting now. And every year we understand they are spending several million dollars more just to keep maintaining the place.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: Del Conte is chicken feed. They were criticizing us for two, three million dollars. What we are talking about is hundreds of millions. So now that they cannot proceed with the hydro scheme they are telling us "*Oh, the road is going to be very good for timber extraction and so on.*"

What do they say about electricity? Every other day there is a blackout.

As regards electricity they say, "*It has been necessary to plan for the expansion of thermal power in the short term to meet the needs of the economy.*" The programme of capital work requires investment in plant and installation costs amounting to \$33 million in 1978 and 13 million in 1979.

I do not know, but maybe they are planning with some consortium of capitalist states or some bankers to finance that scheme but it is not yet in the Development Plan. So, what are they doing now? They are going to spend millions on thermal expansion, steam engines, steam boilers and diesel engines. But that is oil which we are talking about, and they keep telling us by now much the prices of oil have gone up.

Let me remind this House that when we took over the Demerara Electric Company, Preece, Cardew and Ryder, the consultants, gave a report recommending that we buy two steam generators of ten megawatts each and develop the Malali Falls Hydro Electric Scheme at Tiger Hill, in the Demerara River. Why didn't we do it? Che Guevara and the Cuban Government - I negotiated with him - were prepared to give the financing, \$32 million, but why we didn't do it? Because Minister Nascimento was dancing with the C.I.A. then. And what happened? When the scheme was put to the Governor this was the kind of power we had, we could sign markets for rice but we could not sign aid agreements. So, it was stalled in the Colonial Office, no doubt at the dictation of the State Department.

They have been independent since 1966. They had the report. Incidentally that was a bull's eye. Preece, Cardew and Ryder said that after the first two steam generators, the hydro project; tie in all of the private schemes in one national grid and have rural electrification after all of that. The company will make a net profit of \$20 million in the first ten years and \$40 million in respect of the second year.

Not only did they provide a report, the banks and other people were prepared to finance at least the initial takeover and the two steam generators. Where has all that gone? It was because this was a gold mine that Minister Nascimento's colleague then, Mr. D'Aguiar, wanted to buy out this company but why did the Government not implement that hydro scheme? Why? Every day we hear in every other speech made that the oil prices are causing problems. Why didn't you develop that small hydro scheme? You could have saved the purchasing of a lot of oil, and you could have made millions of profits. Instead, what are you going to do now? You are going to spend \$33 million in 1978 and \$13 million in 1979 to buy more steam generators. Acts of commission and omission.

The railway was working; the last engine we bought was a diesel electric. You closed it down. Smudlakha, the Communications expert from Yugoslavia, came to the P.P.P. Government through the U.N. and recommended that we keep the railway, at least the section from Georgetown to Mahaica if we want to close down the rest as a commuter railway. Population is expanding; Georgetown is expanding. It is there in the files. What did they do? They closed it down and brought buses. Buses need oil like

nobody's business. The strategy of the imperialist countries is also to do away with railways and sell motor cars and motor buses because their whole production, the whole cycle of capitalist production is based on the automobile, going back to steel, going back to gold, going back to oil and everything else.

So they brought buses and now what has happened? Every morning when I come down to work there are poor people standing on Sheriff Street, rows and rows of poor people. These are workers. The Government is telling them to produce more; they cannot get to work on time; they have to pay 40 cents for a drop that was before the Budget. The buses are not there. Look how many millions you have spent on buses already and the cost of the gasoline and fuel, the oil.

I repeat, what did the Soviet Union do? It has tram cars; it has subways; it has aeroplanes and railways. It did not concentrate on the motor transport system because of the cost to the economy but that was done in central planning, socialist planning. Who is planning for the Government? Imperialists were planning for them all along and now they are setting up a Commission. Who is in the Commission? Even poor Sukdeo is not on the Board. He was there before. There was a planning body last year. What was it?

I repeat, it is not enough mainly to spend money. Anybody can do that. Anybody can spend money. That is easy but the Government spending requires wisdom, requires careful consideration of all relevant factors and there is need to see what are going to be the financial implications in terms of the future. Let us look. This Budget is not only in serious deficit this year, but it will be in deficit for the next four years. These are their own figures. It is the same thing with the Balance of Payments, the current accounts gap. It is not only in deficit this year, but it is going to be in deficit throughout the next four years. The figures are all here. What does this mean for the people? Continued shortages, continued black market prices; it will mean lower living standards.

Incidentally, they have projected what I would call a "wage freeze". Cde. Speaker, in this Budget statement it states:

"The Government has projected current expenditure to rise by no more than 11.5 percent in 1979 and a further amount of 3 percent and 4 percent in 1980 and 1981 respectively."

What does that mean? By normal increments alone, annual expenditure increases roughly by 5 to 6 percent. They are going to maintain expenditure in 1980 and 1981 to 3 and 4 percent respectively. They have not been able to do this in the past but by some miracle they are going to do it. What is that miracle? Retrenchment of the workers, a wage freeze? So what is probably intended here is to pay the minimum wage which is committed for next year but after that, no more.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker they keep repeating this propaganda of 'not a cent more'. I said so.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: No. Half truths are worse than lies, and liars like you all but remember the truth and the facts. Let me repeat for the last time for the benefit of this House and the public. The Gorsuch Report in 1958 had recommended a tremendous increase in the super-scale factories, small amounts in the medium scale and only a limited amount at the bottom. For the workers the P.P.P. Government increased the minimum wage recommended by Gorsuch. Whatever it was it was an increase. The Minister of Finance is telling us that it was an increase.

If the Speaker wants to enter the debate, I shall give him the facts. The fact of the matter is that Low-A-Chee was given double promotion. In that sense he had an increase. But whatever other Permanent Secretaries had as an increase he got. When we said 'not a cent more', it was meant for the person receiving super scale salaries Low-A-Chee. Is that clear Mr. Speaker?

What did they do? After the last election they raised the super scale salaries, Ministers were included. Now they are taking it out by taxing the working people and they are chiding us about 'not a cent more'. What dishonesty!

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: If Jack had been here things would have been better today and you would have gone out. They have to see more seriously what is to be done.

The Minister stated: "*with respect to other charges a number of economies including a sustained consistent effort to reduce waste, is expected during the year.*" And then he said, "*In the first instance, direct subsidies have been withdrawn.*" Even in the British colonial times there were subsidies in this country, from the time of the war. Now they are being withdrawn.

What we have in Guyana is not a financial budget; it is a reflection, as I said at the beginning, of the crisis of production. But the crisis of production is a reflection of another factor and that is the crisis of confidence, and this crisis of confidence is largely due to the unrepresented nature of this regime at all levels. I heard last night when they said they are going to make 80 per cent of the votes. You can get 100 percent if the army moves in but you cannot get 100 percent production. That is the trouble. So what we have basically is a crisis of production. It will not only affect the P.P.P. supporters, but the P.N.C. supporters. They are fed up to their necks. They are running away. All the money they are spending on education, as soon

as they train them they are gone. The only limitation is to get a visa. But they are gone. It is not because they are children, it is because they see the situation getting from bad to worse.

What about the P.N.C. itself? Wasn't the Prime Minister booed last May Day in Georgetown by his own supporters in his stronghold? They said they did not rig elections but they rig nominations. Wasn't this a second stronghold. Read the confidential reports of the Party organization. What do they say? Last week one was published in the *Mirror*. Attendance at the groups, not only the parent body but its arms are falling, membership is going.

What is another aspect of this, apart from budgetary deficits and so on? The big defence bonds which were supposed to yield \$30 million got only \$2.7 million last year and this year will get \$2 million. I am glad, Cde. Speaker that you are smiling. Even the coercion did not work on the poor civil servants. Even they refuse to be coerced now. We said it was illegal to force them to pay 5 or 10 percent of their salaries as the Government wanted to do at the beginning.

Cde. Speaker, we need to find a way out of this crisis and what is presented is only a gloss. I have here a special message given to the C.C.C. Assembly by the former Secretary General Mr. McIntyre. And what does he say? This is *Caribbean Contact* September, 1977. Talking about high unemployment, he said:

"In this, no less than in other areas, the time for rhetoric is past. In trying to cope with the employment situation, efforts must be directed towards getting the principal productive sectors moving again. For all practical purposes, the region has over the past five years made little head way with diversification through the rapid growth of the basic productive sectors such as agriculture and those parts of the manufacturing sector with a high local content. As a result of this, the bulk of new employment has been created in the traditional public sector. It is no great exaggeration to say that some Caribbean countries are substituting an enlarged bureaucracy for greater production. The answer to the problem of production should be sought not merely in the shortage of conventional inputs such as capital and skills, but also in the need to find new ways of motivating the West Indian people and of galvanizing their energies towards greater development."

What he said here is true of Guyana substituting an enlarged bureaucracy for greater production. And now that they cannot finance it any more, even with taxation and other cuts, they have to retrench.

Mr. McIntyre calls for a new strategy for this area. The time is long past for a new strategy. Why did he leave? Because these are scientists, they see figures, they see facts. They are not politicians who are been pushed here and there buffeted by pressures from imperialism, from the people, and so on. They see the matter rationally and they see the thing getting worse and so some of them cut and run. Well, he has gone and CARICOM is now

floundering. Dr. Williams, the Prime Minister of Trinidad, is being blamed. But, comrades, one has to see what the P.N.M. Government represents. That is an alliance between the local bourgeoisie and the foreign big bourgeoisie. That is what Trinidad is all about. And when you put, whatever the reason, whatever the rationalization, embargoes on their exports into your country, then they are going to squawk. And when those capitalists and the imperialists see that you want to go in for real fundamental industrialization, including a hydroelectric scheme and a smelter and you want to move away from the original one which was to be made up of three Governments and A.M.O.C., who would provide the natural gas, then, obviously, you are in for a lot of trouble. They will cut out your aid and they will put all kind of pressures on you.

We need to find a way out, a more fundamental way, not just tinkering with the whole thing and trying to make a few manoeuvres within the whole system because that is where you are within the whole system. We need a complete break with the whole system if we are to get out of this mess. And above all, we have to see the crisis, the social and economic crisis, as a reflection of what is very much germane in Guyana, the political crisis.

The political crisis is due to the fact that there is fraud in elections, there is army intervention in elections; there are unrepresented Governments at the top and at the Local Government level; there is no social democracy; people's organizations are not respected. The practice of this regime is to destroy those that they cannot control and set up a parallel organization. You can do that by police administrative methods. But you can't get people to go and work and produce. That is another matter.

When you dictate at the level of the organizations, it reflects itself in other forms of suppression including subcultural suppression. And this also reflects itself in the production crisis.

Cde. Chairman, what is needed in Guyana is a political solution. Not only we but the Minister of Finance recognizes this. What does he say in the conclusion of his Budget Speech? He states:

"Cde. Speaker, the economy is facing an economic crisis. The question is should we throw up our hands in despair, or should we put out shoulders to the wheel, and literally and figuratively put our hands to the plough?"

They are not putting their hands to the plough because they are disenchanted, alienated. The whole Guyanese nation needs to be mobilized because the situation, difficult as it is, is not impossible. He goes on to talk about our great natural resources, our potential. We know that. We have twice the land mass of Cuba; more resources; 1/10th of the population of Cuba, perhaps even less, yet Cuba does not have all these grave, grave problems which we have. Why? Internal unity, revolutionary socialist oriented programme, close links with the socialist world. This is what is called

nonalignment. But what is the nonalignment of this Government? Nothing like that. Nonalignment means different things to different people.

If they continue in their old way it will not get better, it will get worse. Things are bad today - we have seen where it has grown worse progressively over the years. And so it is in this context we suggest this rather than having turmoil. No matter how much you jail people, no matter how much you use police methods, eventually they are going to explode. Look what happened in Nicaragua after thirty years or more of dictatorship. As they say even the worm will turn. We don't want Nicaragua here. We want social peace.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: That is why we proposed in August last year, after giving critical support to the Government a year before...

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: ...you were very happy to get the critical support. Don't worry. In August, 1977 we came forward with a call for a National Patriotic Front and the formation of a National Patriotic Front Government. What was the reaction? Immediately they said, "*Jagan and company want Minister Work.*" It is not Minister Work we want. They can bribe some people but they cannot bribe the P.P.P. The P.P.P. is not for sale. Let me make that quite clear. The P.P.P. is not looking for some sinecure. We will not go into any Government simply by an arrangement at the top, some sharing of Ministers. Let that be quite clear, especially as they want the P.P.P. in a minority position so that they can continue with their rascality, the corruption and the extravagance and have the P.P.P. committed to it. We are not looking for any Government work on any arranged basis. What we are talking about is a democratic basis. Listen to the Minister who was speaking right afterwards. The P.N.C. rejected it at the call at the Congress. The *New Nation* of September 4th, 1977 published a report after the offer was made. I am reading from the Central Committee Report:

"The real purpose behind the so-called line of critical support was revealed when Jagan proposed a National Front Government. The party had no interest in this proposal. Discussions with Jagan at the inter-party meetings proved conclusively that critical support was a mere ruse, a policy to obtain a share of political power. There existed no basis, and none still exists, upon which a Government could be founded. For the Party the real issue is national unity. This cannot be achieved by a mere power-sharing deal by political leaders. Jagan shows no interest in promoting national cohesion on a class basis."

We had a Chairman of the P.N.C. with respect to the breakdown of the

talks between the P.P.P. and P.N.C. in December, 1976. This was reported in the *Guyana Chronicle* on the 25th July, 1977:

"We made it clear in that release that we were at all times willing to work on a basis of cooperation but out to subvert the electoral process by handing over in this way to the P.P.P. the task of governing the nation. From the talks it was clear that the P.P.P. were more interested in sharing powers than showing a genuine concern for national unity."

For the record, the very first day we had Party talks with the P.N.C., we said let us look at the whole situation in the country to arrive at a political solution. Why did we want to do that? Because we realized that if political power takes the course that it is taking – army intervention not only in civilian life but in electoral life and so on - there is bound to be a clash in Guyana and we want to avoid that in the national interest. We know too, the realities that my friends over there will not surrender power. It is too sweet. One Minister said we wanted 49 percent in the Public Service Commission. The Public Service Commission, the Police Service Commission and so on, under the Constitution, are supposed to be neutral so that racial and political discrimination can be prevented.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: Your leader wanted 50 percent. In the Constitution talks in London the leader asked for 50 percent; it was turned down.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: It says here that we want to subvert the electoral process. Everybody knows that if there were free and fair elections in Guyana the P.P.P. would win a clear majority. Why is it you didn't allow the United Nations Human Rights Commission to come here at the last election? It is precisely because our proposal is based on a democratic foundation, on free and fair elections, on the electoral process, that they have rejected it. That is why they have rejected it.

We proposed a formula which will be constructed on a democratic basis - at the local government and mass organization levels, mass organizations that the people really want and which are thrown up by free and fair elections should be recognized and respected, at the Central Government level there should be free and fair elections; that all the Left and Democratic Parties in this House who subscribe to an anti-imperialist programme, to a socialist-oriented programme, should constitute the Cabinet or the Council of Ministers. What is there about subverting the democratic process as our Minister over there says? It is based on democracy but knowing that P.N.C. would not accept such a democratic basis, we suggested that the

formula should involve the other Party, one of the two Parties in an equal position. So that the other Party can exercise control in the legislative process. In our proposal we suggested that there should be a Prime Minister and a President, virtually with equal powers, one having veto powers over the Parliament, and the Executive President.

We are not saying this is the only formula but let them in the interest of national unity – if they don't agree with this formula - put up another formula, but clearly the country cannot go along in the way it is going; it cannot go along. And in spite of all the wishes and the entreaties the economic and financial problems of this country will not be solved. It is a truism that without people's involvement there can be no development and that is what is lacking here. Responsibility today for the future of this country does not rest in this House. It rests primarily on one individual, the Prime Minister, the Leader of the P.N.C.

Why it is that imperialism is giving us aid now when it denied aid to revolutionary Chile. Is it that the right wind of the P.N.C. has taken over or is it that the Prime Minister is leading the Right once again, from Right to Left and back once again. If he is a socialist, if he is a revolutionary and we would like history to record that he is such then fight the right wing. Do not dismiss Carrington. Poor fellow, look where he is sitting now. Don't dismiss Wills. Poor fellow, he is not even in the House. Whose head will roll next? Fight the Right. Make peace with the P.P.P. for we want socialism. There can be no doubt about this. Make peace with the socialist countries. If you have problems with your right wing, mobilize the rank and file, your membership, who today are not anti-communist, anti-Cuba as they were prior to 1970, who today want a revolutionary solution. Mobilize them. If the Prime Minister fails to do that history will record that at the decisive moment of decision-making, he failed the country.

I want to repeat; this is election year. They can manipulate the Constitution to perpetuate themselves in power. They can postpone the elections; they can hold elections and rig them. In the name not only of the P.P.P. but of the people of this country, I wish to warn that the masses will not sit idly by and accept such manipulations of the Constitution or of the electoral process. Guyana today is at the crossroads and we hope that the patriots on the side of the ruling Party will make a decision which not only will lead this country out of the morass but will allow it, like Cuba, to become a shining bastion not only for the whole Caribbean but for the whole of the Americas.

Motion - Condemnation of Invasion of Belize Territory: 8th March, 1978

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, I wish on behalf of the members of the P.P.P. Opposition to give strong support to this Motion. For me this is nothing new. We have been supporting the independence of this territory and other territories for very many years. Indeed, during the tea interval, the Premier, the Hon. George Price of Belize, reminded me that in 1961 in Santiago, Chile, before we had reached independence, when we sat at a meeting of E.C.L.A., the Economic Commission for Latin America, we sponsored the inclusion of Belize, at that time known as British Honduras, into this regional organization.

The matter is quite complicated and what we are witnessing, in my view, is imperialism trying to maintain its domination and grip in this area. The Caribbean area is now an area with which imperialism is becoming particularly concerned and it is giving it more and more attention. It has got Latin America and Central America in its pocket so to speak, in many cases, with fascist dictatorships and other such dictatorships of the right-wing view.

In Guatemala, we have a history of regime based on terror and murder over many years. In fact, it was in 1954, a year after the warships had displaced the P.P.P. Government in Guyana that the imperialist-led invasion displaced the Government of Guatemala, the revolutionary democratic Government. That was one of the first tragic blows in our hemisphere and since then a brutal dictatorship has been established there.

As I said, imperialism is now concerned with the Caribbean where there is an anti-imperialist thrust, where there is talk particularly in the former British territories and British territories, about socialism and so on. Imperialism does not use the same methods, direct military aggression and indirect. Now it has its agents working from neighbouring territories. We saw this in our own example when territorial claims were raised on the eve of Independence.

And so it is now in this territory. Why is it that the British Government cannot forthrightly say "*We stand by the territorial integrity of Belize*" and force the American Government to take that same position? It would seem to me that imperialism is in cahoots all over the world today to make deals to arrest the revolutionary process and wherever there is any talk of socialism, wherever there are forces coming up which are likely to lead in that direction, imperialism is manoeuvring. In this case it is willing to cede territory to a regime which is under control by imperialism and has been under control since 1964.

Let us hope that the people of Guatemala will remove that regime so that the problem facing Belize will be removed. Right now we see and we

hear over the radio where two factions of the Right, the military, are vying for power. Both are armed to the teeth and no doubt they will take to the streets. Let us hope that this threat to the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Belize will be removed and the people of Guatemala will do as they are doing in Nicaragua, take to the streets, take to arms, and remove this fascist monster. That is a dagger not only against Belize but it points a dagger in the heart of all the Caribbean including Guyana.

We think that the people of Belize must be given the right to exercise their sovereignty and their self-determination as they deem best and I hope that not only the Members of the Parliament will support this Motion wholeheartedly but that all the people of Guyana, mass organizations, religious organizations, cultural organizations will unitedly lend support to our sister territory so that it can go forward to independence without having this sword of Damocles hanging over its head and, indeed, frustrating it in the future in its attempts at achieving economic viability. Cde. Speaker, we heartily support this Motion.

Condemnation of Invasion of Zambian Territory: 8th March, 1978

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, I rise to support this Motion and to say that I am sorry that it was not presented to us before so that we could have had adequate time to make proposals for the change which I will propose, nevertheless, in a few moments. This Motion seeks to condemn the attack on Zambia by the racist, fascist, minority regime of Smith in Rhodesia and it goes on to talk about support for the restoration of the legitimate rights of the majority of the people of Zimbabwe. We think that this National Assembly should go further and should express its condemnation of the recent so called settlement.

As I remarked a little while ago, imperialism is no longer able to use its own methods of direct and indirect military attack and it is now using more subtle methods of domination. In fact, it started since 1960 when Prime Minister Harold MacMillan went to South Africa and made a famous speech which was called the "*Winds of Change Speech*". What did he say? He told the South Africans to relent on their apartheid racist policy. He told the Rhodesians and other colonial-owning powers "*Grant independence quickly before it is too late*". MacMillan, as Prime Minister, had seen the reverses of imperialism in Korea in the early 1950s, the defeat of the Anglo-French-Israeli attack in Suez in 1966, the fiasco which led to the resignation of Prime Minister Anthony Eden, the break-up of the Baghdad Pact, one of the imperialist pacts, when the Kasim Revolution took place in Iraq in 1958, the occasion when Sekou Toure opted out of the French community, the time when the cold war containment policy was in shambles because of Guinea, in Iraq, Soviet presence was felt, contrary to the containment of communism policy launched by the cold war in 1947.

MacMillan and his ilk had learned that in countries such as India, it is possible to give independence and still retain an imperialist stranglehold. And so, MacMillan said in an apparent gesture of magnanimity: let us make some concessions on the racist front, apartheid, let us grant independence before it is too late. He was talking particularly to the Portuguese colonialists who were not as wise as the French or the British, and who held on doggedly leading to guerilla anti-colonial war. What MacMillan predicted, happened in Mozambique, in Guinea Bissau, in Angola, revolutionary movements coming to power, moving towards socialism. What is the plan? Imperialism now sees Angola has shown it that it cannot move as in Vietnam, so it is using a new manoeuvre: let us get the boys inside the country to do our dirty work. The plan was the Kissinger plan backed by the British, who allowed Smith to declare U.D.I. and were not prepared to dislodge him, although Britain had the force to do so, it can do it at any time. Collusion with the Kissinger plan: let us put some pressure on Smith. Smith has admitted it, even with the recent settlement, he was not prepared to go

as far as that, he said the Americans put pressure on him. But the Kissinger plan backed by the British is to hand over power not to the revolutionary forces in the patriotic front, Mugabe and Nkomo, but to the Rightists. So we have Rev. Sithole, we have Rev. Muzorewa and we have some chiefs who negotiated this settlement.

This settlement is now under attack by the front line states and is now being debated, I think, by the United Nations. Smith is using his fascist groups to launch an attack against Zambia. Of course, this is nothing new. They have been launching attacks against Mozambique for some time now and, therefore, we support this Motion condemning that attack. We think that it is necessary also to add the voice of Guyana. Let us declare where we stand in these matters, to condemn this imperialist settlement which is intended to transfer power, but to transfer power to those who will perpetuate a capitalist form of development in Rhodesia.

Independence, we have learnt in many countries, does not automatically bring benefits to the people, for in their place you can get a local elite, bureaucratic and petit bourgeois elements that are prepared to make a deal with foreign imperialists and to keep the country on a capitalist path. The foreign imperialists are going to move out everything. That is precisely what the Kissinger plan, backed by the British Government, is all about. And so we would like to add in this statement:

“In the third line before the last, delete the word, “and” after the words, “Southern Africa” and add the following words, so that it would read, “condemns the recent settlement in Zimbabwe and pledges its full support, particularly for the restoration of the legitimate rights of the majority of the people of Zimbabwe.”

I am glad that the mover of the Motion on the Government side has agreed to accept this Amendment and I hope that we will continue to have such unanimity in the fight against imperialism for social progress.

Constitution (Amendment) Bill: 10th April, 1978

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, when the Prime Minister spoke on this Bill, he said he was looking at the Yugoslav Constitution. One would think that he was really looking at Machiavelli the Prince. This will sooner appear to be what seems to be the design behind this Bill. Indeed, as the Prime Minister's sister, Jessie Burnham, once said, Machiavelli, the Prince, was the Prime Minister's model. I remember when the Guyana Constitution was suspended Mr. Burnham and I then used to quote the famous observation in all our speeches pertaining to the suspension of the Constitution.

It went like this: "*Oh what a tangled web we weave, when we first practice to deceive...*" This is what has transpired here this afternoon. We went all over the place, skirted over the main issues, talked about the need for a constitutional change, something we have been hearing about for a long time. But the fundamental question which is on the agenda this year, the question of free and fair elections, which has been on the agenda for the last nine years, is being shunted aside and obviously the tactic of the Government is to becloud the issue by talking about the need for a constitutional change.

They went on to say that the Constitution was handed down to them, the Constitution was taken out of the drawers, these were their words, and the existing Constitution is too rigidly rooted in the structures of the colonial past and so on. What is the P.N.C.'s position? The Members would like us to think and this country to believe not only that they were the champions of independence, but they are the standard bearers, the vanguard of the working class and they propose to set up a Constitution, a new model, which will bring about prosperity and social progress for everyone. The blame is put on the colonial masters, and we just heard from the Leader of the United Force Opposition who was with them in London.

Before the United Force was even born it was selling out this country. Here is the Constitutional Commission Report of the Constitutional Committee of 1959. The whole Parliament was constituted as a Constitutional Committee. They are writing books about National Service. They said the P.P.P. fought against independence. Let us look at the record:

"The Motion recommending that British Guiana should become an independence State within the Commonwealth was affirmed on the following division; against: Tello, Jackson, Campbell, Burnham, Kendall."

They were fighting! They are the standard bearers of independence! We go on:

"The divisions on the various motions moved under this Head were as follows: (i) Motion to reserve to Her Majesty, Her Heirs and Successors the power to revoke, add to, suspend or amend the Constitution. For: Tasker, Jackson, Kendall."

Burnham was absent, no doubt, trying to earn a living. These are the people who tell us now that colonial masters dictated to them. Listen to this: *"Motion that power to amend the Constitution be vested in the Legislature by a unanimous vote of those present."* We were taking of removing the powers of the Colonial Office to give us independence. *"For: Jackson, Kendall, Bowman and Beharry."* So we can see where the P.N.C. stood on those questions.

We were told by Mr. Jack that we are afraid. What were they talking about? That no change must be made unless it is done by a unanimous vote, not just two-thirds stolen majority but a unanimous vote. The P.P.P. was not at the Independence Conference. We did not want to stop independence but we did not want to be party to a total fraud which was going on, a total fraud which Harold Wilson called a rigged Constitution amendment, a fiddled Constitution arrangement, the P.R. which Burnham called for. The British Government gave it to him – the colonial masters.

They talk about colonial masters now. Colonial masters put them in. Now they want to put all the blame on the United Force as if the United Force was restricting them.

Prior to the 1964 elections, they said they will have alliance neither with the P.P.P. nor U.F. The P.P.P. was communist. Those were the days when they were jumping around against Cuba, dancing in the streets. The United Force was conservative. Soon after the elections, they made an alliance with the United Force. In fact, had they told the people during the election campaign in 1964 that they would have allied with the United Force; they would not have got even the 40 percent vote they got then. I mentioned that just because we have to come back to this question of a Referendum and what is put in the Referendum because, to say that the future Constitutions will be made without a Referendum is a different thing altogether than to put to a Referendum that the elections will be postponed or the Constitution, not the elections yet will be rigged so as to keep the P.N.C. in power perpetually. It depends on what is put in a Referendum.

In the same way I refer to that analogy that if in 1964 they had gone to the people and said they would unite with the United Force, they would not have got even the 40 percent they got. Cde. Speaker, incidentally, on the question of republicanism, Mr. Burnham made reference to that in his speech. I think for the record we ought to make that position quite clear where they stood because at the 1962 Conference they clearly stated that they were not in favour, republican or monarchical system, Mr. Burnham said that the P.N.C. was now prepared to agree to a republic at independence.

Prior to that Conference, they were against it, so let us get the records

straight first of all about who is revolutionary and who is vanguard because there is a lot of talk now about vanguard. Comparisons are made with the P.N.C. sometimes comparing itself with Allende's Unidad Popular and occasionally we hear them comparing themselves with what is happening in Cuba and the Soviet Union and so on.

Burnham gave us a long treatise about a written Constitution, that there is no such in England. But surely he knows that in England people chopped off the head of a King to write in to the practices of England fundamental democracy, the Magna Carta. People fought in the Chartist Movement for the right to vote; people struggled for the right to strike. They were transported all the way to Australia. Australia was peopled by militants who fought for their freedom. The House of Lords gave way from a position of dominance to the House of Commons, from sovereignty vested in the divine right of kings to sovereignty vested in the people. And so adult suffrage came to that country as a result of the struggle of the people.

Don't come and tell us now that they haven't got a written Constitution and so on. You think you can rig elections in England like you rig them here? You are the laughing stock. Granada Television made three films, two in 1968 and one in 1973. The second one was made before the Prime Minister went to the Commonwealth Conference in London. The commentator said the day before the film was shown that the Prime Minister was coming to a Conference he should not have been attending. The second film was called, "*The Making of a Prime Minister*". He was made by fraud. They made another one in 1973 it was called "*Mr. Burnham does it again*". Why don't you let the Guyanese people see it? I brought in 1968 "*The Making of a Prime Minister*". It was seized at the airport by the police. We have democracy in Guyana. Technicality: You didn't get an import license to bring it in. Why don't you let the Guyanese people see it?

He comes lecturing us about the democratic rights of the British people. All right, they haven't got a written Constitution. But they are governed by Conventions, by common law, by a lot of things which were handed down from the days when they chopped off the king's head to establish the right to democracy and freedom. The American people wrote a Bill of Rights in to their Constitution. The United Nations at its very inception had a Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Government subscribed to it. Recently, the Government signed two others, Convention and Covenants on Human Rights and Political and Civil Rights, the one against discrimination. What did the Government do? It refused to sign the Optional Protocol which would allow a petitioner like me to go to the United Nations and say violations are taking place. You don't want to sign the Protocol because you don't want anybody to complain, to give documentary evidence about the violations here.

What does Cde. Jack tell us? "*Look, see our bona fides, we haven't subverted the human rights section. We have the power, the two-thirds majority. We can do it.*" You haven't subverted it. You haven't taken them out of the

Constitution. This is what he said. But you have subverted it. Day by day you have violated the Constitution.

In the Fundamental Rights it says "freedom of information". The New Guyana Company ordered a newspaper press; in 1971 it paid 20 percent down. The next year February, 1972, that Government made a law making an import licence a requirement for newsprint, for new equipment, for all kinds of things. The New Guyana Company brought a case in 1972, it was not heard until 1974. Decision was reserved for one year. Fortunately, one of the few independent judges in the country gave a decision in favour of the company. The Government appealed against the decision and up to today it has not been heard. Shahabuddeen is busy because he has got to make laws; he has got to draft legislation to...

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan:...come to this House to take away the rights of the people. When I took this matter up at the United Nations Human Rights Division, one man suggested to me that I should ask for a Constitutional Court to be set up in the country to deal with constitutional violations pronto, immediately. I am told in this country they have a Constitutional Court because all constitutional matters dealing with the fundamental rights of the people should be heard immediately. But what did they do? They have the guts to talk about change, that they haven't taken anything out of the Constitution. But they rape the Constitution every day. I referred to one. We can go on naming all kinds of things.

My colleague quoted from the Ramphal Report. Was Shahabuddeen not then a junior in the Attorney General's Office next to Ramphal? Was the Prime Minister not a lawyer of repute in the country? Is he not regarded as such? Did Feilden Singh force him to write in all those things? How powerful was the United Force to block him? The reality of that period was that the British and the Americans were against the P.P.P. They sent the C.I.A. to get us out and they put Burnham in. Burnham can get anything he wants. He does have to fight for anything. That is a fact of life.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: Nascimento was then running with the United Force, with the anti-communists. Don't worry with Nascimento. Nascimento was then talking of Cuban Battle ships on the horizon

Cde. Speaker, I say it is a deceitful thing to come to this House today and tell the nation that these people who wrote the Constitution were under pressure. What did Mr. Ramphal say in the Constitution before they went to London, before going and talking about all the safeguard in the Constitution? "This Constitution has all kinds of safeguards; you have an Ombudsman; you have an independent judiciary; you have the Service Commissions

which are going to ensure that there is no political control of the Public Service." These were the undertakings which were given to the public by the gentleman when he was Attorney General. Obviously, he could not have done all of those things without the clear agreement of the Prime Minister. Let me read you some excerpts from this paper. This is the one that is called *"Preparing for Independence, The Constitution of Guyana, a talk by Hon. S.S. Ramphal, Q.C., Attorney General."* I quote:

"Our 1961 Constitution had itself been prepared on the basis of a general consensus among our political parties arising out of the deliberations of the Select Committee of the Legislature in 1959 and of the London Conference of 1960..."

I repeated already what they were saying in 1958 and 1959 when we had the Select Committee. Mr. Ramphal goes on:

"This Constitution was the starting point of the discussions of the 1962 Conference and the position therefore is that for the greater part, the provisions incorporated in the draft reflect matters on which agreement has already been reached."

Later in his speech, he goes on to say:

"Built into the Constitution is a whole range of constitutional provisions designed to safeguard the fundamentals of parliamentary democracy and the rights of individual citizens. Time does not permit me to deal with these matters in a detailed way. Let me however draw your attention to them many of which have their counterparts in the existing Constitution and will be familiar to you."

Chapter II of the Draft contains our Bill of Rights, detailed constitutional provisions designed to safeguard those civil liberties which are part of our Commonwealth inheritance. I think I can do no better in outlining the scope of these provisions than to repeat the language of the first section of this Chapter which recites:-

"Whereas every person in Guyana is entitled to the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual, that is to say, the right, whatever his race, place of origin, political opinions, colour, creed, or sex, but subject to respect for the rights and freedom of others and for the public interest, to each and all of the following, namely life, liberty, security of the person and the protection of the law; freedom of conscience, of expression and of assembly and association; and protection for the privacy of his home and other property and from deprivation of property without compensation, ..."

And it goes on. He says:

"In addition, the draft provides for appeals from the Court of Appeal to the

Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I would have preferred to have been in a position to confer this ultimate right of appeal on the new Commonwealth Court which it is hoped may one day be established. However, this new Court has not yet come into being and I have therefore proceeded on the basis that appeals shall lay as they now do to the Judicial Committee."

The first act after they stole the two-thirds majority was to take off the Privy Council without putting something in this place. The very first act! Why? Just in case there was an election petition and it did not succeed in the courts which they controlled, they did not want it to go anywhere else. So, they abolished the Privy Council and did not set up another one in its place. Llewellyn John thought he could probably reach the first step even so he brought a petition and up to today it has not been heard. And then Cde. Jack tells us, *"Oh, we haven't taken away the fundamental rights section in the Constitution."* What hypocrisy! Take some other sections. Mr. Ramphal goes on to say:

"In the case of the public service, the draft Constitution makes special provision for a Public Service Commission and a Police Service Commission which will have complete authority with regard to such matters as the appointment, promotion, transfer and discipline of public officers – provisions framed with a view to removing these matters from the area of political control or influence."

What was the position at the Independence Conference on that question? Here is the document, Report of the British Guiana Independence Conference 1965, Clause 16:

"16. The Conference agreed that, of the four ordinary members of the Public Service Commission, one should be appointed after consultation with the Leader of the Opposition and two after consultation with representative public service organizations. The Conference noted that in respect of these three members the Prime Minister would in normal circumstances advise the appointment of a person acceptable to the Leader of the Opposition or the public service organizations, as the case might be, and that the Civil Service Association and the Federation of Unions of Government Employees were for the present the public service organizations to be consulted."

What happened? Cde. Jack says the Constitution is being respected. I have a letter here in my possession where the Prime Minister is written to, where for each one of these Commissions I had nominated one person. The nomination was rejected in every case: for the Police Service Commission, for the Public Service Commission and for the Judicial Service Commission. The Prime Minister came to this House during the Budget Debate and lied...

[Intervention by Speaker]

Dr. Jagan: Prevaricated then; you wanted a better word. He said that the leader wanted 49 percent but he was entitled to one but because he wanted 49 percent, he got nothing. I can produce the letter, I have it right here in the files, to show where names were given to him and he was asked on 31st May to appoint one person in the case of the Judicial Service Commission, one in the case of the Police Service Commission and one in the case of the Public Service Commission. But, because they have raped the Constitution, they do not have to abolish the clauses. It is easier to rape it by administrative police methods. In the same way they have subverted the functions of the Ombudsman and also the Elections Commission. Let me go on reading from Mr. Ramphal. It is important.

“With regard to the appointment of constitutional authorities, such as the Chief Justice and the President of the Court of Appeal and the Chairman and members of the Service Commissions, the draft Constitution recognizes the parliamentary convention of consultation with the Leader of the Opposition and imposes a positive obligation on the Prime Minister to consult with him in relation to those matters on which it is obviously desirable to secure a broad consensus – while avoiding arrangements which could be rendered unworkable through policies of noncooperation.”

Cde. Jack says, let us all sit together and let us talk. How many hours I have wasted with the Prime Minister. We had talks even in the days when we expressed cooperation. What came out of it? When we gave them parliamentary support to amend the Constitution so they could nationalize without having to pay prompt and adequate compensation, the whole country was happy. Next day, based on the pronouncements that the Prime Minister made, the then *Graphic* had big bold headlines in size types like this “PEACE PLAN FOR GUYANA”. The Prime Minister told the House that substantial representation will be given to the P.P.P. Nothing.

When we came out with critical support, talks began between the P.P.P. and the P.N.C. That was one of the questions. When we wanted to talk about a political solution they said no. Cde. Jack said step by step. Take one at a time. One of the things we discussed was representation of the Opposition as the Constitution says. What did they say? Let us carry out a whole examination of the whole country to see who owns what and who holds what job. This is what these people said and eventually not one individual recommended by the P.P.P. was selected or appointed. Mr. Ramphal goes on:

“In addition to these many safeguards of our democratic system and the established rights of the individual citizen provision has been made in the draft for the establishment of the office of an Ombudsman.”

Poor Ombudsman. They have reduced him to a position where he cannot function as he is suppose to do under the Constitution. It is a disgrace what they have done. In the same way they have dealt with an office for the Leader of the Opposition, which their own security chief, one of the people in security, said is not proper and suitable from the police security point of view. Up to today, the Opposition Leader does not have an office. They keep it closed. They don't mind that. They could have easily made a transfer or made some adjustment. But they are so vindictive. They do not want the Ombudsman to function according to the Constitution, to protect the rights of the individual, so they shunt him off in a corner without proper accommodation.

Imagine, an important office like that, his clerks have to pass up and down through his office to get to their office. They can find posh wall-to-wall carpet for Ministers and Junior Ministers but they want the Ombudsman to get fed up and quit.

When Cde. Jack comes and tells us, "*we did not use our two-thirds*", this is hypocrisy to the extreme. The fundamental rights are there but every day the police under the Constitution, under the rules, under the laws, interfere, even in the time of the British they did not appropriate the powers to stop public meetings. During the sugar strike they did it. Ballot boxes. The Constitution provides for freedom of association, provides for elections to be held periodically, it provides for an Elections Commission. What is the role of the Elections Commission? Does it function? Its powers have been usurped by the Ministry of Home Affairs. At the last moment in the last election the Chief Elections Officer agreed that the three Opposition parties will select one person who will accompany the ballot boxes from the polling places to the counting places. The names were given to the Chief Elections Officer. But what happened? Before that, an order was issued by the Cabinet signed by the Secretary to the Cabinet and it reflects the following: "*All personnel selected for the purpose of escorting the boxes containing cast ballots must be persons who have been approved by the regional representative of the Government of Guyana.*" Not by the Elections Commission.

"*No other person or persons purporting to be authorized by any individual group of political party executive should be permitted to ride or travel in any vehicle which is being used for the conveyance of ballot boxes.*" That is after the 1968 elections, when they opened one box they found four parcels of ballot papers wrapped with elastic rubber bands all marked for the P.N.C. When I called the Chairman of the Commission and told him, he said: "*Somebody has to answer for that.*" Up to today nobody has answered. That is why a petition was sent to the United Nations in December, 1972 by C.L.A.C., Civil Liberties Action Council, calling for electoral reform including the counting of ballots at the place of poll, or a person from the Opposition travelling in the same vehicle with the boxes. Let me go on and read this order.

“Such force as may be necessary may be used for the purpose of ensuring the enforcement of the provisions of section 2 of the order. All ballot boxes which are being transferred to Georgetown from the West Demerara, East Demerara, West Berbice, Corentyne and Canje Regions must be lodged at the headquarters of the Guyana Defence Force prior to their being escorted to their assigned destinations for counting.

The provisions of this order are to be complied with for the duration of the polling day and there is to be no departure from the instructions contained therein. All queries posed to presiding and supervisory personnel soliciting or invoking any rule, regulation or provision of any statute, law, or proclamation, which, if applied, will affect the operation of this order must in all circumstances be referred to the appropriate regional controlling officer for a ruling.”

This was an order on the supervision and control of ballot boxes which was issued by the Government on June 25, 1973 to all divisional commanders of the Police Forces and all company and section officers of the Guyana Defence Force in that period prior to the election. Yet, as one speaker pointed out, the Head of the Defence Force said he did not know anything about it, but the reality is that the army did seize the ballot boxes and in the process they killed two persons.

Cde. Chairman, how are you going to get cooperation like this, when the Constitution is being subverted, when the Constitution is being torn up? Then we hear, *“let us sit and talk and let there be cooperation.”* On this occasion one of the leaders of one of the small parties was charged with committing public mischief, seditious libel. They dare not charge him for disclosing official secrets, Cabinet secrets, because they would have then to bring Cabinet officers and all of them to prove that this was not the paper. Eventually they dropped the case because they were compounding themselves at the trial and especially when the P.N.C. Congress was in progress and all the foreign observers were here. The judge, of course, found that there was nothing to answer to. This is how things are working.

Do not tell us about constitutional rights, fundamental rights, that you have not used your two-thirds majority to take them out of the constitution. That is your intention, for you can no longer practice democracy. You had 40 percent in 1964 and you made an alliance with the U.F. Since then, you kicked them out because you wanted to remove the Finance Minister, the Leader of the U.F., so that you could not only rig the constitution, but rig the treasury. That is also why the economy is in such a mess today.

Take the Demerara Electric Company. Why is it we are in this mess? I heard there was a debate last week. I was in this from the very beginning. There used to be blackouts perpetually before 1960. We brought diesel generators and we virtually loaned them to the company. They were refusing to buy anything. We nationalized them. Before we nationalized them, Preece, Cardew and Ryder...

[Intervention by the Speaker]

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, I am trying to show you and this House how by subverting the Constitution, interfering with the work of the Public Service Commission, practising racial and political discrimination, they have got round pegs in square holes; how, by not carrying out the recommendations of experts they, today, have go the place in a mess. Guyanese want to know. Why is it, where is the answer? Why should they not be told? Experts have said that in twenty years – we are nearly twenty years now, that company would have made \$60 million net profit. That is why Peter D'Aguiar wanted to buy it because he was privy to that Report. What did they suggest? They suggested two steam generators which will operate ...

[Intervention by the Speaker]

Dr. Jagan: They do not make appointments there but the Prime Minister and his colleagues in the Cabinet make appointments there which is even worse, because then the jobs for the boys are even more direct. I am only going to say two sentences. The point I want to make is that in the scheme of the proposals put forward we required two 10-megawatt plants, hydro electricity then costing \$32 million which the Cuban government was prepared to finance. I negotiated with Che Guevara. That was abandoned by them. If we are now paying big oil bills, it is because they did not implement that hydro scheme. In the new four year plan they have 6 percent...

[Intervention by the Speaker]

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Chairman, this is an important debate, people are outside. Look at the place outside, black like hell. You are sitting in luxury and enjoying life. The people want to know what is happening in this country and we have a right to speak in this Chamber.

Let us come to the issue about something being wrong with the Constitution. Okay, tell us what is wrong. There was something wrong in 1971 which we helped them to correct. Not only which we helped them to correct, but which they helped to put in, the clause requiring prompt and adequate compensation. The P.N.C. not the U.F., told the Colonial Officer to put it in. The United Force was not on the scene when they were sitting in the Constitutional Committee here in 1958/1959, and in 1960 the P.N.C. allowed the British Government to write that into the Constitution to prevent the P.P.P. from nationalizing anything. That is the historical record, but we allowed them and helped them to change that. Cde. Jack says they wanted a blanket thing to change everything at one time and to take over everything at one time. In that same Bill ...

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: Perhaps I stated it wrongly. I apologize. But what he did say, I hope I can put it correctly. I will walk with a tape recorder the next time so that I can quote exactly what the Cde. Minister says. The Cde. Minister said that we were not prepared to give them a blanket clause which will give them the power to do with everything else, the same thing they did with bauxite. Have I put it right now? But let Jack tell the House what he told Sevaro, the *New York Times* man who came soon after, and Ramphal too. Our policy is not nationalization but participation. Even if they had the power, they would not have done a thing about it.

When I asked Burnham, what about Reynolds, he said, within a matter of months. Before they came to nationalization, they were talking about meaningful participation, they were saying that we do not have experts, how can we take over anything. That was their first argument. Then they moved on from that. When I told them, if you don't have experts why don't you take over the smaller one first, Reynolds, they said, "*no, we prefer to take over the bigger one first.*" "*Within a matter of months*" came in 1975, when we needed them, we told them, if you don't want to nationalize, why you don't do like the Manley Government and put a levy. When they put a levy, Reynolds took them to Court and said you violated the "*secret agreements*" which you made when you sold out the rights of the people. Secret agreements which said you couldn't tax them in 21 years. So even if we had given them the power, they were puppets of imperialism. They did not want to move. That is why when the *New York Times* man asked him, "*What is your future policy?*" Ramphal said partnership, Jack said partnership, "*We are hoping for investments*" and so on. Deny that.

Okay, what is the other obstruction? Land. They are talking a lot about land now. From their own mouths they claim today that they amended the Constitution in 1975. We have the Bill here, the amendment to the Constitution. They say we didn't want to give them that and that is why they had to get the two-thirds majority to do it. That is the rationalisation. But their rascality is exposed in this, that they have not used this power to move against landlords who are squeezing the hell out of the poor people. We have been after the Minister of Agriculture. We have been after all of them.

At Hope Estate they are not moving against the landlords. In the Essequibo Coast there is Taymonth Manor. In the Essequibo Islands, there is Bagh Khan who is squeezing the hell out of the farmers. But all these big boys used to give them money. In the P.N.C Congress in the past, they used to give \$150,000, \$270,000 and so on. And so they don't want to move against them.

What have you done since you have got this law? Since you changed the Constitution, you appointed the Hon. Member Ambrose – in this House we have got to call him Hon. Member to a point. You put him to head the Land Reform Committee. Can Ambrose tell us how many years he has been sitting with that? Let him tell me what he told me in front of Kennard in the Lobby. Tell the House. He cannot get them to move. Why? Because

they have class interest. Their petty bourgeois interest coincides with the interest of the petty bourgeois landlords and they don't want to move. Don't come and tell us the P.P.P. did not give you the blanket right and all that.

Cde. Speaker, I now come to the main fundamental question. Cde. Jack said we must make it clear - are we for a change of the Constitution or aren't we for a change? I would like to ask him and his colleagues. What change are you talking about? What is the Constitution? What are the provisions in the Constitution today which obstruct you from moving forward? Are the Constitutional provisions preventing you from nationalizing the sharks, the foreign banks and insurance companies which you were supposed to nationalize since December, 1976? Tell us if the Constitution is preventing you from doing that? Tell us if the Constitution is preventing you from carrying out in the new planning strategy, a programme based on simultaneous development, of agriculture and industry instead of doing as you are doing, putting 4 percent for manufacturing and 6 percent for power? The hydro scheme and the smelter scheme have gone west, and you tell us of the strengthening ties with CARICOM, with Trinidad as the economic base of imperialism where the multinationals are squeezing us like hell. And they are going to grow stronger with a \$4½ billion investment. Tell us if the Constitution is obstructing you from making changes?

You move forward to COMECON. Your bosses in Washington and the International Monetary Fund say, go back to CARICOM. I was at the U.N. recently, in Washington, Chicago, New York, Edmonton, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg. Everybody saw *"Mr. Burnham has done it again"*.

The point I want to make here is that the Government is saying the Constitution is obstructing it. Tell us how? Which clause in the Constitution is preventing it from doing something? Which clause? Already the Government controls 80 percent of the economy. As I recall, we have been criticising the Government for a long time, also, about the planning strategy it is adopting, dictated by imperialism. The Government got us in the mess because of that strategy and now it claims to be free and it is going the same way.

I spoke to some important people at the U.N. Do you know what they said? *"You of the Guyana Government are very strong. Wills, Ex-Foreign Minister, and the new Foreign Minister, they had very strong positions in the United Nations"*. They said recently, since Wills has gone, there is a change. There is a change in the way the present Foreign Minister is talking about the wonderful things that are happening in Trinidad. Before, they were critical. This is all part of the move that they are making to sell out and they want to tell us that the Constitution is an obstacle. That is a red herring they brought in because they want to rig the Constitution. They can no longer rig the elections so easily because the civil servants who helped them to rig are fed up. They don't know where the next salary is going to come from. The people who did the dirty work for them are no longer marching with them and they are exposed all over the world.

As I told you millions have seen the Granada television film. Other companies, like the C.B.C. had an interview with me, and spliced half of "The Making of a Prime Minister" into it. What did they show? We can have a Referendum now. They were forced to admit that something went wrong with the overseas voting and they said it was due to overzealous people who wanted to make money. Whom have they charged for that corruption? They cannot charge anybody because they were part of the fraud. They know. One of their big boys in London told the television company he doesn't know how over one hundred names of voters got in, he registered about 41.

The commentator said, "We thought there may have been a change of heart on the Prime Minister's part in view of what he said that there were a lot of things wrong in the 1968 elections."

They went around knocking at doors and they found the same empty places with broken mains, where people are supposed to live, abandoned buildings, people shaking their heads and saying, I have been here 15 years, 10 years, 5 years, never heard of somebody. They showed a little girl 7 months old in the arms of a lady. Another little boy 6 years old, he is registered as a fitter and Beverley, the little 7 month old girl is registered as a clerk. But both of them are Jamaicans. Another Jamaican was asked, "How is it you and three other people voted?" He said, "We were promised land in Guyana." And we asked "Don't you think it is strange for you to vote for Guyana?" He said, "No, it is much of a muchness, it is all the same."

This is how they win elections. This is how they got their two-thirds majority and this is how they hope to rig the Referendum. Rig one Referendum, get it out of the way and after that the rigged two-thirds majority will make all the changes that are necessary. The Prime Minister took us around, a lecture tour, and all kinds of things, but he never mentioned about the elections. This is a fundamental question which is now facing this country in this year because this is supposed to be election year. Before he used to talk about entrenchments. It wasn't only the United Force. This is what the Prime Minister said at the British Guiana Independence Conference, 1962, in England. I quote:

"Mr. Chairman, Sir: So far as the People's National Congress is concerned we take this Conference very seriously and we certainly do not feel that this is a time for pleasantries or repetition of being wedded to certain democratic principles. This attachment to democratic principles has got to be expressed in the Constitution..."

There should be entrenchment, so far as the People's National Congress feels. Our proposal for entrenchment is that certain clauses that allude to elections to the House and certain fundamental rights, the judiciary of course, should be entrenched with 66 2/3 percent, and vote on a Referendum to the electorate. We have heard from the major political party that is not the P.N.C., which they subscribe to these ideas and ideals. What therefore is the difficulty about entrenching these

clauses? If we are *ad idem* on them then entrenchment is a mere formality, in our case a needed formality...

We want to be citizens of an independent country, but the independence which we want must also mean freedom and democracy, it must mean not only political democracy but social democracy, and neither can be achieved unless the majority of people find the Constitution acceptable. Military solutions for political problems are not a way out. The only way out is cooperation and understanding between the people of Guiana, and cooperation does not mean dictation."

Cde. Speaker, why then is there a change of heart now about this entrenchment and particularly about one dealing with a Referendum. It has nothing to do with it.

The reason why the Government wants to take away the right of a Referendum is to get it in this form so that it can come later on to put before the House a change of a Constitution as regards elections by doing two things or a combination of them, postponing the elections. My colleague referred to that. A distinguished journalist has also referred to that in an article he wrote that the proposal is to have a long Parliament for ten years and since five years have gone, going back to 1973, then there will be no elections for the next five years. The Government will rationalize it on the grounds that in the days of the war, there was a long Parliament in Guyana. The Government will rationalise it on the grounds that it has a new Development Plan, as it did in 1972 when it postponed Local Government elections for the first time. Then, we heard that the Councillors had just got in 1970 and they needed more time to implement their plans. But, 1974, 1975, 1976, came and passed; we did not hear anything more, even about the rationalization. They were just postponed.

Therefore, all this talk about the constitutional change being necessary for a socialist Guyana is just a lot of poppycock because I would challenge them to point out in what way the Constitution as it is now with the amendments that have already been made, with the taking over of such a large part of the economy into their control, in what way is the Constitution an obstruction? Indira Gandhi once said so, that there has to be a constitutional amendment for a socialist India, and that led to a lot of strictures. That seems to be the intent here also. Clearly, they cannot face a Referendum for a postponement of elections today. The P.N.C. leader was in favour of a Referendum in 1964 and before that because then, from the mood of the people, and that was shown up in the ballot boxes in 1961, he figured that the Opposition will be able to win a P.R. election and thus he called for a Referendum. A Referendum was equivalent to a P.R. election. Champion of Referendum! Champion of democracy!

In all the speeches he made before that, at the end of the 1960 Conference, he talked about a democratic Guyana, the need for it. Subsequently there was talk about it. Why then there is no need for a Referendum as a type of entrenchment? Clearly the practical question is, election is on the

agenda and from all observations today, the P.N.C. is unable to win a majority at such a Referendum. Let them if they are so confident of winning, welcome the United Nations. Why did they refuse to admit the Human Rights Commission the last time? When we mentioned that, the answer was that the United Nations does not have a vote in Guyana. It does not have a vote in Guyana but dead people who do not exist have votes in Guyana. Jamaicans have votes in Guyana!

Cde. Speaker, why is it they do not want now to have a Referendum to the people? Because they don't want to tell them how they want to manipulate the Constitution, to rig the Constitution, to keep them in power. First, postpone the elections; secondly, change the structure of the Parliament and the Government so that the Parliament will no longer be representative of political parties but of mass organizations and also to weight them.

We have seen this kind of weighting in the State Planning Commission. The T.U.C. gets twenty members. The P.P.P. get six members. You can see what they intend to do. G.A.L.A. What is G.A.L.A? Guyana Association of Local Authorities. What are the local authorities? Six districts fought with fraud. In Leguan where we normally get 80 to 90 percent of the vote, the ballot boxes were taken to the Leguan Rest House where P.N.C. people were staying overnight. Next day, they won the Leguan Local Authority Elections. So we boycotted the remainder of the elections in December, 1970 and now they control every local authority. Now G.A.L.A. is a respected body. How many do they have? Twenty like the T.U.C?

They rigged a nomination at the bauxite company among their most militant supporters and they did not get a new union. The Union was allowed to win by rigging the nominations in order to go in to the T.U.C. along with a lot of bogus outfits headed by Edwin James and so on to control the T.U.C. This is how they want to change the structure of the Parliament.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: You take the State's money and bribe them to go over there.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: The Prime Minister says everybody has a price. This is politics.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: They will buy you and you will buy others but you will not buy Jagan and the P.P.P. You will buy Teekah and some others.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: They want to rig the Constitution now in two ways. Postpone the elections for an indefinite period and/or change the structure of the Parliament and the Government by giving weighting in the Parliament not only to political parties at an election but also naming certain organizations which they control. The practice is to destroy any organization which they don't want by police - administrative methods, set up parallel ones and then give them all the facilities. W.R.S.M. can get quotas to get licences. They can open shops and everything, but nobody else can get. GIMPEX can get? Go and ask the comrade. All the licences given to them for last year were cancelled. They have to buy locally.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Chairman, they have C.A.S.W.I.G., they have a whole bunch of organizations like G.A.L.A. They knock down the Rice Producers Association which was a statutory body since in the colonial regime. It was instituted in 1945 by law. The Prime Minister said in 1971 in a speech in the Parliament that the R.P.A. will have representation in the Board. Up to now they have not one member. G.A.W.U., the Prime Minister said in 1971 when we gave them support, steps will be taken to ascertain the wishes of the people. What happened? It took two strikes in 1975, six months in the first crop and six months in the second crop and he had to agree to take a poll. And the second time he said, no days will become available.

May Day 1976, when the workers were going to strike again, like a dog with his tail behind his legs, he said: *"all right I will give it to you"*. That is the language he understands. This is why this country is today in a mess. And I say this, all this manipulation... we come to the next question.

Dr. Shahabuddeen said the people will be consulted. We have experience with consultation in the past; what consultations in the past! We have seen where those consultations have meant nothing. We have seen where peace plan proposals which were given as an undertaking in this Parliament were not fulfilled. We have seen where three Opposition parties were given an undertaking by the Chief Elections Officer, that they would be able to accompany the ballot boxes, and that was not done. We have seen where the Prime Minister said steps will be taken to stop the fraud and the proxy voting in England and overseas and it continued.

I have referred already to the 1964 elections where the P.N.C. said that it would not join with the U.F., and right after the elections, it joined with the U.F. What do assurances from these people mean? Who will take them seriously? And so we say that now is the time for the people of this country to understand that this regime is interested in perpetuating itself in power to enjoy the privileges...

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: I was saying that steps have been taken to ensure that there will be consultations. Steps will be taken, we are hearing. The Prime Minister said that in the Soviet Union there was no Referendum but there was consultation and, no doubt, he will argue by simple analogy that what is good for the Soviet Union is good for Guyana. Not too long ago he referred to the Menshevik and Bolshevik, no doubt, comparing the P.N.C. with the Bolshevik. When Lenin took power through the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, he was prepared to work with all revolutionary forces in the country. But what has been the P.N.C's position? The Members say that the P.P.P. must virtually disband itself. During the Budget Debate the Prime Minister said, let us make up our minds that there will be one Party in Guyana. Obviously, he does not mean the P.P.P., he means the P.N.C. and for many years now the P.N.C. has been referring to itself as the paramount Party, as the vanguard Party.

Cde. Speaker, let us, to clear the record, understand what the P.N.C. really stands for. Is it a vanguard Party? Can we trust this Party? Can the people of Guyana trust this Party? Is it asking us to trust it in the same way that the Cuban people trust Fidel Castro and the Communist Party of Cuba, or the same way that the people of the Soviet Union trust the collective leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? If we are to talk about vanguard Party, we must talk about class and origin and roots. Kumar belongs to the petty bourgeoisies but Kumar fights against your fraud and that is why he refused to come into this Parliament after you rigged it at the last elections.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: Because you were begging for cooperation. Listen to what R.B.O Hart of the United Democratic Party and the League of Coloured Peoples said about you. You are referring to Liberator, but Hart was a thousand times worse than Kumar could be. This is recorded on page 163 of the West on Trial. *"He said this in the April 25, 1954 issue of the Clarion. R.B.O Hart had appealed to Burnham to lead the Party into safe channels", pleading that he must both "cease being a figurehead and become the effective Leader of his Party; he must be able to control more votes on the Executive Committee. This means that the executive must have on it a majority of sober men'.* On February 10, 1955 after the Party split, Hart wrote in the *Guyana Graphic*:

"One the 25th July, 1954, I sold Burnham an idea which he is now putting into practice."

I quote from *Clarion* of that date –

"You owe a duty to the people of this country who have followed you blindly. So far you have been lucky. You have done nothing to merit their blind support and idolatry. How can you as a young man of any character and decency lead them astray again? You and Dr. J.P., Latchmansingh would make a very effective team, and if you stood hand in hand would be able to keep the Party together while kicking the extremists out."

"Kick the Communists out", that was their slogan then. "Latchmansingh is no spring chicken himself but he is one of the few men in your Party of whom I would say, he is not a Communist."

After losing the 1957 elections which the British rigged to help him, they teamed up with the United Democratic Party, the most reactionary Party in the country. That is the Party now called the P.N.C. That is how the P.N.C. was formed. That is the Party which is now talking about vanguard and comparing itself with Lenin's C.P.S.U. with Allende's Socialist Party and the Unidade Populare. These people have said already that they have rejected a call to unite the country. They have rejected a call for a National Patriotic Front based on the unity of all left and democratic forces, and this does not include Kumar. Let that be clear. They have rejected this and they have said, liquidate the P.P.P. What else did they say? They were asked one year, what do you think of critical support? He said, all I see is criticism, I see no support. They want the P.P.P. to surrender, to become a harlot. Never will the P.P.P. allow itself, no matter what they do. What they would like is either to silence the P.P.P., they tried by underhand methods which I have referred to already ...

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: It is an insult for the Prime Minister, in important debate, not to be here. He is the Mover of the Bill and he is absent most of the time during the Debate. It is contempt of the Parliament and you are telling me, when he said he did not hear, that I have five minutes more. How can he reply to me when he has not heard what I said?

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: We have a constitutional right to speak and we are exercising that right. That is all. Cde. Speaker, what is intended now? The P.N.C. talks about cooperation. What did the Prime Minister Mr. Burnham say? *"Military solutions for political problems are not a way out."* The military is being brought out every day in industrial disputes, against Linden workers, against Municipal workers, against sugar workers. Is this the way out for Guyana? He said this is not the way out. The only way out is cooperation and understanding between the peoples of Guyana; cooperation does not mean dictation. This is dictation. Why didn't they bring this

Constitution before the House. Let them bring the Constitution and not go about it in this deceptive manner.

Cde. Speaker, the P.N.C. is determined to rape the Constitution; the P.N.C. is determined to scrap the Constitution. It rigs elections, it rigs nominations at Linden, and now it want to tear up the Constitution. We will not be a part in this confunded nonsense. And not only we, today thousands of people in this country are fed up; they are fed up with blackouts, they are fed up with shortages. They cannot get water. The corruption and the squandermania. Now, the little rights which the people have, constitutional paper rights, they want to tear them up.

Cde. Speaker, this Bill is a travesty of the rights of the people. We call on the people of this country to rise up and demand their rights and preserve this Constitution. We must stand up and fight if we are to settle our positions in this place properly.

(The Leader of the Opposition and Members of the Opposition withdrew from the Chambers).

Congratulations to the Prime Minister and Cds. Janet Jagan and Ramkarran: 17th May, 1978

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, I too would like to make a few observations on this occasion when three Members of this Parliament are celebrating, and the House joining in these celebrations of twenty-five years' service in this Parliament. This is indeed quite a long period in the history of Guyana and much has transpired in this period, some things which are to the credit of the country, others not so creditable. It is unfortunate that on this particular day we have to be debating a very controversial issue which has aroused the ire of practically the whole of Guyana, representative bodies, all shades of public opinion and, therefore, while we would like to celebrate this occasion we find it very difficult to do so reflecting this public opinion in this House.

Indeed, the People's Progressive Party and other forces in the country who are concerned about democracy, who are concerned about Parliament, who are concerned with debate, discussion, dialogue, who are concerned with representative Government and institutions, we fear that today all these things are in serious jeopardy. Thus those forces with which we are allied and those with which we are not even directly allied are concerned about developments. We think it is tragic for the history of this country that on this important day when three members of the original P.P.P. are celebrating twenty-five years in Parliament we have come to a situation where the country is seriously divided, where issues which we fought for are today in jeopardy, the right to vote, for instance, which the P.P.P. at that time fought for, and that is why we find it difficult today to consider this day a day of celebration. Rather, we have declared it a day of mourning.

Referendum (Amendment of the Constitution) Bill - Correction to Clause 5: 17th May, 1978

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, we now have before this House the second Bill dealing with the same question which we dealt with not so long ago. The first Bill sought to get the people of this country to surrender their right to future referenda for amending the Constitution. During the debate on that Bill, the main argument put out by the Government was that there is need for a new Constitution, and all kinds of arguments were put forward about the Constitution not being in keeping with the national ethos of the country at this particular time. We heard arguments also about *"why complain about amending the Constitution with a two-thirds majority? We did not use our two-thirds which we had since 1973 to take away the fundamental rights of the Constitution."* Those are all being regurgitated in the press, in the *Guyana Chronicle* day after day.

Now we have a new gimmick and that is, that the National Assembly will be constituted into a Constituent Assembly to write the new Constitution. I do not know whether this is as a result of the sharp criticisms which have been coming from practically every quarter in this country, but be that as it may, I would like to say, as I see it, what is likely to happen in the near future.

First, the Government will hold a Referendum in early July. Secondly, it will bring another Bill before the National Assembly for the postponement of elections, before the 25th July when the House is supposed to be dissolved. Thirdly, it will set up a Constituent Assembly, constitute the House into a Constituent Assembly. Fourthly, stretch out the work of the Assembly almost indefinitely for other four or five years. Fifthly, bring another Bill in the Parliament to ratify the draft Constitution made by the Constituent Assembly with the two-thirds majority which is already in the House. Lastly, in the changes which will be made, insert that the P.N.C. will be the paramount party in Guyana, that the P.N.C. leader will be Executive President, and, to give the National Assembly a facade of democracy, introduce in the Assembly, along with political parties thrown up at elections, certain so-called mass organizations.

I give this scenario so that the people will not be confused with all this hocus-pocus about the necessity to have a new socialist Constitution, and to give it a democratic air, that people will have a chance to write it, the Parliament, Government and Opposition, and other organizations, and the people will have a chance to have their say in making this Constitution.

Cde. Chairman, the first thing we have to think about in dealing with this Bill for the holding of a Referendum is that it is going to be rigged. The same procedures which were adopted in the last two elections will no doubt be repeated again and that is why the Government did not want to come to this House with those Motions to which I referred a little earlier dealing

with overseas voting and proxy voting and so on, so that a definitive position could be taken, yes or no, whether the Referendum would be free and fair. One of my colleagues will deal more fully with the mechanics of the elections, the making of the voters list, the proxy voting, overseas voting, postal voting and the tampering with the ballot boxes. We will get more information on that; the House will be informed.

Before I come to the point of making the House into a Constituent Assembly, the Government will, after the rigging of the Referendum, postpone the elections. On what ground? Oh, we need to have a new Constitution for a socialist Guyana. That is number one, and that needs time. What will be the mechanics? Oh, we are very democratic, we are going to appoint a Constituent Assembly made up of the Government and the Opposition in the Parliament, and the Opposition will be consulted to see what mass organizations should be brought into this Constituent Assembly in an unofficial capacity. What hypocrisy! Because in that Constituent Assembly they already have the two-thirds majority which was stolen at the last election and knowing how they operate, have operated by steamroller tactics all those years in this Parliament, we know what will be the fate of that Constituent Assembly. That is only a sop to placate public opinion in this country and abroad.

We now come to the next question. The Constituent Assembly itself. No doubt, it may be argued that in the past there was such a body, maybe it was not called the Constituent Assembly but the whole Parliament constituted itself into a Committee to put up proposals for a new Constitution. But that Assembly in 1957 came out of a free and fair election.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: On that previous occasion a democratically elected House with the Government and Opposition sat in this Committee. It included other shades of public opinion in this country that were represented in the House. By interests I mean, sugar interests, the Chamber of Commerce, and they, so to speak, representing public opinion, sat there to write a Constitution.

A speech was made over the weekend by the Prime Minister where he said that the P.P.P. did not consult the people and that certain words were used, that the people are regarded as cranks and crackpots. One thing with the Ruling Party, it is very adept at distorting things, lifting out of context certain phrases and giving them general applicability. Everybody knows that there used to be people like Bishop Ifill and clearly it was because of that that we decided at that time not to have representation from that kind of individual. I repeat, the House then represented all shades of political opinion in this country and economic interests, and therefore, we felt the House, having been elected at a free and fair election, was compe-

tent to write a draft and that draft was not a final draft. That draft was not a final draft which was automatically passed by the majority in the Parliament. What these people are now asking us to do is to agree that there will be this Constituent Assembly in which they have a majority, and then they will bring it back to the Parliament and pass it with the same majority which they have. I want to show that there is not a parallel because they will try to adduce, no doubt, in their argumentation that this was what was done by the P.P.P. Government.

As regards stretching out the work of the Assembly so that they can virtually give themselves another term in office without having been elected by the people, we have rich experience in this House about that matter. I remember when two Ministers were brought before the Ombudsman on a corruption charge instituted by Eusi Kwayana, the Prime Minister first said that there was a Bill in draft to deal with corruption and it would soon become Law. That was December, 1971. Nothing has happened up to today and that Bill has not been brought before this House. In December, 1974, in the Sophia Declaration, steps were taken to deal with that question of corruption, that all the leaders of the P.N.C. would have to report to the Leader of the P.N.C, the maximum leader.

That, again, we have not seen, although in the meantime Trinidad and Jamaica have passed integrity legislation, the same kind of law that is supposed to be drafted.

Side by side with that, they set up a Committee of this House to extend the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman to deal with questions pertaining to corruption and other related matters. That Committee was appointed towards the end of 1971 or the beginning of 1972. What happened? The elections came in July 1973 and still the Committee has not yet put up its findings. Since 1973 to now the Committee has been dissolved. So we have rich experience of how the P.N.C. can manipulate a situation to achieve the result it wants. In other words, it neither wanted the Bill in this Parliament to deal with the question of corruption nor did it want the Ombudsman's powers to be extended. So it played for time and the end result is that no report has come before this House and the Committee has been dissolved. The same thing will happen in the Constituent Assembly. It will play for time. Meantime, Bills will be passed and when the new elections do come, the Constitution would have been changed to have written into it by another amendment, as I said already, the P.N.C. as the vanguard Party or, to use the Members own words, the paramount Party, the Party which is supposed to play the leading, guiding role in the society. At the same time, the P.N.C. leader will be declared the Executive President.

We have noted how the P.N.C. Constitution itself is constructed, where the P.N.C. leader has absolute powers, not as under the democratically-run Marxist/Leninist vanguard Party where there is collective leadership and also democratic centralism. If there is in the Party Constitution that kind of unlimited power contrary to the principles of Marxism/Leninism, then it

can still be called a socialist Guyana and the Executive President can be given the same unlimited powers that De Gaulle demanded in 1968, when the Algerian crisis was on and everybody said *"bring back De Gaulle to save the nation."*

De Gaulle demanded absolute powers and at that time the French people were willing to give them to him. Here, people will not be willing, but they will take it. That is the question here. Perhaps we would not have it as they in Haiti where there is a life-Presidency, Duvalier. Papa Doc created for himself a life-Presidency, and then it became a hereditary-Presidency. After he died, it went from Papa Doc to Baby Doc, his son. In the case of the Prime Minister, unfortunately, there is no son but a daughter can do just as well. It seems that this is what we are heading for, an autocracy as well as a hereditary autocracy. All of the time when we are celebrating the twenty-five years of the Prime Minister in Parliament...

[Intervention by the Speaker]

Dr. Jagan: What else will they do in amending this Constitution? They will try to give it a facade of democracy. After all, this is not the day and age of gunboats. This is not the day and age when the imperialist and reactionary forces can willingly resort to force and get away with it. So the imperialists are now talking about human rights. So their plans everywhere have to at least pay lip service to human rights. They cannot talk about a one-Party State. Everywhere we go now we hear declarations being made, oh, we do not believe in a one-Party State. But every day, in actual practice, the rights of the people are being eroded. As a result, you have virtually a de facto one-Party State.

During the last debate, the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources mentioned their success. He said they had a two-thirds majority since the last elections and they did not take out the fundamental rights sections which they could have done if they wanted to. Again what he did not tell this House, and his colleagues did not tell this House, was the multiplicity of ways by which the Constitution has been subverted. From the Public Service Commission to other institutions like the Ombudsman and so on, the rights which are specified in the Constitution under fundamental rights have been eroded in practice. Another colleague of ours will deal with this question.

[Intervention by the Speaker]

Dr. Jagan: I was making the point that the National Assembly will be given the facade of democracy where mass organizations, along with political parties, will be given representation in the House. At the same time, the image which the Government will create will be one of nonalignment, the democratic regime, practising self reliance and urging the people to

produce or perish. Cde. Speaker, today, the word nonalignment, while as a political pose it has moved to some positive positions, nevertheless, there are many who take different positions in this movement, some working with imperialism, some working against imperialism and some sitting right in the middle straddling all the fences. So now what will we have? We are going to have trips to the West and trips to the East. We are going to have the position where we will move from the two super powers through imperialism of the 70s to a very skilful manoeuvring between the Soviet Union and China and, at the same time, instead of trying to revive the policies, instead of uniting the country, threaten the people with further penalties, that if they do not produce they will perish. We had pointed out before in this House that the Government was moving to the right. We quoted one of the bright luminaries of the P.N.C. who said that the way forward was to adopt capitalist methods. We were told he does not speak for the P.N.C. Now we have it from the horse's mouth. It was reported in the London *Financial Times* by Hugh O'Shaughnessy, in an article written by him, that:

"Mr. Forbes Burnham the Prime Minister of Guyana who had nationalized foreign-owned sugar and bauxite interests in recent years, yesterday gave a virtual pledge that new foreign investments will be immune from takeover. He made a strong appeal for foreign capital to help in the development of Guyana's land and mineral resources, including what we thought were very rich deposits of uranium."

The other day I spoke to a West German, who was interested in uranium. He wanted to know whether our policy was the same as the P.N.C.'s policy, in order that the stability in this country, from their point of view, can be ascertained. The article goes on:

"He calls for foreign investors to join with Guyanese capital in consortium to exploit Guyana's bauxite, silver and other raw materials. He also suggested joint ventures in items such as nickel."

Cde. Speaker, you will recall that when they spoke about meaningful participant in bauxite we said then that was in keeping with the new imperialist strategy of partnership which Douglas Rogers had enunciated in 1970 during his tour of Africa. We said further that the system had been tried out in Mexico where the foreign big bourgeoisies had linked up with the local bourgeoisie and all the people's revolutionary gains of the past had disappeared. He referred to Chile under Eduardo Frei where there is a similar formula under the slogan of Chileanisation of copper. Now, they're going back to the same position.

After the nationalisation of DEMBA, a *New York Times* man interviewed the Minister of Energy and then Minister Ramphal, and they said clearly that the policy was not nationalisation but partnership. They moved, and

we congratulated them for that, forward against imperialism and nationalised them. But what are they doing now, in spite of the praiseworthy things which could be credited to the Prime Minister who spoke about taking over the natural resources of the country. What are they saying now? What does it mean?

[Intervention by the Speaker]

Dr. Jagan: What they are talking about has two distinctions. One is whether foreign properties will be nationalised. That is what Hugh O'Shaughnessy spoke about. He said that the undertaking was given that there will be no nationalisation for now or in the future in his lifetime. The Prime Minister has corrected that. Let us hope that what he says here is the same thing which will report abroad because we know sometimes things are said by this Government with forked tongues. This regime is now inviting foreign capitalists to come back to exploit the natural resources of this country.

Cde. Speaker, here is a clear proof of the sellout of the interests of the people of this country. The Prime Minister also spoke about the pressures which are being put by the I.M.F. So far, they have resisted those pressures for devaluation but other aspects of those pressures have already been implemented. You dismissed the workers to balance the Budget. You remove subsidies and cut down social services. You do all of those things so that you can repay all the money you have borrowed. Debts are taking up 33 percent of the Budget. So the I.M.F. is continually putting more pressures but the Prime Minister says they have resisted the pressures dealing with devaluation.

Mr. Manley said last February that he was not going to accept the I.M.F. package but in April he devalued for the first time. In January he devalued it for the second time, and now he has devalued it for the third time. We are going to see how long this pressure is going to be resisted.

Clearly, we don't see that is going to develop because these pressures can be resisted knowing the nature of this regime. What they want to do is to get the Referendum out of the way, get the Amendment to the Constitution to postpone elections out of the way, and then put more lashes on the people through devaluation. By then, the people won't have any say in the country because they will be getting blows one after the other. That is going to be the format.

Cde. Speaker, I must turn to a few points I think need to be corrected. I have referred already to the statement that the masses are crackpots and cranks. The P.P.P. has never made a statement like that as regards the workers, the farmers. We know that there are a few people like these, like Bishop Ifill, who was another one who rode around on a bicycle with the Union Jack and so on. Everybody knows about these people. A point was made by the Prime Minister in that final paragraph of his speech. He said:

“Finally, it was not the P.N.C. that in 1962 without consulting the public, presented, albeit unsuccessfully to his British Government, a draft Constitution for an automatic adoption.”

That is a big lie! I have here the record of the 1962 Proceedings of the London Constitutional Conference. Appended to this report is a statement called Notes of Conference held at Queens College on Sunday, 14th October, 1962, to discuss views expressed by individuals and organizations in memoranda submitted by them on the proposed draft Constitution of Guyana. It goes on, speaking about me:

“Some time ago, it had been proposed by Government that the draft Constitution should be prepared and considered by the public but this plan has had to be abandoned because of the lack of cooperation by the Opposition Party.”

It goes on further:

“He also regretted,” speaking of the then Premier -

“That the P.N.C. and U.F. were not represented at the Conference. The reason given to them for this was that they did not recognize the draft and therefore could not participate in such a Conference. A saving grace (he said) was perhaps the fact that the leaders of the various parties have had discussions under the chairmanship of the Governor and a tabulated statement of their views had been prepared. In addition, the Government had a draft Constitution prepared by the U.F. and it was understood that the Secretary of State for the Colonies had requested the P.N.C. to submit their views.”

So it was not, as the Prime Minister said, that we did not consult anybody. There was a draft. That draft was put up to the public and debated. In this report, there is mention of organizations like the Junior and Senior Chambers of Commerce, the Sugar Producers' Association and other bodies which were represented at the Conference.

Incidentally, Cde. Speaker, they talk about the colonial Constitution which needs to be changed. In 1961, as a result of their help, the British Government put into the Constitution, the clause for prompt and adequate compensation, as contained in their draft. The Ramsahoye draft of 1962 took out that clause, but the Burnham draft, the Ramphal draft, re-inserted it. That is a fact. Let me read it to you – and they are now talking about the Constitution being a hindrance to them. This is one paragraph of that report. It says:

“Mr. Wilkins said there would not be a divergence of opinion from that proposed by the public if a simple statement like that appearing in the 1961 Constitution, the provision that prompt and adequate compensation will be paid, should be

re-enshrined in the draft Constitution."

Cde. Shabuddeen, the Minister of Justice, was part of all that at that time and no doubt he knows what I am talking about. So, it was not true, as the Prime Minister misinformed this nation that the P.P.P. went to London in 1962 with a draft Constitution which was rammed down the throats of the Guyanese people. That is a big, blatant lie!

Incidentally, Cde. Speaker, at that meeting, there were eighty-two organizations represented, and individuals were present, including Mr. Mohammed Nissar who now sits with the Government. He was there at the time; his name is mentioned here along with those organizations. So, it is not true to say that we railroaded this measure through the House and thus denied the rights of the people.

There was another point which was raised and that is what I would like to raise. Today, the public has spoken out against this Bill. What are those public bodies? All the Opposition Parties, the churches, the major denominations in this country have come out against this Bill, including the Guyana Council of Churches, the Hindu Dharmic Sabha, the Sad'r Anjuman along with the Methodist Church, the Catholic Church. There was held in Surinam an Episcopal Conference of the Catholic Bishops of the Antilles and they have come out against this Bill and Referendum. The bulk of the lawyers have come out against the Bill and these are not P.P.P. lawyers in the main; there was a mixed bag of all kinds of political persuasion and ideological positions. The doctors, again by a huge majority, have come out against this Bill; so have the architects, and, no doubt, as time goes on, there are going to be more and more organisations expressing their opposition to this Bill.

Cde. Speaker, what are we trying to do in this country? Are we merely trying to hold on to power by any means or do we want to see this country go forward? That is the fundamental question which has to be asked today.

If we are going to go ahead on the basis of democracy, of consultation with the masses, of involving the masses - because without their involvement you cannot solve the bottleneck of production, the crisis of production which is plaguing this country today - are we going to ride roughshod against the wishes of the total majority of the people of this country, simply because some people want to stay in offices to hold on to power and privileges?

Cde. Speaker, I would ask that this Bill be deferred. This Bill should be deferred and the Government should seek to take the opportunity to meet with all the organizations, not just the political parties, which have spoken out, and the Government must not use the press to hide information!

The *Chronicle* newspaper has refused paid advertisements from the Guyana Council of Churches and the whole galaxy of lawyers. Why is it? What are they afraid of? Why they are afraid for these two representative bodies

in Guyana to speak out and tell the public how they feel, and not only how they feel but to inform the public and educate them as the lawyers' statement was clearly indicative of?

I have a copy of last Sunday's *Chronicle*, 14th May. What does it state?

"Hysterics notwithstanding, the inconsistent position of the main opposition must be highlighted. In 1959, when the issue of Constitutional change was being debated in the legislative Assembly, Cheddi 'Braggart' Jagan was one of those who voted against the use of several Referendums as a means of changing the Constitution."

Cde. Speaker, a few days before, they took the same line. That was on Thursday, 11th May. This is what the paper stated:

"The People's Progressive Party had said that the Referendum procedure for changing the Constitution must stay. But a Government spokesman said such a position was totally inconsistent. The spokesman pointed out that as far back as 1959 when the matter of constitutional change was being discussed in the Legislative Assembly; Dr. Jagan was one of those who voted against the Referendum as a procedure for changing the Constitution. (See Report of the Constitution Commission 1959)."

Cde. Speaker, I have that report here. I will hand it over to you later on for you to peruse and see whether there was any such proposal. There was nothing about a Referendum in here! The *Chronicle* not only prints lies but uses such insulting remarks as "Braggart" Jagan. I do not mind; it does not bother me. But, for the *Chronicle*, a Government paper, paid for by the taxpayers, to descend to such low positions is a discredit to the profession of journalism. These vermin who write like this should not be sitting there being paid by taxpayers calling themselves journalists, distorting historical facts!

Here is the book! I challenge anyone to say in which chapter, in which verse in this Constitutional report I said that I was opposed to Referendum. That is why, incidentally, the P.N.C. Members of Parliament voted at that time that the call for entrenchment and any constitutional changes must be supported by the whole House. Now they have changed that position. They do not want Referendum; they do not want the whole House, because they want to pass it through the two-thirds majority which they stole at the last elections.

I conclude by saying that I challenge the *Chronicle*, I challenge the Members of the Government to put facts before the public and not lies, so that the public could be properly informed about what is taking place in this House and in this country and not use the media for the purpose of distorting history and rewriting history so that they could perpetuate themselves by misguiding the population of Guyana.

Motion – Government agreement with the I.M.F. 24th August, 1978

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, this is not the first time that this country is getting loans from the I.M.F. I have a small clipping here from the *Guyana Graphic* of the 12th May, 1973, and it says this:

“This is Guyana’s seventh stand-by arrangement with the Fund although no drawings were made under the last agreement which expires on May 14.”

But on this occasion we now have to go through Parliament and this debate and the letter of intent. Why is that? Clearly the Government has brought the country to a state of bankruptcy where it is unable to meet its bills, where it has no foreign exchange to make payments and where even they have to ask Governments to reschedule debts. So now, we have terms being imposed because the situation has reached the state of a mess. Two years ago when there was a lot of money coming in from sugar, for instance, a windfall from sugar, at that time they borrowed wildly also and they spent wildly just like the pork-knocker when he gets a big find, he has a big spree, squander it all. So today, we are in a mess. Now, the I.M.F. comes along. We are told that we need the stamp of approval of the I.M.F. and once we get this stamp of approval our credit rating will go up and we are going to be able to borrow more. That is the logic and that is the argument given by the Minister of Finance.

The problem in Guyana is not that we did not have money. This country borrowed a lot of money. The public debt of Guyana increased from \$128 million in 1964 to about \$1,400 million at the present time. It is not a question that we did not have money. The question is: where has the money gone? Where has it been put? What has it achieved? The Minister tells us the usual tale of *“all countries are in trouble; oil crisis complicated the problems of countries”*, and they went along to the World Bank, *“even the socialist countries are going to the World Bank.”* But this is to present a distorted picture. Let us say *“some”* socialist countries. The world socialist system is not in crisis. Indeed, it is because of the capitalist crisis that Nixon and company, before he was pelted out, had to open the door to the socialist world so that they could find markets in the socialist world when the dollar was devalued around 1970.

So let us get the facts clear. The socialist world in general is not in crisis; it is the capitalist world which is in crisis. Some socialist countries have been moving in this direction to the I.M.F., to other lending institutions in the capitalist world, and that is because of certain differences between some of those countries and the world socialist system in general. He spoke of Yugoslavia; he spoke of Romania; he spoke of Vietnam. But we know in

the case of Vietnam of tremendous injury which was caused by imperialism to that country, that imperialism owes a debt and must settle that debt, and if she goes to the I.M.F., then that is a duty which has to be fulfilled by the imperialists to satisfy Vietnam. But make no mistake about it, Vietnam will not be one of those who, like the P.N.C. Government, will look to imperialism for solutions. In this regard, let me say that it is the strategy of imperialism, now incapable of using the old methods of direct and indirect aggression to mould conditions to its wishes in the world. Now it is using more subtle methods and the new security Chief Brzezinski has made this quite clear. A little while ago in a magazine article, 'America in a Hostile World', he said:

"Military power by itself will no longer dictate the ability of a nation to influence political, social and cultural development."

In fact, he called for a new international economic order. Then he went on, he says:

"As regards US policies towards socialist Eastern Europe, the basic assumption of the new approach was that mere verbal hostility would not overthrow the communist regime and that events in East Germany and Hungary have demonstrated that the West did not have the will to use force. Instead of waiting for the communist regimes to collapse, the United States would henceforth bank on promoting voluntary changes within them and within the bloc as a whole."

So when we talk about socialist countries in the I.M.F., in the same way that we have political renegades, we have some deviationists not only at the individual level but at a State level, it is within the policy of imperialism to try to influence these countries to move them away from their moorings to socialism. That is in terms of overall perspective and strategy.

Let us come back to our own situation. Cde. Speaker, the Minister of Finance started out by talking about the public debate in this country. What he did not point out to us was that in Jamaica, on similar proposals such as these when put to the Government, there was a full and frank debate. Economists from the region, of the right and of the left, were lined up by the Manley Government; they included well known economists from the University of the West Indies, including the past Secretary-General of CARICOM on one side and on the other side, some of the right-wingers. What was the decision? Open frank debates!

Where was the debate here? Is this the only place where you have debate? What about the radio? What about the University? What about the newspapers? Cde. Speaker, it is a known fact that in this country open debate is becoming more and more closed. There is a stifled opposition, a stifled debate and a stifled dialogue. We speak here, okay.

Let us go back to Jamaica. In February, the Jamaican Government re-

jected the proposals on the advice of the left economists, the revolutionary progressive economists from the area. But by April pressures mounted and the right wing in the Government succumbed. There was a first devaluation and since then two other devaluations. My colleague who just spoke told us that around December, the Jamaican Government did not fulfil one condition and so did not qualify for a loan which was earmarked at that time. Stringent conditions have been imposed. We must ask what is the nature of this.

The Minister told us that the Government will not depart from the social objectives of the Government, from the courses of socialism. But how does one build socialism? Do you build socialism by attacking the working class? Do you build socialism by putting more pressures on them, by removing subsidies? What has been happening in socialist countries in this period of world capitalist crisis? The Minister of Finance is referring to coffee. No doubt, he means the high prices of coffee in the Soviet Union. What he does not understand or know is that the Soviet Union produces tea for its own domestic consumption.

Therefore, if anybody wants to buy coffee it is the policy of the Government to increase the price of that coffee. But tea is there. Where is our import substitution policy? It is in rags. Thus, we should not take out a few items here and there and distort the meaning. The fact of the matter is that the Government says that it is not going to depart from its socialist objectives. But we do not have to go very far. If we go to Barbados and Trinidad or anywhere in the West Indies there are similar economies, we will see they do not have all these high prices. As far as welfare is concerned, they have better welfare schemes. This Government boasts about free education. In little Barbados there is free transportation for children, free books. This is not in theory, but in fact. There is also one meal a day free. Send the Minister to investigate. In Trinidad, the old people get \$75 or \$76 a month pension, food stamps, and free transportation in the bus any time. We are calling ourselves a socialist State. It is no wonder that socialism is being given a bad name because in countries which do not talk about socialism, where they are practising capitalist welfarism, conditions of the people are better.

The Minister said that countries go to the I.M.F. when their balances of payment situation becomes acute and it seems that to get some more loans is the way to solve the problem. The Minister tells us about the strike. My colleague has answered that. But they know and the T.U.C. knows. A letter is before the I.L.O. stating that the strike could have been settled in five weeks had it not been for the fact that they wanted to set up a parallel union in the sugar industry to replace a union which has the confidence of over 90 per cent of the sugar workers, and because they wanted to break the strike, having robbed them through the use of scab labour, a violation of international trade union principles, in order to have the scab labour permanently employed.

Then they talked about political strike. They said the P.P.P. is out to wreck the economy. But let us take an overview because you may pick out one of these things. They talk about the weather and they talk about the strike. What basically is the reason for our balance of payments problem? One, production stagnation, and two, not enough exports to earn foreign exchange. All we hear is about a fall in the price. What about the quantity that we export. In rice, in 1964/1965 we exported 101,000 tons and ten years after, in 1974/1975, we exported 73,000 tons. That is rice, one of the major crops of Guyana. This is a reality. During the P.P.P. time, rice production in seven years increased by 74 percent compared with the previous period. During the P.N.C. time for a similar seven year period, it increased by 0.6 percent. Why all the bellyache about the drop in the price? Everybody knows that. What about your own acts of omission and commission?

Yesterday, the Chairman of the Rice Board said that about \$18 million worth of equipment was standing around more or less in the wreck in less than five years. I have the quotation here from the newspaper and the same thing can be said. This is what appeared in yesterday's *Chronicle*:

"More than \$18 million worth of equipment less than five years old was nonoperational and lying around various sites."

A few weeks ago there appeared in the same *Chronicle* an article from another Government official who talked about \$300-odd million worth of equipment in wrack.

Cde. Chairman, sugar production was also in stagnation. It increased in a 10-year period by 5 percent. The Government and the Ministry must ask themselves why? Until you answer that particular question you will always be in this position. So the first problem of our Balance of Payments in a crisis of production; there is a stagnation in exports and whatever little foreign exchange we earn, we have to pay \$154 million this year as compensation and debt payments.

A few years ago when we were talking about the debt problems, they laughed us to scorn. They had one person who is no economist to write long articles in the *Chronicle* to tell us about debt burden and debt service ratio in terms of exports and all of that. Well, we have the figures now. It is climbing by leaps and bounds; going up fantastically. From 15 percent of the Budget expenditure in 1964 to 33 percent today and as a percentage of exports it is also climbing; from 12 percent of export of goods and services in 1977 to 18 percent this year. My colleague has given some startling figures to show that we are in a sorry mess where we are borrowing less that we are paying out. That is what is happening in this country at the moment.

How are we going to solve these problems? By borrowing more? The more we borrow the greater we pay and looked at from the Budget point of view, there is a higher percentage of the Budget meaning a cut in the social

services sector, a decline in that sector. So you try to balance the Budget at the expense of the working class; you try to solve the balance of payments problem by again hitting the working class. You cut imports so you have long lines; so you have black-marketing. Don't only talk about the poor man black-marketing, talk also of Government black-marketing. Talk also about the Government adding on not only what we see in the Budget but also increased amounts for the goods which they buy at the State level.

Why it is that cement in Barbados and Trinidad is being sold for \$6 and it is being sold here for nearly double the price? Why is it? Is freight from Trinidad to here double? Barbados does not produce cement. Cde. Speaker, the problem is that they buy the cement from Cuba where they get it even cheaper than when they buy it from the capitalist countries. How much did you pay for soap from the G.D.R.? And how much are you selling soap for? Tell us.

In previous years when the E.T.B. bought goods from merchants they used to specify the original cost, the cost of handling, shipping, insurance, freight etc., and put on a service charge. Nowadays, they don't do that any more; they give you one blanket price, apart from the Budget taxes which we have seen which are so very steep in this country. Let me give you some figures. From 1964 to the present time, direct and indirect taxation increased from \$65 million in 1964 to \$374 million in 1978. These are what we know about in the Budget. What we don't see are the various frauds that are being committed on the working people of Guyana. So the State is buying at the moment and the State is selling at uncontrolled prices; it sells at what it likes.

How do you expect to solve this problem? If you continue to borrow money your debt problem will become bigger and bigger. You may have to reschedule the debts. I notice that the Minister of Finance is talking about that. I know that you are going to use the phrase "*roll over to the next year.*" That is not in the long-term sense but in the one-year sense.

Brazil, Argentina, Peru, those countries had their debts rescheduled, and what has happened? They borrowed more and more like this Government is doing and Brazil reached a point where two years ago the United States Government refused to reschedule the debts. Peru had a strong anti-imperialist position, much firmer than this Government only a few years ago, but because of the debt problem they have been forced to move backwards from Alvarez to Bemudez, moving now to a pro-imperialist position. But the Government says it will not do that at all, and that is why it is important for us to speak in terms of what are the main aims and objectives of the I.M.F.

My colleague referred to a book by Theresa Haytor. This individual used to work for an organization called the Overseas Development Institute and she was asked to do the study. This was financed mainly by the World Bank. When she had finished the study, because she began to get into the meat of how the World Bank, the I.M.F., and the American Institute

for Development operated, the O.D.I. refused to publish this after pressure was put on it by the World Bank and the I.M.F. It is important to know that. She had to leave the job and she is now teaching at Oxford. It is important that comrades who are dealing with this question should familiarize themselves with this book because it is rather comprehensive. On page 25 she says the following:

“The concern of the World Bank and of the United States A.I.D. with influencing macroeconomic policies in Latin America is fairly recent. They were preceded in this field by the I.M.F. Involvement of the World Bank, the A.I.D., and the I.M.F. has come about through differing processes and their methods of trying to get their solutions adopted also vary. Nevertheless the three institutions now work quite closely together and there is, it is often said, ‘a broad identity of views’ between them. It is these institutions, and not the others of the Inter-American system, which actually conduct the negotiation with Latin-American governments on general economic policies, and on linking the provision of financial resources to the adoption of particular policies.”

Looking through my files, I saw that in 1975 a Mr. Beharry, an economist from Jamaica now working with the World Bank, came here and said that he wanted to make a profile study of Guyana. Since then, we have seen a whole lot of people coming here: other people from the World Bank, other people from the I.M.F., other people from private institutions, the Rockefeller Foundation, for instance. And what has been the result since then? We have referred to, in this House already, the statement made by Fred Sukdeo at one time a very close economic adviser to the Government, where he spoke of the need to adopt new policies which will move Guyana towards the capitalist form of development.

Cde. Speaker, since then, we have heard it even from the horse’s mouth because they were saying *“who is Sukdeo?”* He is not speaking for the Government. The Prime Minister when he was in London was interviewed at a press conference and he indicated, and this was reported in the *Financial Times*, that foreign capital will be welcomed in Guyana. There was also a statement in the *Financial Times* that nationalization would be shelved. The next day the *Chronicle* published a correction by the Prime Minister which stated that he never said that, but what he said was that private investors would be coming here under certain conditions and if the Government intended to nationalize then; well then, those statements would be inserted in the agreements.

Well, we have had other statements made. Nicolas Caserlink, who came here, after speaking with the Minister of Finance told businessmen, and this was reported in the *Chronicle*, that private enterprise was alive and well in Guyana and that from the discussions he had with Cde. Hope it was clear that the Government was interested in promoting private sector investment.

Could it be that because of the need now to have more capital, to have the stamp of approval of the I.M.F. which works side by side in close consultation with the World Bank, with the I.D.A., with the Inter-American Bank and so on, that the Government has given undertakings the people of Guyana are not privy to. After all, we know the record of this Government. Soon after it got in there were secret agreements made. Secret agreements with Reynolds freezing income tax for 25 years, giving them concessions, leases to a quarter million acres of land for 75 years; they signed a secret agreement allowing the American Government to build military installations at Timehri to land military aircraft, military equipment and military personnel, etc. Up to today that has not been brought to attention officially. It had to come from Mr. Philip Habeeb when he visited Guyana last year that the US Government is no longer interested in that facility which was made by that secret agreement.

What secret agreements have you made now? What other commitments have you given? These are questions which the Guyanese people have to ask because we know from experience that such agreements have been made in the past which sold out the birthright of the people of this country. And we do not want to solve our problems by putting this country in a direction where it will once again come within the tentacles of imperialism. Cde. Speaker, there is one question we must ask and this is very fundamental. Let the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Economic Development tell this House which one single country in the developing world has gone to the I.M.F. and has sorted out its financial and economic problems. Name one! Countries in Latin America have a longer experience with the I.M.F. and they have been ruined. Their economies today are far worse than they were a few years ago, before the war. Not that they were in any such healthy state before but the I.M.F. formula, the so-called stabilisation programme, has not helped them to come out of their problems. As a result many of these countries have moved politically in a dictatorial way, some of them having outright fascism because they could not cope with the problems and the people. They tried to solve the crisis at the expense of the people and when the people fought back they brought out the military and this is what we are already seeing in Guyana.

Strikes are legal according to the Constitution but the Minister of Economic Development threatens: *"You all want to strike? Try it! Try it!"* It is not only sugar workers now. What about Samson's workers? What about bauxite workers? What about municipal workers? What about Guyana Transport Services? They said that part of the money from the International Monetary Fund is to deal with the workers, not by normal workers industrial relations practices but by military things. Carrington knows and that is why he is sitting in the Back Benches so that the military means can be used. They ask, if not loans, what is the answer? Experience has shown, not only in Guyana but other Third World countries, that loans alone do not solve the problems of development. The I.M.F. stabilisation pro-

grammes do not deal adequately with the whole problem of underdevelopment.

A big debate has been going on with the people in the Economic Commission for Latin America, and the International Monetary Fund, between what they call the monetarists and the structuralists. The monetarists see the problems only from the point of view of the effects, you have balance of payments problem, you have budgetary deficits, well let us solve them. If you cannot solve the budgetary problems you will not be able to pay back the debts, you will default and so you look at the effects. They say balance the budget, stop the imports, solve the balance of payments problems, do it at the expense of the workers.

The structuralists say that this problem has to be solved in a more fundamental way. Starting from the question of production, starting from the point of land in the countryside, land reform we heard a lot about land for the tillers. All right, we thought it was necessary to get through with the rigged Referendum. What is being done to help the poor farmers to take them off the hook of the landlords? What about income redistribution? If you are going to talk about consumption you must talk about income redistribution. What is being done by this Government about that? The public sector is paid certain wages to try to cope with the cost of living. What happens to the private sector? Why don't you try to protect the workers? What about sawmilling? What about coconut estates? What about ground provisions? Are these not involved in making up the accounts? Why is it the Government does not want to protect them also by national minimum wage legislation? Soon we are going to hear them say they do not want to interfere with collective bargaining, yet the army is being used every day to settle strikes. Merely to borrow money is not the way out and then be subject to the dictation of the imperialists, to fashion your economy, to direct it in a certain way, in a capitalist way. They are not going to come and tell you denationalise. Of course, they are going to stop you from further nationalisation.

What about the banks? Brave words were uttered not too long ago by the Prime Minister. He talked about miniaturization of the banks in 1970 and he spelt that out further to me that the foreign banks will not be allowed to borrow money or to get savings from the Guyanese people; if they operate here they have to operate from money which they bring into the country. There were suggestions that they will be nationalized in 1976. Where is the miniaturization? Where is the nationalisation? Today, the country is heavily indebted to these banks and they were allowed to up their interest rates. Ask the Bank of Guyana how much we owe in short-term credits to these banks here. Then you will see how much they are raking off and then we are going to make further commitments to the I.M.F. Depreciation allowances will be allowed to be exported. We are giving assurances that there will be no more restrictions for balance of payments reasons. Manley, at the beginning, drew on variable currency rates to pro-

tect the consumers. You are giving assurances that you will not have such currency rates. In other words, what are you doing? You are laying the foundation for further pressures on the Guyanese working people and to facilitate the imperialists and the capitalists of this country.

Mention was made of the huge loans and the big schemes. This House has not yet been presented with feasibility studies of these major schemes to show the earning capacity to meet some of those huge payments which will not have to be made. Outright criticism during the Budget Debate was that very little in the new Plan is going to be earmarked for energy (electrical) development and little or nothing for the manufacturing industry. So we cannot see that all this borrowing and all this spending will solve the basic problems which you have right now. Indeed, they are going to be aggravated. It was asked, "*What would we do*". This question is being asked now also in Jamaica. Is there an alternative to the I.M.F. proposals? I prefaced my remarks by saying that no Third World country which has depended on the I.M.F. has solved its problems. On the other hand, we have one country in this hemisphere which had the same problem. I refer to Cuba. Cuba has problems, nobody will deny that. But Cuba does not have the basic problems that we have, a problem of high unemployment, the problem of these measures increasing the unemployment problem, the problem of health and the problem of education. They have not got those problems that we have. Why is it that Cuba does not face the same problems that Guyana faces? It does not face the same problems that we have because it has made basically vital fundamental structural changes. That is what is lacking in Guyana. How are you going to solve the crisis of production and productivity when daily we hear of inefficiencies?

The Luckhoo Report was handed to the Prime Minister. The preliminary report speaks of gross inefficiency. How are we going to solve these problems? I have just given figures about the Rice Board. One can go on like that in the whole Public Service. How are you going to solve these problems, unless you solve those problems of political patronage and political interference and racial and political discrimination? How are you going to solve them? They are built into the body politics of Guyana. You cannot solve that.

The Prime Minister has now become Sir Galahad and a shining knight. He is going to go all around and drive out the corrupt. Poor Civil Servants, their backs are very broad and they can take a lot of licks, licks like peas. But the corruption starts at the top at the political level. If you choke and rob to get a whole Government, what do you expect? What are the other people at the bottom going to do? And all the way from the top to the bottom? What do you expect? Corruption is a way of life in this country.

Incidentally, why is it these people were not charged before the Referendum? It was well known about the sixteen-odd that were brought before the courts, it was published, but you thought that if you did it perhaps it would affect you in the Referendum. But that would not have made any

difference. You didn't get more than 10 percent anyway. Your confidential report said 13.7 percent. You didn't see it? We know lots more than you know. Even with the multiple voting you couldn't muster anything. That is what is so tragic about the present situation.

This is what their blue-eyed boy Mr. Sukdeo said on 19.10.1975:

"Unless there are revolutionary changes in the State sector and the remainder of the economy, there is a possibility that state capitalism will be the dominant form of relationship in the society. Although this may be considered as an advancement on private enterprise it cannot solve the increasing demands of the society."

What have they done to solve this problem? Where is workers' control? Where is workers' participation? Where is the integrity legislation? Where are the watchdog committees? Where are the workers in the Corporations looking at accounts? They do at GIMPEX, don't worry. You must send your man to Narbada's New Guyana; they will learn something there, about workers' control.

Cde. Speaker, they ask what is the solution, what is the alternative? The alternative is clear. One, stop the payment of debts; stop the payment of compensation. The Prime Minister in 1971, when he needed our support to nationalise the bauxite industry, when I asked how much he is going to pay, he said \$100 million. How much interest? No interest, he called Ramphal to verify it in front of me. When he got pressure, \$100 million went to \$107 million; no interest became 6 percent, from forty years and above to pay, to 20 years. When I told them, *"Why don't you apply the Allende formula?"* he said, *"You want what happened to Allende to happen to me?"*

They are all living well. They are socialist. Look at their allowances; look at their salaries, and they are telling the small man to tighten his belt. They are well off. They don't want to die but the people must die, the people must bear the burdens. That is one area.

Thirty-three percent of Government's Budget expenditure is going to pay debts and compensation. Our Balance of Payments problem is due to the fact that we have to pay a lot of money going abroad. That is one area which you can stop. Secondly, the political elite is too big and expensive apart from the extravagance which was referred to already. We have said to cut down since the Budget of last year. Cut down certain areas where savings can be made; the P.N.C. Ministry of National Development, the Propaganda Ministry, and the Foreign Ministry which are all propaganda arms where millions of dollars are going down the drain.

Finally, if you want to go to socialism you have to stop carrying out a war against the population. You cannot produce and have productivity by mere pleas. With 10 to 15 percent holding down the majority of the people of this country, you cannot solve the bottleneck of production. This is a known fact. This is a truism and you have to get down to recognizing that

reality, that fact.

The Prime Minister spoke in 1970 about foreign capital, how foreign capital cannot develop the country. My comrade read a statement he made then. The Deputy Prime Minister, Dr. Reid, also made similar strong statements at that time about the question of private capital. He told the P.N.C. Congress in 1970:

“Aid is tied to political or expected political alignment to the donor country in major matters on the world scene, and as part of this scheme, key officers in the underdeveloped countries are subject ostensibly on training to indoctrination in the donor country or sent on free trips so that they could become sympathetic to the way of life and thinking in the donor countries.”

He was merely restating what the Prime Minister had said on this point. That time Mr. Burnham told the civil servants that training schemes, foreign aid, foreign investments are not capable of ensuring the maximum development of our resources.

These were statements made. What about the A.I.D. and the World Bank? William Gaud, who is the administrator for the A.I.D., urged Americans to accept aid for development *“as an integral part of our own foreign policy and essential to our own interest.”*

No doubt we are going to hear that other countries are borrowing money. It is the old theme song. But let me repeat, other countries, socialist countries have used credits and loans for the further development of socialism to proceed from advanced socialism to communism. That is the stage. Not in this stage where we are. We have not even laid the foundations to socialism, not even the preconditions and we go stupidly to Cuba and we are saying how we are advancing in Guyana from advanced socialism to communism; even beyond Cuba.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: I want to give you facts but you do not want to accept them. We know that you are short on theory and ideology. We do not want to blame you for that. I only tell you to advise the boys.

Cde. Speaker, our solution as I said is based on one, stop those payments. Egypt had a loan of \$4000 million from the Soviet Union for the Aswan Dam under Nasser. Under Sadat, who has moved the country to the right, Egypt has now cancelled all payments to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is not an imperialist nation. These people used to talk about two imperialisms not so long ago. Now, they criticize in just the same way. The *New Nation* had an article the other day where it criticized aid from both sides as being aid which is on a self-interest basis. Be that as it may, Egypt cancelled loan payments to the Soviet Union which helped Egypt in a critical situation where the World Bank, when the British Government,

the American Government, cancelled all aid offers for the Aswan Dam after Nasser had nationalized the Suez Canal. Then, the aid was cut off also because he had traded with, sold cotton to, Czechoslovakia and bought factories and arms. The Soviet Union came in and now we find that Sadat who has moved the country to the right has cancelled those debts.

Well, if a Third World country can cancel or refuse to pay to a socialist country, I see no reason why a Third World country like Guyana which says that it is taking an anti-imperialist, socialist course, cannot do the same. We know as a fact that when the negotiators want to negotiate with Bookers, Kennard and Sukdeo offered one dollar compensation. But that was raised to \$102 million at 6 percent interest to be paid in twenty years plus a lot of perks on the side.

So, Cde. Speaker, the position is this: we have to grapple with this nettle and this will mean dealing firmly on that one score. On the second score of the bureaucratic elite, the political elite, that question has to be looked after also, and the mere political expenditure as distinct from legitimate governmental expenditure, has to be looked after also.

In June, 1976, the P.P.P. put forward a seventeen-point programme. I do not want to tire the House by reciting those seventeen points. Those were re-summarised in the National Front Proposal that the P.P.P. put forward last year. Okay, the P.N.C. has rejected the call for a National Patriotic Front Government but there is nothing to prevent the P.N.C. from adopting those policies; in other words, dealing with the imperialists firmly.

The next point is to develop a planning strategy which will remove us from the shackles and the controls of imperialism. We are still tied not only to the I.M.F. as we will be now, that means US imperialism, but indirectly through CARICOM to the big imperialist concerns cited mainly in Trinidad. I do not have to recite the figures. They were raised already in this House, how Guyana is at a disadvantage in having to purchase from Trinidad industrial goods which are even more expensive than if they were bought from the capitalist countries.

What about relations with the socialist world? What about strengthening those relations? I do not mean only by visits - economic relations, trade relations. A Jamaican Minister recently mentioned that drugs for veterinary services could be bought in Hungary, he said, I believe the price was one-sixteenth of the price that is demanded in the capitalist countries. What have we done to diversify our trade? In this Agreement that the Government has now signed, it can no longer put quantitative restrictions. Anything produced in CARICOM it has to buy. Look at the statistics again. The Government has been talking...

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: The Agreement is here. This is paragraph 15 of the Stand-By Arrangement:

“In addition to the reduction of arrears mentioned above, the Government is prepared to rescind the prohibition on transfers abroad of funds arising from depreciation allowances by foreign-based companies at an early date, but in any case prior to October 31, 1978. Considering the extent of the existing disequilibrium, a further liberalization of the trade and payments system will not be possible during the programmed period. However, should the current account of the Balance of Payments strengthen substantially more than is anticipated in the programme, the Government intends to further liberalize the system. Finally, during the period of the stand-by arrangement, the Government does not intend to introduce any multiple currency practice, impose new or intensify existing restrictions on payments and transfers for current international transactions, or impose new or intensify existing restrictions on imports for balance of payments reasons.”

The imperialists will impose on you. Tell me how much in goods you must buy from COMECON countries? The point is this, there is all this demagoguery about socialism, rhetoric alone cannot bring socialism. Theory has to be married to practice. You should not have one policy here and one policy there, not just mere nationalisation. We have to look at it in a comprehensive way; workers' control, planning strategy, the question of democracy, the question of discrimination which has to do, as I said before, with efficiency, insubordination. That is why we said you have an alternative. You want to be in Government, you rigged a Referendum to extend your life. All right. Do not pressure the Guyanese people. Take the alternative. If you say you are socialist, the P.P.P. from outside, from the Opposition, will back you, as it has backed you in times of crisis. Take the road to socialism by hitting the imperialists and the capitalists, not the working class.

Do you know that in the countryside today, because of their policies toward the small agricultural farmer, he is being liquidated and a capitalist type of agricultural structure is developing? I was in Surinam this past week and the same thing is happening there. The only difference between here and there is that, there, the private capitalists are the cause of black-marketing and they are squeezing the small man. But here, it is state capitalism and other parasites attaching themselves to the corporations, like the Rice Marketing Board, and robbing the farmers so that only the big boys who are in the Rice Action Committees and other places can survive. Those who have means can get more means. Those who have contacts can get support through political patronage.

This is what the I.M.F. wants. This is what the Americans want. This is how they defeated a revolutionary Government in Bolivia by building up a new bourgeoisie. A new bourgeoisie is being built up today in the countryside because of the policy of the Government and yet they talk about socialism. They do not want workers' control in the nationalized enterprises. If they were socialists, all this jazz about the workers having to be educated – the workers in the Soviet Union in 1917 were more illiterate

generally then here in Guyana. Their level of literacy was lower than in Guyana. Lenin did not talk a lot of nonsense about educating workers before they can be put in workers' control, but you all rationalise so that you can carry on with your nefarious practices and allow a new bourgeois class to develop both in the town and in national enterprises and in agriculture. That is what the imperialists want and what the I.M.F. wants. They are going to lend you some money not to have balanced agricultural industrial development, but to serve their purpose and to see that this country proceeds not on a socialist course but on a capitalist course, and all the talk about socialism will end.

I am about to conclude. This country today is heading on the road to disaster. Other Governments have faced the same problems that we face, but other Governments were not in the fortunate position that this Government is in, in that, one, it has a responsible Opposition and, two, that 90 percent of this country, if the members of the Government were serious about socialism, will be backing this Government. Despite that fact that they hold on to power by fraud, if they were really serving the people they would get the backing of the people. This is why we fear for the future of this country because mere rhetoric is not going to help the cause of socialism either in Guyana or elsewhere in the Caribbean.

We are being told that we are great integrationists, that the West Indies is our first concern and so on. Well, I can tell you that Guyana's name is mud today in most countries in the region and they would like to avoid Guyana like a plague. This is why we urge this Government to study the proposals of the P.P.P., the seventeen-point proposals which were put out in 1976 during the Enmore Martyrs Day Commemoration ceremony and try to implement these proposals in a comprehensive way. We cannot look at development by merely picking out one thing here and another there and say we are building socialism. We have to look at the economic base and the political superstructure, the ideological superstructure, institutional superstructure and cultural superstructure. Only when we make corresponding changes in all these places will we be able to solve the basic problem which is causing all this trouble. We have to look at the problem of production and productivity. If you do not do that, as night follows day, this country is heading for disaster. Only by the implementation of those proposals, in a comprehensive way, National Patriotic Front or no National Patriotic Front, will there be a solution to the country's problems to create a new and better Guyana.

Administration of Justice Bill: 1st November, 1978

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, this Bill called the Administration of Justice Bill is really misnamed. It should really be called the Administration of Injustice Bill. The mover of this Bill took great pains to give us a discourse about the administration of justice, how it evolved in the United Kingdom. How strange it is that at some times Members from the Government when reference is made and called about matters pertaining to the United Kingdom they speak of colonial mentality. On this occasion, when it suits the Government, the Members give us a long discourse about the origins of the jury system and how the administration of justice has evolved so much so that magistrates today deal with, as he put it, nearly 90 percent of the indictable cases.

Your Honour, it is necessary to deal with this matter historically and dialectically and not see this matter merely as a technical question. That is what the Hon. Minister of Justice attempted to do. It is not a question of the competence of a judge or a magistrate; it is much more than that. He said the jury system developed in the England because at that time practically in all cases the penalty was a capital one. But what he failed to point out is that the jury system developed in the United Kingdom as part of a general struggle for democracy and freedom in that country. Underlying the whole concept of trial by jury is that a person must be tried by his peers and I need not tell the mover of the Bill, and he is well aware of it, that in England they chopped off the head of a King in order to ensure the fundamental rights of the people. As I said, included among these, the right to vote, the right for the workers, the ordinary person to be elected to Parliament, even to make the House of Commons, the supreme chamber, higher than the House of Lords. Those were reforms which went through in the whole political system of the United Kingdom. And to deal mainly with the administration of justice and isolate that from that general development is really to put one's head in the sand.

Okay, he says now 90 percent of the cases are tried by Magistrates. But what he didn't tell us is the atmosphere in which the administration of justice operates in the United Kingdom. Can we say that in the United Kingdom today, there is a similar political mayhem as in Guyana?

Cde. Speaker, they didn't rig the Constitution in the United Kingdom. They didn't rig a Referendum to extend the life of the Government. The Government in the United Kingdom is not a Government which gets its power by fraud. The Government of the United Kingdom is a Government which gets its power by consent of the people and the whole political system, the judicial system operates within that framework. And if within that framework people elect to have trial by magistrates, it could also mean that they have confidence in the judicial system. Thus they are willing in

that political system, and the way it operates, to elect that they go to magistrates instead of to a jury. In other words, despite the fact that statistics were given to show that about 90 percent of the cases go to the magistrates, nevertheless, the Minister of Justice was careful to point out that still the accused person's right to elect has not been removed. At least that is what I understood from what he said. But the fact that he elects to go also is an indication that he is confident in the judicial system because he is operating within a total political system founded on democracy.

Bourgeois democracy, though it may be, nevertheless, it is a horse of a different colour from a 10 percent Government which we have here, where people have no confidence at all in the Government nor in the institutions of the Government including those having to do with the administration of justice. The Minister argues by way of simple analogy. Your Party calls itself Marxist. Maybe they haven't taught you about historical and dialectical imperialism. So you can come to this House and argue historically and dialectically, so that we can compare situations in a proper way.

What is the situation in our country? Jomo Kenyatta was taken when he was fighting for liberation not for a trial by jury but to a remote village where magistrates tried him. What happened? Seven years! Where was the Minister of Justice then? His leader was then arguing against Burnham. The P.P.P. was then arguing against the injustice of that system of that kind of manipulation.

Where would Nazruddeen and Bowman have been in 1953 when the British piled on them a charge of sedition, if it were left to the British Colonial Government to decide which magistrate should try them? Where would they have been?

It is not just a technical matter, as the Minister tries to make it appear, the decision whether the case should go before a magistrate or a judge and jury. It is a technical matter and, as he put it, even the magistrate himself will have to make a judicial decision whether he is competent to handle the matter. All he will have to do is to get a phone call. He doesn't have to worry with technical competence and judicial decision. We know how things work here. A phone call is enough and political direction is given. You do so and so. You and you will try this case. We have had flying magistrates. We have had some people promoted over others as a result of which two senior magistrates in this country packed up their bags and left long ago. The Hon. Minister knows that.

It is not a question of technical competence. Why is it Rodney is not given a job at the University even though members of the Selection Committee of the Academic Board attest to the fact that he is competent and qualified to have a job as Head of the History Department. Who decided that he must not get the job? Who did? Who sits on the Board of Governors and what is the Minister of Education doing about it now? When he was in the Opposition he was the one jumping up and making a lot of noise about it, but when they get on the side of the Government and they get

\$3,500 a month, their mouths are shut. They come in and talk; they stifle their consciences and they rationalise; they rationalise as they do now in this interest of moving the system, clearing up the backlog, etc.

That kind of rationalization is not good enough when we are dealing with a situation like Guyana, where we see framed up charges, where we see police withholding important evidence which is in favour of the defence. Take the Arnold Rampersaud case for example. We have got the case against Balwant Singh, the political case against Kumar. Is it that you are afraid of the jury? Why are you afraid of the jury? Are we to look only at expense or money when the liberty of the subject is at stake? Surely, money is wasted in so many ways in this country.

Look! The Deputy Prime Minister only a little while ago said that the corporations have a right and, indeed, a duty to spend thousands of dollars to give salutations to the P.N.C. Congress but the Government does not have money to appoint more judges. Why? It is not that. It is because they now have this 10 percent Government and cannot trust the jury any longer. Even their own supporters are rebelling against them and they can no longer have confidence in the jury system, so, they want to manipulate the system for political purposes.

We speak of technical qualification. Mr. Ramphal, when he was here as Attorney General spoke about the rule of law. He said the Constitution provided for a Supreme Court, an independent judiciary, and institutional procedures for appointment by the Judicial Service Commission and constitutional guarantees securing the tenure of the judges. Nice words! That was in 1965 when the Constitution was being sold to the public. But what do we find today in the context of the paramountcy of the Party? Judges are intimidated by P.N.C. flags pointed right next door to remind them. In the same way that the corporations, whether they like it or not, have to send messages at public expense, so the judges are warned: *"Remember who is giving you bread!"* So, we have the P.N.C. flag flying all over the place even in Courts. We had, during the Referendum not too long ago, instances where police vehicles were carrying stickers marked *"Vote Yes for the Bill"*. Police stations and courts all had signs urging the public to vote in favour of the Referendum. We have other examples but I do not want to tire the House by naming them.

The fact of the matter is that the P.N.C. has arrogated to itself all powers. Just now, two Ministers swore to uphold the Constitution. Which Constitution? They first manipulated the Constitution by appointing technocrat Ministers and paying more of their backbenchers to do Party work at public expense. Maybe, now that the T.U.C., the postal workers, the teachers and the civil servants are raising hell in the streets, they are knocking them off now, making enemies, and they are making the technocrat Ministers elected Ministers. That little fraud went on before.

Why is it that a letter of appointment from the Chancellor of the Judiciary which was approved by the Judicial Service Commission giving ap-

pointment to a leading barrister in this country was countermanded? Who did it? Was it the Minister of Justice? Maybe he should be here to tell us. We want information like that, not a lot of rationalisation. Let him tell us who countermanded that decision? Two Ministers were swearing to uphold the Constitution. What did the Minister of Justice do then? The Constitution was violated. Mr. Ramphal talked about an independent judiciary and a Judicial Service Commission. So, why tell us you are not talking to children in this country today, that it is simply a technical matter and the magistrates will use their judicial consciences. Things do not work like that in Guyana today. We see civil servants and others being coerced to do the dirty work of the P.N.C. though Public Service Unions, Teachers' Unions and the T.U.C. passed a Resolution condemning such practices at their last 25th annual conference last month. But, it goes on. You see them outside there. Poor people, they are being coerced to do the dirty work of the P.N.C. How then do you expect in this context that we must give approval to this measure?

Your Honour, we have before us not only a framed-up charges, to which I referred, against Arnold Rampersaud, Balwant Singh, Ganraj Kumar and others but we know of some people who are being given preference in appointments and promotions while others, though competent, are kept out, no doubt by political orders given from high up. We also must ask; what is the competence of some of these who have been appointed as judges and magistrates? What are the qualifications which they have? Is it competence and experience which are the criteria as it used to be in this country at one time, even in the bad old colonial days? Or, is it now bootlicking and the search for promotion and personal advancement? This is the kind of thing which is going on today in Guyana.

Not so long ago we debated two measures in this House. It was just when the 1977 sugar strike started. One was to re-enact the National Security Act, Part II of which provided for detention without trial. The Minister of Justice did not tell us whether England has that. At the same time, the Government rushed through this Parliament another measure to take away from the accused after he is convicted, the right to be free when he has applied to the Appeal Court. They took that away and they put it in the hands of the magistrate and the magistrate now has the discretion to decide whether or not the person must be given bail. We were told then that this was to catch some hardened criminals. When we referred to what obtains in England, we were told, "*Oh, you have a colonial mentality*", and now chapter and verses about England is being cited to us.

What is the fact of the matter in practice? We saw during the sugar strike the same magistrate, whom we are supposed to have confidence in, imposing excessive bail of \$10,000 for simple little offences and in some cases bail was refused. We had the ludicrous case of a charge made against an individual by the police for public terror. Some lawyers said they have never seen that in the law books. Where was the right to strike, where was

the right to picket, where was the right to peaceful demonstration? All of that was violated by the police and they made ridiculous charges. The magistrates, some of them also no doubt knowing where their bread is buttered, refused in some cases, as I said, to give bail and in other cases they put up fantastic bail. Even more than that, one magistrate in a decision told the accused that the bail is being granted to him provided he goes back to the cane field. This is the kind of judicial system we are asked to have confidence in. Mr. Minister, this is not England.

I do not uphold capitalism, but capitalism has certain norms of behaviour, what is called bourgeois democracy, those which the British people fought for from the days of Magna Carta. Those have become established within the system. Therefore, we have to ask ourselves whether we have that in Guyana. It seems to me that all these measures which the Government is imposing have to be seen in a framework of our political development. In other words, the bourgeois democracy which was there when the Government took power is being cast aside. Why?

We would not say that these people in the Government benches are evil men. We know they have certain petit bourgeois nationalist interests. But we would not ascribe malice. The fact of the matter is that this regime is becoming more and more unpopular daily and as the people fight back to defend their living standards, the Government is becoming, step by step, more and more autocratic and this is only one of a long series of measures which we have seen. Cde. Carrington deserves the name comrade. He, a trade unionist, growing up in the ranks of one of the most militant trade unions in this country, accepted as part of his blood, democratic industrial relations. Of course, at some times under pressure, he buckles. But by and large he was a trade union democrat. But that was not good enough for the P.N.C. at this historical period, when they want to set up parallel unions, when they rig union elections as they did in Linden, when they want to bring out the army, the military and the paramilitary forces against the workers as they did at Linden, as they did with the municipal workers last year, and as they did during the sugar strike. They cannot handle any more because of their autocratic and anti-democratic methods and their anti-working class policies. They can no longer practice democracy. Thus, everything goes by the board, principles.

We saw in the sugar strike where policemen seized food belonging to strikers. They will have to answer to the I.L.O. because they signed certain conventions. They do not only do that but also, as I said, they perverted the whole administration of justice when it came to that strike. Since 1963, when the P.P.P. was in Government, it was agreed that on all matters pertaining to labour, where labour has a vital interest, there will be consultation with the T.U.C. and the respective organizations.

As I said, Your Honour, since 1963, when the Labour Relations Bill was in this House, when the P.N.C. took to the streets along with other forces, when there was an 80-day strike, it was agreed in the settlement of that

strike that in future there should be consultation with the T.U.C. and other unions in all matters pertaining to labour where they have the vital interest. What has happened? Recently, the Government increased the N.I.S. contributions by 462 percent. Previously, they had increased it when they said that it was necessary to reduce the age from 65 to 60. They enlarged the ambit of the Widows and Orphans Fund to include teachers, police personnel, nurses, and no doubt, soon all Government Corporation workers will be included. When this matter was raised in this House we deliberately asked, was there consultation with the T.U.C., the respective unions, the P.S.U., the Teachers' Association, etc.? The Minister of Finance said, yes. Now the T.U.C., the P.S.U. and the Teachers' Association are saying there was no consultation whatsoever. Who is lying? Cde. Speaker, I think it is the duty of the Minister of Finance to come in this House and give a statement on this question. Profumo once lied in the Parliament in England and he had to resign.

Cde. Speaker, this is a serious matter. As you know decisions have been taken to have industrial action to move towards a general strike. If this consultation had taken place, perhaps they wouldn't have been in this position. How can you go about talking about produce or perish? How can you go about saying we don't have enough money to employ more judges and establish more courts? That is the rationalisation, "we can't afford it", therefore, let us modify the system but really what modification means is a manipulation of the system for political purposes.

The arrogance of this Government! It feels it can do anything, because it has the bayonets behind it. But time will show that you can hold down the people for a while with the bayonets but you can't produce the food and the goods. I have a little book here called *The Trojan Horse* by Sherill Payer. On page 68 she writes:

"It should be clear by now that the I.M.F. plays an intensively political role in its dealing with economically weak countries, not an impartial technical one. We must go on one step further in order to understand the crucial part played by the I.M.F. in the two most discouraging patterns of Third World politics, the subversion of social revolution and the death of democracy."

What we are witnessing here in Guyana, not only today but a further period of time beginning with the rolling of the head of Winslow Carrington, is a move to the right, is a move towards applying autocratic methods to solve problems. Not democratic methods and this is leading to the death of democracy in this country. But we warn you such measures will not solve the headaches which the Guyanese people are going through today, nor will they solve the problems of this Government because they will be compounded.

Okay, you will get more money, nearly \$500,000,000 this year. Last year and this year already we were paying out more than we were borrowing,

because the debt and the compensation payments have again gone up to 33 percent of the current Budget expenditure - from 3 percent of exports 5 years ago to 18 percent this year. Those are the figures in the I.M.F. Letter of Intent. Are we going to go on in that manner?

Years ago certain people who had no knowledge of economics suddenly became economic experts and they said the Government's borrowing capacity is there. We are so much better off than the socialist countries and the statistics were all arrayed in two articles in the *Sunday Chronicle*. What is happening today? The fact of the matter is that this country is being deliberately enticed into a debt trap and what is happening to countries like Indonesia... The more the Government will try to solve the economic crisis by putting more burdens on the backs of the workers and taking away their democratic rights. That's the point I am making.

Cde. Speaker, I wish to close my contribution to this debate and ask the Government seriously to defer this Bill. Let there be more dialogue and try to reach agreement at least with the technical people concerned, the legal profession who are opposed to this measure. Are you going to fight against everybody? Lawyers, doctors, architects, dentists, accountants, engineers, everybody? The farmers, the workers, everybody? Are you going to hold the guns against them and manipulate the judicial system, lock them up because they speak out? That is the intent of this Bill. That is what it is. We warn you, that this is not going to bring about the solution to this country's headache. I recommend, for your consideration, a deferment of this Bill, the placing of this Bill perhaps before a Select Committee of this House where we can have some more time. This, incidentally, is how Parliament works in some countries. Before a Bill comes to the House it goes to a Select Committee, Special Committees, in the United States, in the Soviet Union, in other countries, so that all the technicalities and everything else can be examined thoroughly and after that the public will also have a say in the matter. Generally speaking, the public hardly is aware of what is happening before it is rushed through and passed by this Parliament.

I recommend therefore, that suggestion to the Minister and to the Government in all seriousness because I cannot see this Government trying to fight against the whole population. It will not be resolving the problems and more and more we will be heading from an authoritarian dictatorship which we have at the moment to a virtual Police State. That we have to avoid if this country is to move forward peacefully towards social progress.

Request for leave to move the adjournment of The Assembly on definite matters of urgent public importance - Breaches in the Sea Defences on the Essequibo Coast: 4th January, 1979

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, I wrote to you this morning and saw you in your office to raise a matter of urgent public importance with respect to the breaches at Hampton Court and Devonshire Castle/Walton Hall in the Essequibo Coast area. Our information is that a dam, nearly 500 to 600 feet, has been washed away at Hampton Court. This is causing flooding not only to that area, but to neighbouring areas of Devonshire Castle and possibly, also, Walton Hall.

I have with me a letter from residents of Devonshire Castle and Hampton Court including a Member of Parliament, Mr. Isahak Basir, which has been written to the Regional Minister, Cde. Van Sluytman, Minister of State for Agriculture, requesting an urgent meeting to discuss matters pertaining to these breaches, not only at Hampton Court, but also at Devonshire Castle where, my information is, there is a breach of about 70 feet and this has caused already, despite some information that came over the radio today that there has been no loss to crops, one thousand acres of rice to be in danger. My further information is that not enough work of an emergency nature is being done. There is not enough material, there are not enough vehicles in the area and if urgent steps are not taken, there can be a tremendous loss to farmers in the area apart from other kinds of losses, livestock, etc. I am speaking about the loss to rice.

In this regard, therefore, I think it will be important for the Government to speak not only to its own Ministers and Officials, but also to deal with this matter very urgently by speaking to the residents concerned to see what can be done expeditiously in this matter. One of the individuals, I understand, who is virtually the Prime Minister of the Essequibo Coast, Mr. Hopkinson –

Why I am saying that this matter is urgent for debate is that an important individual such as Mr. Hopkinson has said that this area should be declared an emergency area and the G.D.F. should be mobilized to do work in the area. These are important considerations for this important debate. Very often, we get wrong information about what is happening in this country. That is why, Cde. Speaker, I urge that we have an adjournment debate on this matter so that all the facts can come out much more fully than the Minister gave them a little while ago.

Local Authorities (Postponement of Elections) Bill: 8th January, 1979

Dr. Jagan: Mr. Speaker, from what we have just heard, it seems that the aim of the Government is to give the people more democracy, but the way to get around doing this is to deny them democracy at every step. During the early part of last year, in order to postpone the elections, it was said that Guyana needed a new Constitution, to use the exact words of the Government, "*in keeping with the national ethos*" etc. Now, to postpone the Local Government Elections, we are hearing the same thing "*in keeping with our own national ethos*" and so on.

Cde. Speaker, the Minister, in introducing the Bill, gave us an historical account of the Waddington Constitution saying that something needed to be done. That was between 1951 and 1952. Then there was the Committee headed by an Englishman of the so-called Marshall Plan and so on. Now, we are hearing that this was the Plan which was formulated by a foreigner and imposed by a foreigner, something along those lines. The fact of the matter is that the Marshall Plan was implemented by this same Government, so don't throw red herrings now, across the trail, and tell us about an Englishman imposing this and that. I suppose, at that time, the P.N.C. and the Government which it headed and the imperialists were so close allies that they didn't see foreign dictation at that time, but our memories are not so short to forget that the same Marshall Plan, I repeat, was implemented by the P.N.C. Government.

I am talking about borrowing from outside. Looking through my file of clippings this morning, I saw where, at one of the meetings, a couple of years ago, it must have been last year, pertaining to the question of the regional setup which is to be implemented, the Prime Minister said that he got the idea after his visit to Zambia and Tanzania. It is all right not to borrow from an Englishman, although you implement it, but then you go along and borrow from Tanzania and Zambia. Be that as it may, the fact of the matter is, it is not the form we are concerned about, we are concerned about the content.

You have regionalism now, you have all the blue prints, and you have Regional Ministers. Yet, we are told now, we need a system where there would be integration from the bottom to the top. You have Local Authorities which you have got there, which you have kept there without elections, postponing them every two years successively. You have absolute control over every single Local Authority. You have Regional Ministers. Recently you had set up, under the regional system, a new area in the North West District which was supposed to be devoid of Local Authority. Now, we are told we have to see how this will fit in with the old Constitution, etc.

The fact of the matter is that the system is not working because it denies the fundamental basis of democracy, of people's involvement. We hear criticisms at all levels. There is preaching all the time that you need people's involvement, you need democracy. The Minister of Economic Development, at a meeting he addressed on September 9, 1976, said this, and this came out in the *New Nation*:

"We cannot decide the priorities of the people for them, but instead, we have to allow the people to tell us what their priorities are."

The General Secretary of the P.N.C., talking in the same vein about development said: *"if we are to succeed, all the people have to develop."*

The Development Plan, therefore, has certain meaning for the people; among them the involvement at all levels of the population, the need to pass on the benefit to the people, and the need for continuous effort. This was reported in *GIS News*, 5/10/76.

Participation, we hear this word repeating itself. I was present at a "Think-In" organized by the C.C.W.U. on July 18, 1976 where the Minister of Economic Development spoke. He said:

"The essence of a socialist society is democracy. Democracy premises the active participation of workers in all sectors of national life. The political sector is unarguably vital."

He went on to say that what was needed was:

"... a system which made for the widest possible participation of people in various processes of national life."

Well, there is a big wide gap between precept and practice, between preaching and performance. We know that there is a dialectal interrelationship and interaction between democracy and socialism. Long before the Ministers became theoreticians Lenin told us, on this question of democracy and socialism:

"Whoever wants to reach socialism by any other path than that of political democracy will inevitably arrive at conclusions that are absurd and reactionary both in the economic and political sense."

Both in the economic and political sense!

So, we come to this House and bandy phrases and repeat them about participation, democracy and involvement but, in reality, we cannot see it on the ground. You do not see it on the ground that is why this country today is in an economic mess. There is no workers' control; there is no economic democracy at the factory level, at the industrial level, at the farm-

ers' level. The Rice Marketing Board is an example of that. We hear so much about cooperatives, cooperative socialism, but instead, when it comes to practice, an organization is imposed upon the people without the workers, the farmers represented, the producers represented, to squeeze them, and so we have it shown on the ground in lack of production.

At the Local Government level, all around you hear statements that the thing is not working. A previous Minister in charge of this, Hamilton Green, speaking to the Local Authorities, said:

"I suspect you are not as close to the people as you ought to be; if you are not, then you will fail."

This was reported in the *Mirror* of 6th March, 1975. Cde. Speaker, if you are not close to the people, why are you not close to the people? If you are not elected by the people, how can you be close to the people? If you do not have to answer to the people, you do not have to report to the people, you do not have to be elected by the people, there is no public accountability, the people cannot exercise any form of control, then how can you be near to the people? If you are near to the big "*sahibs*" in the P.N.C., whether the top governors at the centre, or the local governors at the bottom, then you will stay in power. You will be there, but obviously you will be far from the people.

We have a newspaper report of a statement made by G.A.L.A. not too long ago. That is the blue-eyed organization which has been propped up by the ruling Party. I know the Chairman of this organization is a man who has some independence and he speaks out. Maybe, he is reaching the time when he has to meet his maker and so he has to make things right. What does the statement say?

"The Guyana Association of Local Authorities, individual local authorities and several local authority councillors have, within recent times, been complaining about what appears to be the declining influence and relevance of local authorities. There can be no doubt that local authorities are in danger of being over shadowed by the Regional System."

The regional system, the one imported from Tanzania and Zambia by the Prime Minister himself.

We also have another statement here. These are all from the Government newspaper- the *Chronicle*. This article is headlined "*Plaisance Rate-payers Peeved over Roads*" and was published on 18th June, 1976. The second paragraph states:

"The six councillors have been disqualified from continuing to be councillors because they have failed to attend a number of council meetings..."

No interest! The article continues:

"It was further explained there are now eight vacancies existing on the council..."

Another sentence in the same article states:

"One spokesman for the ratepayers pointed out that there is widespread dissatisfaction over the proper running and functioning of the council, particularly with respect to the very bad condition of the village roads and streets."

Here is another article dealing with the same theme, *"Council urged to fill three vacant seats."* This was reported in the *Guyana Graphic* on 16th September, 1974. They had to bring a special Bill here. All the names that were there previously were run out from the list. They had to keep adding and when those were run out, they added more. What a disgrace! Yet, we kept talking about people's participation and democracy.

Another clipping states: *"G.A.P.E. disappointed at little action"* and this was reported in the *Chronicle* of 19th January, 1977. Apparently, G.A.P.E. had set up a little committee called the Voluntary Service Committee, to help Local Authorities, and this is what the article states:

"But according to the Newsletter, that is their Newsletter, the Committee was very disappointed to find very little action, in a few instances, but in the majority of cases, no action at all."

The article goes on:

"Secondly, the composition of the Councils themselves is of people who do not have the necessary ingredients to execute these plans."

This is not P.P.P. talking now; this is G.A.P.E., Guyana Association of Professional Engineers.

How can you expect results when people either do not care or they are incompetent, when they are not responsible to the people, when they are far divorced, living in a world by themselves? That shows up in production. That is why, in the rice production, when you compare the average annual production of the seven years under P.P.P. Government with seven years under P.N.C. Government, there is a 74 percent increase in rice production under the P.P.P., but under the P.N.C. there is 6 percent for seven years. When you take the whole average annual production for the thirteen year period, there is an increase by only 2 percent. This has to do with the kind of undemocratic set up you have at the social level where you do not recognize the people's organizations, where you kick them out of the Rice Marketing Board, and at the Local Government level, where you prop

up these undemocratic bodies.

Cde. Speaker, this is why, in so many countries today, there is talk about reforming, fundamentally, the Local Government set up. In Trinidad, there was a move to break away Tobago and because of that, the P.N.M. said, *"no self rule, but the Party is in favour of upgrading Local Government."* *"Greater Autonomy for Jamaican Parishes"* says a clipping from Jamaica on the 10th June, 1976.

I would like to deal with this matter in a more fundamental way. The Minister tries to make a distinction between elections, masses of people participating. Let me spell it out. He said what he wants is a system where we have masses of people participating, but that elections alone are not the answer. But what is an election but the masses of the people at any particular level participating? It is a specious argument to talk about the need for mass participation while at the same time denying the right of the people to have democratic elections, in the case of Local Government, periodically every two years. Out of that election, if there was public accountability and if the elections were free and fair, you will then have not only the elected Members but all the other bodies which can be created around it to have the mass participation.

In countries which are now regarded as revolutionary, democratic and socialist, this is the kind of thing you have. The Cubans did not say that because they have Committees for the defence of the revolution, therefore, they did not need local assemblies and they did not need other bodies. Fidel Castro once challenged American President Johnson who was talking about human rights and democracy in Cuba, to give guns to all the black people in America and the masses of the workers and farmers in America, as he did in Cuba, and then we will see if America really has democracy. We cannot compare what we have here, a 10 percent or 14 percent Government, with a Government which has popular support. To do so, would be to compare chalk with cheese.

The Cuban people, the Angolan people, the people of Guinea Bissau have set up a structure. It is a link, a link from local to district or county, to region to centre. However, it is not structure alone that is important. There must be a connecting link, between all of that, of democracy, but all we are hearing is talk about structure. We see personality conflicts between the Local Government and the regional system and that is because you have appointed bodies, appointed Ministers and so on. You have a Government at the top which does not represent the majority of the people, which stays on in power either by fraud or by postponing the elections, and right at the bottom, the Local Government bodies which stay in power by perpetuation of postponement of elections.

All these nine points we heard about, are all well and good. Why are we afraid to have Local Government Elections as you delineated? Tell us how that is going to affect your central planning at the moment? If it is going to be any worse than it is at the moment, that is the link between the bottom

and the top. There is no central planning at the moment, I know that. What I am saying is that, the Minister is saying, there must be a link between the centre and the local, and presumably, at the centre, there will be central planning, and that central planning must be integrated with the local planning right from the bottom. Nobody quarrels with that. There is admission on all sides that the Local Authorities are not working, they are not performing even some of the functions they are supposed to do and if they are only doing routine things, carrying on in their old tradition from the colonial days. It is not their fault; it is the fault of the direction of the Central Government, of the nature of the system of economy which is a Government policy question. If the Government was socialist at the centre, then its arms, at the bottom, through its Regional Ministers, even though they are non-elected, through its Local Authorities, would be carrying out functions of that kind, but what have they done?

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: I am not talking about elected Ministers.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: Ministers are not elected in the same sense that the whole Government is not elected. I am talking about political -

[Interruptions]

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, the Minister said that finances sometimes are a problem and a limitation factor in the efficient working of Local Authorities and so on. He referred to rates and taxes. That is what I meant, that Local Authorities which are functioning today are functioning in the context of the political economy which was traditional from the days of colonialism, despite the talk of a socialist Government. That is what I am talking about - economy. Now, that is because the Government, despite the talk of a socialist Government, has not adopted socialist measures within the country: Socialist measures in terms of economy. Therefore, the Local Government, which is an arm of the Central Government, cannot, on its own, expand its orbit. Therefore, it continues as in the bad old colonial days- collecting rates and taxes. Do not blame them. You have to blame yourselves if they do that at the present moment and have been doing that.

That is one side of the coin only. The other side of the coin is what happens to the little money, even the little money that is collected. Since a lot of it is squandered, wasted and stolen, the people do not have confidence. That is why a lot of people do not want to pay, apart from the fact that so many people in Guyana today, cannot afford it. The cost of living is so high; they cannot afford to pay, so they let the thing lapse.

Cde. Speaker, it is not only a set of points, nine points, nine declarations that will bring in any greater performance at the bottom at the level of the people? What we need are structures such as those that are being set up, could be set up now, without a new Constitution. There is nothing in the present Constitution which prevents the Government from having a structure such as they have in Cuba, which they have in Angola. In fact, we have that structure without it being inserted in the Constitution. We have Local Government, we have Regional Ministers, who are supposed to go on a regional system, who are supposed to coordinate all these Local Authorities and there is a Central Government, even though we admit that there is not the kind of central planning as they have in the socialist countries. Well, they say they are going ahead with that.

The structure is there. You do not have to wait on a new Constitution for that. The Minister said that, under the P.N.C. guidelines, it is intended to change the composition of the Parliament by giving a local element and providing for a local element. Ten regional councils will elect one member each to sit in the Parliament. Is that going to make the system work at the bottom? If at the very bottom you do not have democracy, well, we have assumed that when that happens you are going to have elections at the bottom presumably not only for the regional bodies, but also for the local district authorities.

Cde. Chairman, my point is that you do not have to wait until then. What is humbugging this country today is not only what is happening in this Parliament or the laws made here, but what is happening on the ground. That is fundamental. That is why Angola didn't wait. I am told that, in Cuba, they waited 19 years. It says here:

“Based on Article 3 of the Constitution which states that, ‘the masses shall be guaranteed broad, effective participation in the exercise of political power’, the law provides for a structure not unlike that of Guinea-Bissau.

It begins at the village or neighbourhood level, with the village (or neighbourhood) People’s Assembly (consisting of all voters over 18) electing People’s Commissions. They, in turn, elect County Commissions, and so it goes, with each level electing the one above it up to the highest national level.”

This is the Cuban model, so they elect from the bottom up. Here it is, talking about factories:

“Already, in every factory I visited, there was a Workers’ Commission exercising varying degrees of control (depending largely on technical and administrative capabilities).

As in the political domain, the economic realm is designed to allow maximum decentralization and initiative from below. In State enterprises, management committees are composed equally of workers from the enterprise and those chosen by the Government. In each unit of production, all the workers are to compose the

Workers' Assembly which is to meet at least once a month..."

The P.N.C had to lecture to us that Cuba took 19 years. Well, you are not deceiving me, because Cuba has, from the time of the revolution, a fundamental democratic structure. Fundamental democracy I am talking about, not bourgeois democracy, but socialist democracy.

Cde. Chairman, in Angola they didn't use the excuse that the people are not ready. In Angola, the people have less formal education than the people in Guyana, but, because democracy grew out of the bowels of a liberation movement which fought with guns in hand, people are in power and the institutions are created accordingly. Not here, a petit bourgeoisie, a mediatory bourgeoisie, a new industrial bourgeoisie is developing and they want to grab as much as they can. So, they are afraid to give up their positions and they postpone elections over and over. That is only one aspect of the lack of democracy in the country, as happened elsewhere at the industrial level and other levels. And they talk in glib terms about people's participation and so on, but they will not fool and deceive; people are not going to be deceived in this country.

They have shown the regime during the last Referendum that they were not deceived by the propaganda, that Guyana needs a new Constitution. There is no Constitutional crisis in the same way that there is no structural crisis in relation to integration of Central and Local Government. There is no structural crisis.

What is wrong is that, at the Centre and at the Local level, there is no democracy and that is a question which this regime cannot face up to. This Party in power cannot face up to that because it knows that it would be facing the prospect of removal from the seat of power both at the Central and Local Government level. The bureaucratic bourgeoisie and the mediatory bourgeoisie do not want to surrender privileges and positions. So, we get more and more demagogic utterances; demagogy in place of democracy; denial of democracy more and more and moving the country backwards into the arms of imperialism which will insist not only that the country modify and change its foreign policy positions and remain within the capitalist camp, but that the country internally takes a capitalist course.

Let those who preach and talk so glibly about socialism understand today that people are not fooled; they will be showing that they have basic commonsense and they have the necessary political consciousness to understand what is going on. Even those abroad who were taken in by the propaganda that this is a socialist country, a Marxist Government, now their eyes are being opened also. Out of the unfortunate tragedy of Jonestown, which they tried to cover up, one thing has come out at least. Even a judge has been coerced to give up a case. What sordid happenings in Guyana! All of this is now in the world headlines day after day. So, one thing has now come out. Guyana did not make the international headlines at the Referendum time but read all the newspapers now about the rigging

of the Referendum, about the rigging of the 1973 and 1968 elections. Every day! Not all the articles are sensationalism. Some of them now deal with the economic and social realities of Guyana, like the *Financial Times*, like the *New York Times* and so on.

The Government is bringing people here, from abroad. One clipping stated that the American Government is now trying to extradite four criminals who are holding high positions here. The name of one of them is Hill, who is now Rabbi Washington. The name of another is Sutherland. One is in the army and one is in the National Service. Criminals! Is that how you expect to solve...

[**The Speaker:** Dr. Jagan, what does that particular sentence have to do with this Bill?]

Dr. Jagan: I am showing, Cde. Speaker, that they are carrying this country down and down by their undemocratic methods and at the same time they are opening this country to an imperialist type of culture. All we have to do is to listen to the radio and look at the *Chronicle* and see what is being printed.

[**Cde. Nascimento:** The same papers who called you a Moscow puppet.]

Dr. Jagan: Called me a Moscow puppet? I am glad for that! I am glad for that! I am not ashamed of being a Moscow puppet if you want to put it that way, because Moscow stands for socialism; it stands for democracy; it stands for proletarian internationalism; it helps liberation movements, not like you. Puppets of the C.I.A! Puppets of imperialism!

Cde. Speaker, what I am showing is that a lack of democracy has shown that it has brought this country to an economic and social impasse and inviting more people to come here, consorting with the C.I.A. again and the I.M.F., is not going to get this country out of the backwater. The quicker the Government understands this and the people take the necessary steps, the better for the Guyanese people and nation. It is a disgrace; it is a shame for the Government to come every two years and postpone Local Government Elections. It is an insult on the intelligence of the Guyanese people. We oppose this manoeuvre to deny the Guyanese nation the opportunity to govern themselves at least at the Local Government level.

We condemn this Government's use of its automatic majority in this Parliament which it stole at the 1973 elections to deny the rights of the people to live a decent life in various parts of this country today, to be involved in the process of building their own future, governing themselves, making laws, regulations, etc. for themselves. This is now the core of practice even in capitalist countries, not only in socialist countries.

I will read one last clipping and then close. This is from New Zealand.

This is also from the *Guyana Graphic*. It is dated 30th November, 1974:

“Professor Roberts, a longtime environmentalist and Professor of Public Administration at Victoria University in Wellington, told a recent meeting of the Commonwealth Human Ecology Council in London that the disintegration and alienation which now characterize cities throughout the world – the formation of poor ghettos and the move of the well-to-do suburban ghettos of their own – could be greatly eased by legislation creating small neighbourhood councils with the political strength to obtain the kind of life the community wants, not what the system would impose.”

It goes on:

“A tall order perhaps, but one which Professor Roberts feels the big city politicians must acknowledge, otherwise, ‘they will find more and more that they will confront sullen masses that resist the central Government’.”

We know that a lot of people ran away from the ghettos of California and United States to come to an unfortunate tragic end in Guyana, but we also see a lot of people escaping from this country to find a life somewhere else because of the same kind of alienation which is going on here. Only this week we heard Government or somebody was concerned about drugs at Linden, Wismar and Georgetown. So, we are heading in the same direction. If you lie in bed with the imperialist, the imperialist bug is bound to bite you. This is where this country is heading and we call upon the people of this country to stand up and resist the autocratic measures this Government is dealing out year after year and taking this country deeper and deeper in the mud. We ask this Government, if it is interested in the masses, not to proceed with this Bill. Instead, it must go ahead and hold Local Government Elections so the people can participate fully in the process of decision-making and nation building.

Budget Debate: 21st March, 1979

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, over the last fourteen years of P.N.C. rule – perhaps a better word should be “*misrule*” – we have had several Finance Ministers. It seems that the P.N.C. has run out of them so now they have introduced the Budget through the Economic Development Minister. We have had three Development Programmes and we have had many slogans beginning with “*Not a Soul Will go to Bed Hungry*”, to “*Free Milk and Cassava*”, and “*the Nation Would be Fed, Housed and Clothed by 1976.*”

What do we hear today? We hear about the capitalist crisis. Indeed, not the capitalist crisis but the energy crisis. We hear that we have interdependence; we are living in a world of interdependence. We are reminded of the past which we inherited, the miles and miles of road that we have built and the fact that we sit down in front of our telephones and distant dial to any part of the country and to the world -marvellous progress. When we look around and ask what has all this meant for the people, there are good roads but they cannot have the bus, good roads but they do not have the money to enter a bus; the cost of living for the period November 1977 – November 1978 showed that the food index jumped by 73.7 points: clothing, 52.8 points, and all the other index figures rising by 49 points.

When we talk about the past and what we inherited, why don't they tell the House that, in seven years of P.P.P. Government, the cost of living index figure rose only 11 points. There was plenty of food, cassava, milk and plantains, and we had to carry a big publicity campaign to get people to eat skinned, unscaled fish. There was a big campaign at the Carnegie School of Home Economics to get people to eat skinned fish. Today, you cannot find skinned fish. Kwakwari and Cuirass have now become luxuries. Shark meat is a luxury.

A few Budgets ago, when Cde. Hope became Minister of Finance, we were told that progress was around the corner. We were told that the world would soon come out of the recession and we would soon be solving the temporary problems that we had. That was his first Budget Statement. We then dubbed the Minister “*Hopeful Hope.*”

The time has come when we have to try another Minister and what does he tell us? Behind all the facts and figures presented, the impression created is a tax-free Budget, but the fact of the matter is that this is an \$85 million tax Budget. That is what it is in reality for they have stated in the Budget Statement that had they paid a minimum wage of \$14 a day. It would have cost the Government an additional \$85 million.

What did the Government do in the past? In 1974, it was \$19 million. Last year and the year before, in addition to the removal of all the subsidies and so forth, there was \$44 million in taxes. Now, the Government chooses

not to pay the \$14 per day to which it is committed, for which it gave an undertaking to the Trade Union Congress. Now the Members come and say, "There are no taxes in the Budget."

The Minister in his Budget Statement, page 56, said and I quote:

"...the stark and inescapable fact is that our expectations for growth in the economy, during 1978, have not materialized. Production remained static."

This is spelt out in greater detail on page 18 of the Budget Statement, where there is an itemised list of the shortfall in production of rice, sugar, bauxite and so on. I do not want to tire the House by enumerating those figures.

We have been talking, in this House, for a long time about stagnation and what has been the answer? I remember that the Minister of Agriculture, and others, have been telling us from time to time that everything is going well, that production is increasing and expanding. Now, there is an admission that we are not producing. This was a reality long ago. Obviously, it is done for other reasons.

Many times I have told the House about the stagnation in production. I shall quickly summarize what has been said several times:

Rice production over the seven-year period of the P.P.P. Government, 1958/9 to 1964/5, was 873,742 tons, an increase of 74 percent on the corresponding seven-year period of the colonial regime. In the case of the P.N.C. over the corresponding seven-year period, 1968/9 to 1974/5, production was 879,359 tons, which is an increase of only 0.6 percent on the P.P.P. production. The P.N.C. had Independence; it had all the power. Why this stagnation? It is nothing new; it is there.

I do not want to give the figures for the export of rice. That has also declined. In 1963/4 it was 85,000 tons in round numbers. Ten years later, if you take sugar production in the seven-year period of the P.P.P. Government and compare it with the previous seven-year period, it shows a 44 percent increase. In the corresponding seven-year period for the P.N.C., it was 6 percent and if you take the thirteen-year period, the average increase is 2 percent.

Let us look at the other categories. Fish production: 14 ounces per person per week. Milk: four-fifths of one pint per person per week. Beef production: 3 to 4 ounces per person per week. Ground provisions: 1½ pounds per person per week. These figures were produced by Professor Clive Thomas, for the four unions, when they spoke before the T.U.C. in 1976.

Stagnation is not a new question, but it is now being brought forward into the light for one specific purpose, to put the blame on the workers, to say to them: "You did not increase production and productivity; therefore, we cannot pay you \$14 per day." That is the excuse. This is why they have gone about giving all those figures in detail. Whereas before, for years, they have been hiding and covering up the naked fact that we had a crisis in produc-

tion in this country, which was responsible for the financial and economic difficulties facing this country. The Members of the Government have to find justification for now refusing to pay the workers.

They have, of course, been blaming the workers. This was an old story. In the period 1972/4, when the crisis first manifested itself, the Members of the Government said it was the oil crisis. Later they began blaming the civil servants who were saboteurs, they said. They began blaming the weather in 1976 and, more recently, they began blaming the P.P.P.

This is a perennial question. Since way back in 1968, plots were invented. They said that the P.P.P. was involved in all kinds of plots. The Prime Minister will remember the Beria plot. We had other plots to wreck and destabilize. Well, all this is to cover up the naked fact that the Government of the P.N.C. is the biggest destabilizer of the national interest. This is the naked fact in Guyana.

What do they do instead of this talk about national unity? They talk about it, they pay lip service to it, but the concrete steps which are to be taken to bring about unity, the concrete facts which have to be undertaken in order to get the brakes removed from production and productivity, these they ignore. Instead, they turn back to their masters who put them in to solve the economic and financial headaches. They turn to the I.M.F.; they turn to the imperialist masters who put them in, instead of getting to the root of the problem to try to find out what can be done to settle those problems. So, we have now what was the first secret on June 12 last year—the I.M.F. Agreement. We see the consequences of this now: at the wages level, in domestic policy, in foreign policy. We see the hand of imperialism dictating policy. We had a new Investment Code; a great deal of publicity was given to this.

The last speaker read from the P.N.C. Policy Statement, or the objects of the Party. Cde. Speaker, what the Hon. Member should have read from, was the Bible of the P.N.C., the Sophia Declaration which was made compulsory reading in all schools, for all children, and for the benefit of the House I should like to quote from that Statement. I read all literature including stinking, dirty literature. This was their Policy Statement when they were moving away from imperialism under the pressure from the working class and from the intense political and ideological struggle in this country. I quote:

“As we move to control land in the interest of the nation, we will also take control over all foreign trade – import and export.

We are frequently asked about our Policy in relation to foreign private investment. The time has come now to give, indeed to repeat, the answer once and for all. Private investment from abroad is welcomed in specific fields in consortium with Government and/or cooperatives, provided that in each case Government and/or the cooperatives hold majority equity and real control.

During the period ahead, your Party intends to proceed with the implementation of the policy of ownership and control of national resources.

The Government Party and Party Members must make a united effort to achieve our oft-stated objective during 1975 and bring an end to foreign banks taking and investing local deposits during next year."

Cde. Speaker, here they spoke well, but we saw a difference between rhetoric and performance. It was only during the period of the Referendum that they were talking about land to the tiller, whereas way back in 1974 they were talking about land control in the interest of the nation.

What is there now in the Investment Code? We warned, before this I.M.F. Agreement was signed, in a document of the Central Committee of the People's Progressive Party in the middle of 1977 when the Government intended to pursue an open door policy to foreign capital, and this is now what we have. We will now see under the new Investment Code where the Government will restrict itself virtually to infrastructure. This is what the Investment Code said, the strategic activities, '*strategic*', note that, which will be reserved for the State are as follows:

Mining, beneficiation and exportation of specific grades of bauxite, this does not include the production or smelting of alumina;

Power Generation for general public distribution;

Public Transportation (excluding feeder and supplementary services);

Telecommunication;

Education at nursery, primary, secondary or University levels (excluding special training institutions such as secretarial schools);

Importation of specific items for purposes of trading

What does this mean in relation to the Sophia Declaration? The Sophia Declaration states, with regard to foreign capital, that if it comes in, it will have to come in partnership with the Government or the cooperatives, with the Government or the cooperatives having a majority share holding, ownership and control of national resources, not just natural, but national, meaning financial resources and so on.

This statement is from a new Investment Code which I have just read. What are the strategic activities that will have to be seen in the context of the indicative programme planned for 1978 to 1981? It must not be read separately, it must be read in conjunction with their –

[Interruptions]

Dr. Jagan: In the last Budget Statement, the indicative plan for 1977 to 1981 proposed for the manufacturing industry, only 3.9 percent of the total capital expenditure. For electricity, only 6.5 percent, and that is mainly conventional electricity, not hydro electricity.

A great deal more of the Plan was devoted to agriculture, infrastructure. In other words, the Government, in its own developmental projection, does not have the money or will not have the money to carry out balanced agricultural industrial development in the country. That is clear. So, what will be done? The imperialists, therefore, are told: *"you can come in the country"*, contrary to the principles laid down in the Sophia Declaration, and have virtually a free hand except in one area, that is, specific grades of bauxite. When I spoke to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, he told me that meant calcined bauxite. That means that they can come in, in other grades of bauxite, they can come in alumina production, and any kind of industry on any basis they want, on their own, in partnership with Government, with cooperatives or with other private capitalists. This is an important development and we say it is due to the dictation of the imperialists and the policies of this Government.

We now turn to the next question. If the imperialists are to come here to invest – and what are they interested in mainly in Guyana? They are not concerned with industrialization of Guyana per se. Once they have free trade, which is provided by CARICOM, then they prefer to set up their factories, their multinational branches in Trinidad. We saw them, the \$4.6 billion industrialization scheme at Point Lisas in Trinidad. They are concerned about minerals in Guyana, raw materials. What are we going to find? We already see where an agreement was signed with the French Company in relation to uranium. A German industrialist came to see me on the same question. He wanted to know if we got into Government whether we would honour any such agreement made by this Government.

We had wind of this new Investment Code long ago, and it is putting into practical reality what Fred Sukhdeo said in May, 1977, and the so-called ideologists of the P.N.C., who can quote scriptures, like the devil quoting scriptures, are now saying, that all socialist countries, including the Soviet Union are faced with problems of production and productivity, and they are trying to sell this reversal of their own principles as a new economic policy of the Soviet Union in the late twenties and early thirties. There is a world of difference, which I will come to, between this regime and the regime which was established after the Russian revolution in the Soviet Union. We must not only talk about form, we must talk about content, and I shall deal with that in a few moments.

What is the other aspect of the pressures from imperialism now on this Government on the economic financial front? Capitalism depends on cheap and docile labour. Therefore, a wages freeze is a part of the I.M.F. medi-

cine. Therefore, this regime does not pay a \$14 minimum wage, not because, as it says, it cannot afford it, but because it is told not to pay. This is part and parcel of that position. They also want the working class to be muzzled. Our good friend, the former Minister of Labour, got up in this House and defended the Government. He defends what is going on, but he knows that his head-rolling was also part of this process of emasculating the working class.

With regards to the developmental strategy which I referred to, what we are now doing is going back to the Puerto Rican model which was the first model which formed the basis of the first Developmental Plan. This is not the first country in the world where services and other things are sold to the capitalist class at cheap prices. In England, they had nationalization of railways, of electricity and of coal. However, they were used in the interest of the capitalist class. When the prices of coal, steel and electricity were higher in other parts of Europe, in England, it was found that they were lower under the Labour Government, to serve the capitalist class. This is a fact. With regards to the telephone, transport and electricity which are now regarded as the strategic sectors, strategic activities, foreign capitalists are not concerned with all of that, they do not want that. You sell them they very best services at the cheapest prices and they will lend you the money to do it and you will never get out of paying the debts.

I should like to speak on that question now because last year alone we borrowed \$500 million. In the last year of the P.P.P. Government, the national debt in this country was only \$128 million. At the end of 1977 it was roughly \$1,500 million. Last year alone we borrowed \$500 million. The stark nakedness of the financial situation is glossed over in this statement. Let me bring this to your notice:

As a percentage of the current Budget expenditure, the debt charges today amount to 40 percent. It was \$10 million only. The total debt charges as a percentage of the current expenditure was \$10 million, in 1964. This year it is projected to be \$234 million. It was 15 percent then; this year it is 40 per cent.

Let us take revenue now, the current receipts of the Government. If you take the debt charges in relation to what the Government is receiving from the people with steep taxation and so on, despite that, the debt payment is 58 percent of the current Budget income. In other words, we are going on to paying nearly two-thirds of what we are receiving as debt payments.

Let us look at the deficit in relation to the present current expenditure. Current budget expenditure is \$587 million in round numbers. The current deficit is \$186 million, actually \$185.8 million which means that the current deficit as a percentage of the Budget is 32 percent.

Let us look at another fact. The Hon. Minister for Economic Development said, *"Let us talk about what portion of the exports it is."* Dr. Maurice Odle at the Institute of Development Studies at the University wrote an article on the International Monetary Fund in the early part of this year

and he pointed out that about five years before, our debts in relation to exports was only three per cent. In 1977, it was 18 percent and this year it is 26 percent. The total export of goods and services in 1978 was \$888 million. The total debt charges were \$234 million. I am trying to show how the debt payments are becoming a big problem not only in relation to income and expenditure, but also in relation to our exports. It means then that we have problems to balance the Budget. There are Budget deficits and balance of payments deficits, because we have to pay so much outside. The more the Government borrows, the more it spends on what it calls strategic services; the more we will find these problems becoming aggravated.

As I said - and I repeat - stagnation is nothing new. The P.P.P. long ago pointed out what must be done to solve this problem. Way back in 1973, we put forward a seven-point policy statement. In June 1976 our party came out with a seventeen-point policy statement. Some are questioning the patriotism of the P.P.P. Let it be put on the record when the P.N.C. took an anti-imperialist turn in 1975/76, both in domestic and foreign policies, where the balance was against imperialism in the total policies, contrary to the previous period when the balance was on the side of pro-imperialism, when there was talk of destabilization, the P.P.P. came out and changed its political line to critical support.

At the personal level we agreed, on May Day 1976, to appear together with the P.N.C. leadership to tell the world that there is national unity. The P.P.P. cannot get any publicity in the Government media but on that occasion a photograph of Jagan and Burnham was splashed over the front pages of their glossy magazine and sent all over the world. They made good propaganda of that.

One month later, on Enmore Martyr's Day, in June, when I got up to speak I said it is not enough if you are going to fight imperialism, for two leaders to stand up together. Equally important, we must have a sound economy, otherwise you cannot stand the pressures of the I.M.F. You know what has happened all over the world with the I.M.F.

So, we put forward the 17 points. Those were ignored. Up to today, they are ignored. Those 17 points of 1976 and 7 points of 1973 included some of the things which the Prime Minister got up in this House and said that his Government would do.

In 1971, when we gave them support to nationalize the bauxite company, we gave them parliamentary support to nationalize and not have to pay immediate compensation, but they never implemented those things. Therefore, we had to repeat them in 1973 and we had to repeat them again in 1976. That is the root of the problems.

Therefore, all of this about the P.P.P. not being patriotic and being tied to Moscow and this and that, is garbage. The record is there. That is the record, the record of our critical support

On important occasions when the national interest was involved, as in

1971, we gave support. In 1976 we gave support, but in their own petty bourgeois nationalist self-interest they refused to implement those things which we have been calling for and some of which the Prime Minister himself said would be implemented when the Peace Plan was enunciated in this House in 1971.

Cde. Speaker, let us not live in dreams, in hopes, which are not going to materialize. Many talk of creating a utopia, such as Robert Owen and other Utopian Socialists. Jim Jones promised a haven in Guyana and it all ended in tragedy for an unfortunate number of people who had to run away from capitalism and ghetto life in the United States. Preaching alone is not going to help. What Guyana needs is more than just taking a course dictated by imperialism to make Guyana into a raw material agrarian appendage of the Caribbean Common Market, dominated by imperialism which is depended upon capitalism and deformed industrialization. That is the reality when we talk about economics. That is where we are being pushed by the I.M.F. and the imperialists and that is where this Government, under pressure, is taking us.

Let us look at foreign policy. Here again, we see a move to a pro-imperialist position: a shift away from the 1975/1976 position to the 1971/74 position when the balance was on the side of imperialism. This is where we are moving the country again and we have seen some aspects of this already. One aspect is our relations with Brazil. *New Nation* had a cartoon the other day showing two hands clasping-friends. We have no quarrel with having friendly relations with Brazil but let us refresh our memories. It was only in 1975/1976 that the Government was attacking Brazil for wanting to destabilize this Government and this nation. The previous Agreements, which were made with Brazil previous to that period, which were put in cold storage in that period, are now being resuscitated to give Brazil a free port facility in Georgetown, to build a road to the interior, and to get a \$6 million loan from Brazil to build a bridge over the Takutu River. In the previous context of working with imperialism, they have also signed the Amazon Pact. Brazil, whose dictatorship has stretched its tentacles to the south and to the west, is now moving to the north; Guyana and fascist Brazil are now partners. Their hands are clasped in unity.

Cde. Speaker, this is not a matter over which we must sit and gloat. This is a serious matter. Imperialism works today through sub-imperialism with puppets like Mobutu in Zaire, with people like those in Central America who are out to pounce on any movement, like Brazil in the South. When the American troops withdrew from the Dominican Republic, Brazilian troops moved in to maintain order, as they put it. Let us understand these realities of international life.

What has happened to the Minister of Education? Has he forgotten all of these things? He should not only tell us about how much education we are given. Let us not forget what Cde. Carrington told us, how we have to raise the level of education. In India, they had so many BAs and BScs and

MScs and in Sri Lanka too, so many educated people, but they could not even get a job as a bus conductor, a chauffeur, or street cleaner, the economy was so bad, and eventually ending, as you know, in the removal, lock, stock and barrel, of those of the Congress Party in India, and the Sri Lankan Party. These are facts which we have to take into consideration in assessing our own situation.

What is another aspect of this change in foreign policy? On Vietnam, there was an international emergency conference called in Helsinki. Naturally, we went and we thought we would have seen the Guyana delegation there - the Guyana Government. The P.N.C. fought hard to get in the World Peace Council, they used pressures and all sorts of things, but on this occasion they hid. What is the Statement they put out? Cde. Speaker, I have it here. It says, in the first paragraph:

"It is particularly disturbing that involvement in the conflicts of socialist States includes members of the Non-Aligned movement..."

Cde. Chairman, this is American propaganda that socialist States are fighting. This is imperialist propaganda. The fact is China has betrayed socialism; the fact is a new world axis is being formed, as we had in the war, when we had Japan, Germany and Italy. Now, we have the United States and N.A.T.O. with the N.A.T.O. Allies, Japan and China.

Long ago, before Kissinger became Secretary of State, when he was a Harvard University Professor, he wrote in a book called *Necessity For Choice*, that the rift was just beginning between China and the Soviet Union and it must be the United States' policy to widen that rift and bring China behind United States foreign policy. That is now happening, and these people who say they are socialists absent themselves from an important conference concerning one of the most heroic nations of the world, the Vietnamese, who had been fighting foreign aggression for more than 50 years. They refused to show up, and they begin to regurgitate imperialist propaganda. What is the third paragraph?

"Guyana regrets that in relation to Democratic Kampuchea, the Security Council was prevented from taking a decision based upon the principled position put forward by its Non-Aligned members."

This is again, propaganda. The capitalist countries and the imperialist countries were attacking the Pol Pot regime, talking about slaughter and murder. When that regime was overthrown, I remember hearing a debate going on the radio, the *Voice of America*, that a Security Debate was coming on, and that the United States would be in a very difficult position because it was constantly attacking the Pol Pot regime, that there was a denial of all kinds of rights. When that regime was overthrown, I saw films, I saw photographs and I heard a report from journalists who had been there. This is

where the P.N.C. should have been to see and hear all those things, but they absented themselves. Is it the money, the filthy lucre?

As I said, a new axis is being formed and China is now working on the side of imperialism in all the theatres of the world, be it Chile, be it Kampuchea, be it N.A.T.O. In the case of the US base in the Indian Ocean, all the Non-Aligned countries voted against it, yet, China says it is good to have it there. The North Koreans threw the American troops out of South Korea; the Chinese say no, they must stay there.

So, let us get the facts clear. Domestic policy and foreign policy are related, they are interlinked and they react and they inter-react on each other. They cannot hope to be socialists at home as they claim and at the same time, give socialism a bad name. Why are they opening the door in Guyana to foreign capitalism and at the same time lining up with the imperialists and the so-called communists of China to stop the process of national liberation and socialism?

Incidentally, that part where it says that Guyana rejects, and the Security Council was prevented from taking a decision based upon the principled position of Non-Aligned members, is a serious attack on the Soviet Union because the Soviet Union uses the veto. When we talk about Non-Alignment, let us understand. There are all kinds of positions in the Non-Alignment Movement. We saw in the Angolan crisis where twenty two African States lined up with the M.P.L.A. and twenty two lined up with U.N.I.T.A. and F.N.L.A. On the latter side was South Africa, Zaire, USA and China. So this is the line they are now taking in private circles, that the Soviet Union did not give us the money so we must go to the Americans. This is the line.

Cde. Speaker, there is another way out. There is another solution and that was presented by G.A.W.U.

When the Suspension was taken, I was dealing with the foreign policy statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, dated March 4, 1979. The last paragraph says the following:

"In the light of its particulate position, the Government of Guyana calls for an end to hostilities, the withdrawal of all foreign forces and the restoration of a regime of peace in the area."

This is a similar line which is now peddled by the imperialists, that the Chinese must withdraw from Vietnam and the Vietnamese must withdraw from Kampuchea. This is a similar line, incidentally, which the Americans took when they had committed aggression against Vietnam, when world public opinion was demanding a withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. U.S imperialism then took the line that all troops must withdraw, that is, not only American troops but North Vietnamese troops from South Vietnam. It is clear that the Government, both in its domestic and foreign policies, is now turning swiftly to the right, to the pro-imperialist

positions which it held before.

Now the question which we have to ask ourselves is where this is going to get us. Already, we have to ask ourselves about this question of the payment to the workers of an adequate wage and we have to ask ourselves, as Cde. Pollydore, General Secretary of the T.U.C. asked in his Annual Report for 1978: *"is there a way out of this crisis? Can we afford to pay the \$14 a day?"* Before answering this question, I think the main question which we must ask is, can the working people afford to live on less than \$14 a day? This is the fundamental question. When one considers what is happening in the shops, apart from the scarcities and the high prices, I have already referred to the rampant inflation and the steep increase in the cost of living; clearly those figures justify the payment of the \$14 a day.

It is strange how the Government is now arguing. Not only is it saying we cannot afford it, but it is saying that increased wages will cause hardships. This is a statement which the Government has put out and which is more or less saying that the payment of wages will cause more hardships. The Members of the Government referred to the poor pensioners, for instance, and the unemployed who will suffer increasingly added pressure. If they were so sympathetic to the pensioners they certainly would have increased the \$16 a month which is being given to them. Trinidad does not claim to be socialist but it has a minimum pension of over \$70 per month, food stamps and free transportation, something which the pensioners do not get in this country. It is remarkable that these pseudo-socialists are now shedding tears about pensioners. The fact of the matter is that they are constantly making propaganda.

One so-called journalist by the name of Kester Alves is constantly repeating a lie, propaganda, about *"not a cent more"*. The P.P.P., when it was in Government, had increased the wage for the lowest-paid workers against the recommendations of the Gorsuch Commission in 1968. That is a fact and Kester Alves and the P.N.C. know this but they use the mass media, which they control, to repeat a lie, hoping to delude workers to make the workers feel well, what is the P.P.P. talking about? They did not do it. That is why they keep repeating this statement and taking it out of context and, indeed, distorting what is the meaning of that. It had relevance when it was uttered in relation to the super scale salaries which were to be increased tremendously by the Gorsuch Commission. They are propagandists, and the disseminators of falsehood, they want to repeat a lie over and over.

The G.A.W.U., in its memorandum to the T.U.C., at a special conference pointed out that the Government can afford to pay the \$14, indeed, to restore all the subsidies and to increase personal allowances and so forth. However, this calls for revolutionary action, not just talk. If you examine the structure of the Budget, step by step, the sector which is going to social services is being cut from 45 percent in 1964 to 28 percent today, and what is growing? The bureaucracy grows: the privileges, the salaries. To add insult to injury, the Government, not too long ago, promoted three Minis-

ters to Senior Ministers. Their salaries and allowances rose from \$2,000 a month to \$3,000 a month. That is the extravagance we are talking about.

We say first, cut down the waste, cut down the privileges, cut down the extravagances. Those are the first things. Secondly, we say stop the debt and compensation payments. I have said already that 40 percent of the expenditure of the Government, on current Budget, is going for the payment of debts - more than that, 58 percent of the Budget. Balance it, not at the expense of the working people as was done last year, in increases. All the revenues of the Government is going to pay debts and that has come up to a fantastic sum of \$234 million. If, therefore, we take a revolutionary action in stopping those payments then we can balance taxation, in cuts of all subsidies, in retrenchment of 4,000 workers at the bottom.

We can also solve the problem of Balance of Payments difficulties because the crisis is manifested in these two ways: Balance of Payments deficits, and Budget deficit. Solve the Budget deficit by cutting out the extravagance, the waste and the luxurious living of the elite in many areas which, by judicial pruning, can be brought down to a reasonable level. Stop those payments, the debt and compensation payments, which will help to solve the problem at the expense of the foreign elite who have exploited this country, who have drained the wealth of this country and who have kept this country in its present state of underdevelopment. That is the way out. That is the answer, but these people only talk about socialism. They talk about national unity. Why do they not take such action? If they take such action they know they will get the support and backing of the P.P.P. but they cannot penalize the worker and expect that the P.P.P. will give them 100 percent support or whatever support they want.

I remember the last meeting we had with the P.N.C. in 1976 when the Prime Minister issued an ultimatum. He said: "*withdraw the editorial or the talks are not going on.*" What was the editorial in the *Mirror*: "*Money for Guns not Bread.*" These people have set up a paramilitary and military organization to keep them in power, not to defend the nation.

They put in a vote of \$19 million and they sabotaged the People's Militia too. It was to be in every hamlet, in every village, in this country. Instead, they want to establish in this country a P.N.C. force to keep them in power as the dictator Gairy did. This is what they are doing.

At the same time, they were talking about removing all subsidies, that the country cannot afford to pay subsidies and they wanted the P.P.P. to go along with that. Critical support does not mean surrendering the rights of the people to those who want to fight against the people's interest, those who have robbed them and squeezed them.

They say that we are destabilizers; that they are revolutionaries and we are counter-revolutionaries that they are Golsheviks and we are Mensheviks. They compare themselves with the Allende in Chile and they say we are behaving like the destabilizers of the Allende Government. Allende did not have an Opposition which gave him critical support at a critical point

when, from their own mouths, they were attacking Brazil, United States and North America for trying to destabilize them.

This country is one of the few countries in the world where the Opposition is Left, where it is in a more revolutionary position than the Government. Can the Government give the reason why those talks broke down on the very first day? The talks opened. I said, "*Let us talk comprehensively about a political solution.*" They said, "No." They wanted to talk step by step, point by point. I knew from the 1971 experience when they had made many commitments here, that they did not intend to fulfil any of those points to recognize the democratic rights of the Guyanese people, particularly the Opposition, because that would permit the Opposition to grow even more than it has grown. Therefore, it was necessary to talk about the total situation.

Anything that implied their removal from the Government, obviously, they would not tolerate and it was in that context we said, "*let us talk about the comprehensive situation, the main question of political unity.*" They were not prepared for that. So, when they talk about national unity and they shed crocodile tears, it is only to fool the people.

Cde. Kester Alves made a statement the other day. He can reply tomorrow in the *Daily Chronicle*, and the next day, and he can go on the radio. I am not defaming him. I am only repeating what he said. He said that, "*the P.P.P. took an extreme position on many issues.*" I do not want to go into all the details, but I want to say it for the record in this House because, when I write to the *Daily Chronicle*, they do not publish it. They only publish what they like. If the Members of the P.N.C. are serious about national unity, how is it that they have not taken any serious steps to talk with the Opposition? How is it that they have not followed, have not taken up the decision of the T.U.C. Special Conference which said that there should be a political solution to the country's problems.

Many of them come into this House and they distort Marxism. They quote from books taking things out of their context and not only out of context, but without relating them to the whole milieu of what was happening, for instance, in the Soviet Union, without looking at the whole class position, the whole questions of power, and who wields political power.

It is all right to talk, as they do. I understand one Minister said that in Cuba they use buses to transport people to rallies and they use the press to mobilize the people. They use the press, the mass media, for development. This is form but not content.

I have referred already to the New Economic Policy. The question is this: in Cuba there was the 26th of July Movement—revolutionary democrats. Fidel Castro broke away from the petty bourgeois Nationalist Party and formed the 26th July Movement. When he came to power, soon after he teamed up with the Marxist/Leninists, within two years, we have seen that with the Marxist/Leninists of the People's Socialist Party, he formed the Communist Party and took Cuba into the socialist world. That is a

reality. In the case of the Soviet Union, the workers took power; a Workers' State was established.

Can we say, in Guyana, we have a Workers' State? Cde. Speaker, it is one thing to talk of a party and to talk of a Workers' State. What is the P.N.C? What is it? What are its historical roots? Let us not forget its historical roots, an alliance, a merger between the Rightist wing of the P.P.P., which became opportunist at a crucial moment when we were facing imperialism, when that wing lost the elections of '57, and the reactionary racist elements who were opposed to the P.P.P. in 1953 and onwards, the U.D.P. and the League of Coloured Peoples. That is the P.N.C. Those are its historical roots; that is the leadership and then let us not be fooled by this thing that the workers are supporting them. They were, obviously, but workers vote for the Conservative Party in England too and put it in power. They vote for Conservatives elsewhere very freely because they are brainwashed, fooled, as the P.N.C. has been fooling them but time is catching up with them, as was shown in the last Referendum.

Cde. Speaker, why did the members of the P.N.C. reject the call of the P.P.P? If they are genuine socialists, if they were revolutionaries, if they were Marxist/Leninists, they would have embraced, with open arms, the call of the P.P.P. In no country of the world could you have got such a beautiful situation. What Allende was trying to do in Chile could have been achieved in this country, if the premise was correct, that is, that the leadership of the P.N.C. was revolutionary, was socialist, but the P.N.C. rejected it because of the class interest. On Independence, the bureaucrats, petty bourgeois nationalists rose to the top of the administrative governmental ladder. On nationalization, they rose again to the top and a big bureaucracy has been established. Today, the people have to pay for that. Then there is another side of the bourgeoisie developing, attaching itself parasitically, like barnacles on the State Corporations, and bleeding the Corporations. Instead of the profits going to the people and going to the national treasury, they are going to these parasites, commission agents, construction companies, accounting firms, legal firms, architectural firms, shipping firms, and so on. This is the Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the G.E.C., listen to this:

Question: *"Are you satisfied with the contract?"*

Answer: *"I am not a lawyer. Clarke and Martin were our lawyers, and they approved."*

(Chairman points out several instances in contract where the clients, that is the Corporation, did not seem to be protected. Time was not related to work, etc., and Commissioner Felix points out to observations made by Moss in his evidence and in his letters).

Answer: *"We were unfortunate in that the lawyers of Shawinigan, in Guyana, were Clarke and Martin and they were also our lawyers."*

Politics or patronage? Both sides are represented. Listen to this now:

Question: *"This is an astonishing revelation; surely this is unsatisfactory?"*

Answer: *"Well, this is what happened. We often come across this problem since Clarke and Martin are lawyers for other Corporation and when we should sue, for example, for damage to our vehicles we are told don't worry to do so."*

Question: *"Then you had no independent advice on the Shawinigan's Contract."*

Answer: *"Only from Clarke and Martin."*

We have another instance of a man who holds key positions on the Public Service and Police Service Commissions, being dominant. He has an accounting firm. We have been saying that the accounts of all Corporations must go to the Government Audit Department, but his accounting firm gets the business. Recently, we saw the same individual becoming a national capitalist. He is a director of a refrigerator company and he is a director also of a stove company and this is the same company in which Guyanese capitalists will now be involved with foreign capitalists, Trinidadian capitalists, who own the refrigerator company, and the International Finance Corporations through the World Bank, will be giving them loans.

This is the tie up, a new bureaucratic bourgeoisie arising, industrial bourgeoisie, and these fellows are now interlinked through political patronage and they do not want to surrender their privileges and their positions. That is why they refuse our call for a National Patriotic Front Government which could have united this country and united the people to take a firm position against imperialism.

If you want to build socialism you have to fight imperialism; anti-imperialism is the gateway to socialism. Socialism is not built by verbiage. They say so in the statement *"We continue to strive for the orderly transformation of our country into a socialist State."* Hocus pocus, these are only words to fool the gullible. You cannot go to socialism unless you take an anti-imperialist course firmly in domestic policy and foreign policy. Tell us which country in the world in both domestic and foreign policy took a pro-imperialist course and arrived at socialism. Tell us which one.

In Jamaica, I spoke with one of the Leaders of the Uruguay Party, the Leader of which is now in exile. They signed an agreement in that country, in 1958. The peso is devalued in that country now. It used to be worth, a few years ago, 27 pesos to \$1 (US). Now it is about 2700 pesos to \$1 (US). The military overthrew the last President named Bordaberry, because the class struggle was advancing, because the revolutionary forces were coming forward. To prevent that from happening, they staged a pre-emptive coup—which we have been talking about.

That is why we have reiterated that the solution to the social and economic problems must come through a political solution. Without a solution to the political crisis, we are not going to have a solution to the eco-

conomic and social crisis. No matter how they try to rig the Constitution to make the present Prime Minister into a President and give him an extended term of office, give him unlimited powers, emasculate the Parliament, put in Nominated Members – those things are not going to solve the problems of the country. They will help to keep the P.N.C. in power. Now, they can't rig so easily, the world is watching. The International Commission of Jurists, their own friends at one time, has now shown the rigging that goes on. They made a wonderful report on the last Referendum.

I say this, Guyana needs a political solution. The working people of Guyana, through their premier organization, the T.U.C., have called for this, but they are pressing the T.U.C. to go to the Constituent Assembly to help them rig the Constitution instead of taking the course.

I say to these people who, for the time being, hold the Government seats that they must, in the national interest, reconsider the position of the people of this country, and avoid the dangers that we have seen in Uruguay and elsewhere, to genuinely seek to solve the political crisis in the country and let Guyana go forward out of the perpetual depression in which this country has now found itself.

Estimates: 29th March, 1979

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Chairman, I wish to refer to Subhead 1, Items (4), (8), (9), (14), (21), (24), (25) and (27) and on page 39, Subhead 13.

We note that the total vote is now approximately \$13½ million. This is quite a significant increase from what was spent under this Head not too long ago. I do not mean the immediate three-year picture which is presented in this Budget but comparing, I would say, the early part of the 1970s.

The question we have to ask ourselves is whether we are getting value for money and whether it is necessary to spend this huge sum of money which has more than doubled in less than 10 years.

[**The Chairman:** Cde. Jagan, are you dealing with all of these items consecutively?]

Dr. Jagan: The ones on page 38 dealing particularly with the Personal Emoluments section, there is an increase, for instance, in Item (4), Foreign Service Officer Grade III category. In Item (8), Foreign Service Officer Grade I, there is an increase from 18 to 23. There is an Assistant Accountant being employed now. Presumably, if the bureaucracy gets bigger, we have to have a bigger accounting staff to check up on what they are doing. Then, in the case of Ambassadors, High Commissioners and Accredited Representatives, Item (14), we have 9 now from 10 last year. We would like to know the reason for this decrease in number, at that level. Perhaps, the Minister will be able to tell us why this was done and what was the reason.

Cde. Chairman, the point I was making on these expenditures is that when we look at the direction of our trade we find that only about one percent of the total trade of Guyana is with the socialist countries. All you have to do is look at the Bank of Guyana statement; we find the decrease in that direction. If you look at the direction of our foreign policy you will see that in the previous period 1975–1976, the Government had an anti-imperialist position in foreign affairs. We see now a definite shift to the right. This was demonstrated in the Government's statement, for instance, on China's aggression in Vietnam. We saw a vicious attack by the Minister of Economic Development on the Soviet Union, spreading a lot of lies.

The Soviet Union did not have a representative, they broke off relations with the Lon Nol regime after that they had nothing there, during the time of the Pol Pot regime. Pol Pot is your stooge at the moment. At the moment, who is it that you are backing? You are US's puppet and China's puppet. That is what I am talking about.

Cde. Chairman, the point I want to make, and I made it at the very beginning, is that expenditure in foreign affairs can be justified if it is in the

national interest and if it is in the interest of the whole revolutionary movement in the world, because, as a nation, we must play a progressive role in the whole international structure. That is my point. In the same way we do not question money allocated here, under this Head, for liberation struggles in Africa, we do not question that because we feel ...

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Chairman, our nation must play a progressive role not only in terms of domestic politics but also in the international arena. Both are interlinked and react on one another. If we see what is going on today in terms of the Government's policy we will see that this expenditure is not justified and this Head should be reduced by half of what it was five-six years ago. We do not need this entire big burden which has to be met by the people; burdens placed on their backs by increased taxes and cuts in subsidies and so on. That is what I am talking about. This is demonstrated in the pro-imperialist position which is now taken by the Government and in that sense we do not need so many Embassies, so many High Commission offices and such large paraphernalia of personalities all over the place and indeed, living quite luxuriously. I see under Entertainment Allowance there is \$658,468. If you divide that by 9, call it 10, what it was before to use a simpler decimal figure, ten of these big boys with an Entertainment Allowance of \$658,000 works out to roughly \$66,000 per year per person.

What are we trying to do? Why do we have to spend all this money? Of course, it can be said that we don't have to live the style which the P.P.P. want, that we have to live at a style becoming the dignity of this nation. This is the angle which is generally put out. Cde. Chairman, it is one thing to live in a dignified way, but it is another thing to live in extravagance. I remember having lunch with a high figure in the political committee of the Labour Party in England and he told me, and a Member of Parliament, that for the first time he was sent an invitation from the Guyana High Commission, it was an invitation to have luncheon in one of the most expensive restaurants in the United Kingdom. At the same time, the Deputy Prime Minister was returning from Korea and had gone to London and this big thing was put on. The comment made to me was that, if they think this is the way they are going to impress the British Government while looking for more aid, they are certainly mistaken. That is what was told to me by a person who is high up in the Labour Party.

Cde. Chairman, we see the Cadillac-style living demonstrated when Ministers and others go abroad. They have big allowances, but we are not now at that point; we are talking now of those who are permanently abroad, the Cadillac-style, which the people of this country have to sweat to pay. This is why we question these amounts.

Item (24), Outfit Allowance, the amount to be voted is \$88,414. I see this figure seems to be constant. Last year it was exactly the same and this time

it is estimated to be the same. Does this mean that we are paying every year an Outfit Allowance for the same people or do we give them once and for all? Do we have to give a Warm Clothing Allowance as we gave to some Ministers and their wives when they were going on a tour recently? We have to have clear answers for all these questions.

Item (21), Overseas Allowance, over \$1 million is to be voted. What is the rate on which this Overseas Allowance is given? What is the basis of it? The Minister must tell us.

On the next page, page 39, Subhead 13, Expenses for the Printing and Distribution of Information Material. Cde. Chairman, I have seen material which was distributed in England, in Canada and in the United States through the Government offices. It was P.N.C. propaganda printed abroad. Is that the role of public funds, for doing P.N.C. propaganda work? We would like the Minister to be very specific on this question, whether he agrees that personnel paid from public funds in the foreign service, posted abroad, can distribute P.N.C. Party propaganda and, in so doing, help the P.N.C. in its efforts to stay in Government by unconstitutional means: by disseminating information which is loaded with a lot of half-truths, information which does not inform the public generally about the realities of Guyana. I would like to know from the Minister whether he considers that such partisan work by the staffs of these embassies and High Commission offices should be done and indeed whether the printing of that kind of information material, the P.N.C. propaganda material, is justified. Those are, Cde. Chairman, the points which are bothering people in this country and I would like the Minister who has been attending many conferences abroad, particularly Non-Aligned conferences, whether he considers that at the moment, the foreign policy of the Government.

All right, Cde. Chairman. In the general debate we did not get any answers. What might be important in the future is that we have a general debate on the separate Heads so that the Minister could answer.

***Guyana Chronicle* Article on Appointment of Ombudsman: 30th March, 1979**

Dr. Jagan: Cde Speaker, I wish to raise a matter of personal importance in connection with a statement carried in the State paper, the *Guyana Chronicle*. On the front page of today's issue it says "JAGAN'S TARDINESS DELAYING APPOINTMENT OF OMBUDSMAN" and it goes on:

"Government is anxious to appoint a new Ombudsman but the appointment is being delayed because the Opposition Leader, Dr. Cheddi Jagan, has not yet responded to a request from Prime Minister, Forbes Burnham, for them to concur on the matter, Attorney General and Minister of Justice, Dr. Mohammed Shahabuddeen, has said."

Cde Speaker, the facts are that, after receipt of a letter from the Prime Minister, I wrote him on 16 October, 1978, replying to his letter in the following words:

"Thank you for your letter of October 11, 1978, intimating that in accordance with Article 52 (2) of the Constitution you wish to have consultation with me on the appointment of an Ombudsman. Before the meeting is arranged, I shall be grateful if you would let me have the names of persons whom you may be considering for this appointment.

*Yours Sincerely,
Dr. Cheddi Jagan"*

No reply was given to me following that letter and on 8th February, a Member of Parliament, Cde. Reepu Daman Persaud, attempted, in a letter addressed to you, to have this matter raised on the Suspension of the Standing Orders as a Matter of Definite and Urgent Public Importance. That was not permitted. Debate was not permitted and the following day I wrote to the President. On the 9th February, 1979, I wrote the President a letter pointing out that the term of office of the Ombudsman, Mr. Van Sertima, had come to an end and that he had not been asked to continue for another term, as far as I was aware. I have a copy of the letter here. I do not wish to read the whole thing but just to inform the House that the information conveyed in the *Chronicle* is certainly erroneous and incorrect and that the Attorney General who should know better. He has, I believe, charge of this matter and he should know what has transpired. I am sure the President must have informed him and the Prime Minister about my representations to him on this score. First, Cde. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, I do not want to go through the exercise, as I have done on so many occasions in the past when I have submitted names and all have been discarded. That is

why, on this occasion, rather than going through a wasteful exercise, I asked that the Prime Minister should submit the names of persons whom he wanted appointed, or whom he is considering appointing, to this post. I hope, Cde. Speaker, that the Attorney General will withdraw his statements and, indeed, make an apology. I hope that the *Chronicle* also will carry the correction in the same way, with the same prominence, that this one was carried in the said paper.

Customs (Amendment) Bill: 30th March, 1979

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, the Minister informed us that one of the objects of this Bill is to straighten out matters pertaining to duty-free entry into other territories from countries where goods are manufactured and that the purpose is to ensure that the countries in which the goods are really manufactured show that they have a certain value added, a certain amount of percentage.

Now, you will recall, Cde. Speaker, that some time ago, Cde. Ramkarran brought to this House a whole bag of products and displayed them to this House and in fact, on that same occasion pulled off labels marked "*Made in Trinidad*" or "*Made in Barbados*" and under those labels on the containers you had "*Made in Britain*" or "*Made in the United States.*" No doubt this Bill is intended to make sure that we do not have such kinds of manufacturing racketeering which went on before. In other words, what we had in the past was the importation in bulk of goods, or the raw materials from the United States, the assembling of those in assembly plants, packaging them, bottling them, putting them in containers and passing them off as having been made within the region, whereas, in truth and in fact even the labels and the containers, not to speak of the contents, were all produced abroad. This can be regarded as a good step.

What I would like to ask the Minister is this; I know also that in the CARICOM Treaty, in the Appendix, I think it was pages and pages listed products like apple juice, tomato juice and wrought-iron as having originated within the area. What is happening about that? I know that in some of the small territories there was an attempt to bring some agreement to reclassify those items. However, there was an objection by some of the territories, especially the small territories, and as a result no agreement was reached. I don't know if any has been reached since the last I heard, but the summit conference has never taken place and maybe it is still in limbo. While, on the one hand, we are trying to raise the percentage of value-added and while we are trying to prevent certain crippling practices, as the Minister of Finance pointed out when he said that transportation costs are inflated and so on, at the same time, the core of that problem was the basic item which was produced abroad but which was deemed to have been produced, according to the Treaty, internally. That is the core of the problem and that has not yet been sorted out.

The other problem which I would like to raise, Cde. Speaker, is, this is only one side of the question, the other side is the exorbitant prices that we have to pay for these products, even if we produce them in the area, even if they qualify under the new terms of value-added. What is the Government doing about that? They know.

I understand the Government objected, on one occasion, that the price

quoted for detergents was more expensive than if they were bought from the parent company in England. When Jamaica got a loan from Trinidad, in the Agreement, it was stipulated that, as the other side of aid given to Jamaica, they had to buy goods in Trinidad. Drugs produced in Trinidad were ten times more expensive than if they had been bought from outside. Drugs and other things assembled in Trinidad, cars, and so on.

We have our own case where we have to buy oil. I have referred to those figures before in this House; 147 percent increase in a period of six months from September, 1972 to April, 1974 when in the same period the price of gasoline increased in the United States by only 28 percent. Texaco is one of the biggest refineries in the world, rooted in Trinidad, producing oil and refining oil produced in Trinidad and oil brought from outside, then sold here and sold in the United States, but we are paying 147 percent and United States pays 28 percent increase.

Fertilizers from the United States of America, chemicals in Trinidad, the prices to the United States, its parent company, are \$188 per ton of urea; to Guyana it is \$320. That is what the Minister should be coming and telling us. What are they doing about that? Instead of bringing these things in haste, pushing them down the throats of Members of this Parliament, without having the time to research and study, they should tell us how this country is being robbed. We want Caribbean unity. We want economic cooperation. This is highway robbery by the multinationals which are operating in these territories and they are continuing with a whole pack of tricks to exploit the people in the Caribbean, Guyana included. That is what the Minister should be telling us, especially in these times when things are so hard.

What have they done to diversify our trade? I think two years ago they went to a conference in Cuba and said they are applying for affiliation to CARICOM. Are they so enslaved, so tied up that they can do nothing about this super exploitation of the Guyanese people? These are the more important questions which this Parliament should be debating rather than these little frills thrown in from time to time. What we want to see is the shape of it, and if we look at the shape we would see the multinationals exploiting us. Don't just look at the frills. Can the Minister tell us whether this has to do with the fundamental change which people are talking about with a list which was appended to the original CARICOM agreement? What of the question of the prices, prices which are manipulated by these multinational corporations? This is why Allende was killed, because Allende was able to show that, in his country, multinationals were making 70 percent profit and the parent companies in North America were making 12 percent profit. That is why, after nationalization, Allende said, "*we will readjust all the figures and use the 12 percent which they make in North America in determining what the prices will be.*" That is why they killed him, but we are going along merrily, paying big compensation...

[The Speaker: Maybe we do not want to be shot.]

Dr. Jagan: They are shooting down the people here. The Prime Minister told me once, "*you want me to be dead like Allende?*" They are working with the multinationals, with the sharks, they are working hand in glove with imperialism and people are suffering in this country. What have they done about COMECON? How much have you shifted your trade? Since the Prime Minister visited Moscow, tell us how much has been done? Do not only make declarations about anti-imperialists, let us see it in practice, not just in verbal statements. What has been done with all the agreements? I would like the Minister to tell us something about these very important questions which are facing this country today.

Condemnation of Somoza Regime and recognition of Government of National Reconstruction: July 5th, 1979

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

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

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

“More eloquent than all the legal allegations is the following document we are going to reproduce. It contains the opinion of an eminent Yankee, Elihu Root, who was Secretary of State of the Empire.”

In a letter published by *Century*, right after the signing of the Treaty, Root said the following:

“I am assailed by anxieties and fear when I consider the question whether the Nicaraguan Government that celebrated the Treaty is really the genuine representative of the Nicaraguan people, and whether that Government can be regarded in Nicaragua and in Central America as a legitimate and free agent to authorize the Treaty.”

I have read the report of the Head of our Marines in Nicaragua and I find in it these words:

"The present Government is not in power by the will of the people. The elections were, in their greater part, fraudulent."

Further on, I have read, in the same report, the statement that those who oppose the Government make up three quarters of the country.

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

Arvelho goes on:

"Let us not forget that there is quite a background, for Elihu Root's moral code in matters of imperial grabs or seizures. He was the true author of the Platt Amendment and was the one who carried out that heroic action against Cuba."

It appears that what happened in Nicaragua exceeds even the outside limits of the moral code of the shark.

By chance, was it not Senator Borah who, in his famous speech in January 1917, said to his countrymen, *"the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty is a downright violation of the most elementary principles of international decency. That Treaty was made with ourselves. The so-called Government of Nicaragua has neither power nor authority to contract it."*

Arvelho goes on to say: *"that was exactly what the Head of the Yankee Marines of Occupation had stated in his report to his Government."*

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

He said:

"I have seen young children torn from their parents' hands and machine gunned in front of them. A young prisoner was castrated, and then his ears and eyeballs were punctured. When they were finished, they killed him. His special guard is taught to kill, not capture. 'Kill, kill, kill', is drilled into them."

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

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

Dreleiro Martinez Dramerez was fifty years old.

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

There are various things which seem to indicate that intervention is taking place. In Guatemala, an army officer, Reuben Castanada, was captured, an Israeli fighter plane was shot down. That pro-imperialist Zionist state, racist state, is also helping this fascist regime, supplying arms and fighter planes. There are indications that American and Honduran mercenaries

are fighting on behalf of the dictatorship as we saw in the struggle in Angola. It has been reported that a heavy cruiser was bombarding Sandinistas' positions at El Narango. Since it is unlikely that this type of cruiser is owned by any of the countries in the neighbourhood, it is suspected that it probably belongs to the United States.

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

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

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

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

So, it is that times are changing but note what happened there in this Resolution. All the dictatorships in Latin America either voted for or abstained. Uruguay and Nicaragua voted against the Resolution. Chile, Uruguay, Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador all abstained. On this occasion, however, the countries were led first of all by the Andean Pact – I should say first of all by Cuba, because we know that Cuba has been giving support to the Sandinista movement and the liberation struggle for many, many years. There is no question about that.

What is very important is that the Governments which make up the Andean Pact – Colombia, Venezuela, Peru, Ecuador, they came out and supported the Resolution very strongly. Panama, Mexico, Costa Rica, they

broke off diplomatic relations very early, and even Brazil broke off diplomatic relations. These are great developments in our hemisphere and we are happy that these democratic tendencies are now exerting themselves on the political arena in terms of hemispheric affairs. It is well that the United States has been defeated on this occasion.

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

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

I referred, a little while ago, in reading the "*Shark and the Sardines*" to the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty. Well, it seems that history has now turned almost a full circle where Chamorro, the publisher of one of the most popular papers, was assassinated in 1977 by the Somoza dictatorship and this sparked off the revolution, sparked off the uprising and, although it was not a military success when it first started last year, nevertheless, it kindled the revolutionary consciousness of the masses of the people and brought about unity of all the popular forces in the country to oppose the dictatorship. Successes have been achieved, we are happy to note. Two ships were seized by their crews, one of them in Panama; the crew have sought asylum in Panama. A Nicaraguan airliner was hijacked and taken by its crew to Costa Rica where they also sought asylum. The liberation forces have set up on the border with Costa Rica a 25 mile zone which is regarded now as liberated territory from which they can move against the dictator. They have liberated several cities and we now see that they are achieving successes in the international arena where they have been conducting a lot of political work in order to win support for their struggle. There is, how-

ever, the need for continuing solidarity, the need for support, medicines, etc.

I have a Report here of an interview with one of the comrades of the National Leadership of the Sandinista National Liberation Front where he said: *"we request, concretely, those medicines which will allow us to counteract the illness in our country called mountain leprosy which occurs in the mountain zones of our country and which the Government, until recently, didn't even bother to alleviate."*

He goes on to say:

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

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

The Motion also calls, as I said, for the recognition of the Government of National Reconstruction. Little Grenada followed very early some of the other Governments, and put out a strong statement and declared publicly that it was recognizing this new Government. I wonder why the Guyana Government has remained silent. Perhaps, the Minister will tell us why Guyana, which was said to be the leader in the English-speaking Carib-

bean, if not elsewhere, has remained silent? We will hear. This is no time for silence. This is a time to show our active and militant solidarity to these heroic fighters.

I know sometimes the Government makes the point that we do not have enough money and we are already helping Africa and we cannot help anybody else. That was the answer which was given in the late 1960s when the question of solidarity with Vietnam came up. They did not even give moral support much less financial, at that time. Well, let us erase the past and let us now write a new chapter. We call on the Government to give generous financial support, to speak out in bold terms and to recommend that further steps must be taken to isolate this regime and defeat it as quickly as possible so that we can have another free territory in the Americas.

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

Now, let us take the point about how they operate through the Non-Aligned Movement. Mr. Speaker, Julius Nyerere, a man whom we all respect, made the point once. He said,

“...many Governments, many delegations go to many conferences: Non-Aligned, O.A.S., etc. They go along with Resolutions, they agree with consensus. They do not vote; they do not put up their hands to show where they stand but they indicate, they imply, that they go along with the consensus, but when they go home they do nothing about it. Because so many Governments are double dealing and behaving in an equivocal manner, many of these forums have come, in effect, ineffective: United Nations, Non-Aligned Movement, O.A.U., and so on. The people go there and they do not go back to their countries to mobilize the people. To mobilize public opinion, that is action.”

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

When I dealt with the point of sanctuary for African freedom fighters, I said, Okay, good, but this is a far way from Africa. The comrades do not want to be all the way in Guyana, they want to be nearby. What about the

freedom fighters nearby, in Brazil? The Foreign Minister said *"oh, yes, we will consider each application on its merit so that when they get the application they will send it to the C.I.A."* I say it is a circus because you all make it like a circus. I said this because there were some people who, for instance, in 1972 at the Foreign Ministers' Conference here when the decision came to seat certain countries, some of them walked out of the conference and left. We do not change our line. The Non-Aligned Movement, because of its basic principles at Bandung in 1955, to fight against colonialism, imperialism, racism and for socialism, was called an immoral movement. That is what we are talking about because we cannot expect Suharto who overthrew one of the first leaders of Non-Alignment to go along with those principles. We could not expect those who are shot now, who overthrew Nkrumah, to carry out the principles of Non-Alignment. So, the imperialists came into the movement and watered it up and they have a lot of people vacillating like you all. They go and say, yes, and when they come home they do not do anything about it.

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

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

must withdraw and then we will withdraw", and they regurgitated the decision. Now, they are saying the same thing, the Chinese must withdraw from Vietnam and Vietnam must withdraw from Kampuchea. This is Non-Alignment for them. They are hiding under the apron strings, the coat tails of Non-Alignment when the fact of the matter is that they know that China has betrayed socialism, has joined the U.S., the E.E.C., and Japan axis and played the role in the whole international arena of imperialism. They know that.

Since the I.M.F., since the New Investment Code, since they want money, they have to play this vacillating role and hide, and then come to this House and say, *"all the wonderful initiatives we have taken under the Non-Aligned Movement."* That is not going to fool anybody. With regards to taking the credit for the diplomatic relations with Cuba, let us get the facts straight. It was the P.N.C. Government which broke off cultural and trade relations with Cuba started by the P.P.P. Government. After they broke off trade and cultural relations, they carried out an anti-Cuban policy for many years. Let the record be straight, it was Eric Williams' Government in this Caribbean region which first sent a technical mission to Havana. Dr. —, the Livestock Officer, came back and said that the progress Cuba had made in ten years will take the Caribbean region fifty years. That was in 1969, not 1972. Don't worry with what Fidel says. We are talking about facts. Fidel does not know the history of Guyana and the Caribbean.

I want to show this House the basic insincerity of the position of the Government in respect to its so-called *"stand"* of militant fighters against imperialism. Take the Motions which are before this House. I spoke to the Minister two days ago, or was it yesterday? I said, *"Minister, what about — I did not say Minister, I said Rashleigh, what about taking this Motion that we have at the same time?"* That is the one about political prisoners. This one was tabled since the 10th of January last year. It says:

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

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

in? Is it that?

Let us take another one – Puerto Rico.

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

There is this other one about Puerto Rico.

I am only showing the inconsistency of this Government. The Members double talk. I am leading up to the point why we cannot support that Amendment. If I do not adduce the facts, I cannot convince our colleagues over there.

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

The last one in reference to that, on 9th March, 1978, it was published. Can we be blamed about the charge which was made that we are distorting things if the Government Ministers are in the closed circuits where they operate? Whatever they do, they do not come to the nation and talk about it. They do not come to Parliament and debate them. How are we to know? The Minister mentioned the *Mirror* not knowing whether we had diplomatic relations with Nicaragua. I remember that for many months we tried to get information about Chile: whether the Government had broken off relations with Chile and when. We could not get it for months. Do not come and blow hot and cold here and tell us that we should have known better. How do you expect the people to know, if Parliament does not debate this Motion? The Prime Minister quoted from the joint statement made in Moscow. Tell us about the joint statement and also that you do not agree with the manufacture of the nuclear bomb.

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

The matter is very clear. Kissinger laid down the law about what Moynehan said when he was Ambassador at the United Nations. He had talked about automatic majority, that is, between the socialist countries and the progressive revolutionary Third World countries voting together. At that time, this Government was making some progressive decisions but, Cde. Speaker, from 1970 —

[Interruptions]

Dr. Jagan: Let us divide the period because he is heckling me. From 1964 to 1970 there was a complete pro-imperialist position; from 1970 to 1973 a vacillating position in favour of imperialism; from 1974, beginning with the Sophia Declaration and the Angolan crisis, etc., the break in relations with Israel, that was what Kissinger was complaining about - those narrow issues on which the United States Government felt seriously. That led to the recall of the Chargé d' Affaires of the U.S. when the Prime Minister accused the C.I.A. of sabotaging the Cuban Airline and the P.N.C. had to withdraw its Ambassador from the United States.

[Interruptions]

Dr. Jagan: He is not a P.P.P. puppet, he is a P.N.C. puppet. Therefore he cannot be our Ambassador. If he was serving Guyana, we would have called him our Ambassador.

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

The United States imperialism was first talking about intervention with an O.A.S. peacekeeping force after it was defeated in Vietnam. Nixon tried to set up a Latin-American peace force which they used after America invaded the Dominican Republic with 45,000 troops which, incidentally, Burnham justified after he came back from a horse ride with Johnson in America. He agreed with it. He said, "*now I understand why America intervened in the Dominican Republic in 1968.*" After America was forced to withdraw its troops, the Brazilian so-called Inter-American Peace Force, filled the background. That is how it happened. The United States wanted to do the same thing again. On this occasion, it was a little different. That time, in the Dominican Republic, the commando troops and the rebels were going to succeed. In fact, they had taken over the ... and that is when the

Americans landed the 45,000 marines. That is what they wanted to do again, but on this occasion the United States found itself isolated because even its own puppets in the O.A.S. had decided not to go along with it. Two weeks ago, they would not have touched this Motion but because the United States is now calling to the O.A.S., they have to go along. It is as clear as day. So, we have to see the gyrations of this Government: how it manoeuvres and because of that this is a blatant attempt at dishonesty to fool the Guyanese nation about its stand. The boys in Washington say now, "*boy, you can now say Somoza must go.*" That is the reality.

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

Extension of Part 11 of the National Security (Miscellaneous Provision) Act: 27th August, 1979

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, this Act is being extended at a time when we should ask what the objective situation that demands its extension is. Is there a state of war when the country is in a state of siege? Are conditions such that the normal law-enforcing authorities cannot maintain law and order? Why do we have to have a law which empowers the Government of the day to destroy, to invade the rights of the people which are enshrined not only in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Covenant of Human Rights, Civil and Political Rights, but also the fundamental rights in our own Constitution? They have subscribed to these Covenants. They have put in our Constitution those rights and now they seek to use the powers that they have to violate those rights. The Attorney General, our Minister of Justice, recently went to a conference in Zambia, the Commonwealth Conference, and was talking about the moral authority of the Government of Rhodesia, a Government which exercises powers under a rigged Constitution and under fraud. I would like to ask him today, a man supposedly of great integrity and intelligence, to say whether we have any different situation in Guyana, whether we do not have in Guyana a regime attempting to take away the rights of the people, a regime which has extended its life by a manoeuvre and a fraud, and a Government which now is proposing to rig the Constitution, as in Rhodesia, to continue in power. All this double talk does not come from honest people, but it comes from dishonest people and this is what we have in this country, a bunch of dishonest people who appropriate powers, seize powers from the people by fraud and dishonest means and they come and put on the appearance of men of integrity and go to the world and talk about principles. Why principles are right in the case of Rhodesia and not right here? Let the Minister of Justice talk about that. We would like to hear him.

The National Security Act is intended, they say, for the purpose of public safety and public order for the defence of Guyana. Guyana is not being threatened by anybody so far as public safety and public order are concerned. Who is disturbing the public peace? They refused to pay the people the \$14 per day. These liars get in the streets and on the radio, including the Prime Minister, and lie about not a cent more –

[**The Speaker:** Cde. Jagan, I would not have you making that statement, calling the Prime Minister a liar.]

Dr. Jagan: The Prime Minister is a liar and I will repeat it over and over in this House.

[**The Speaker:** If you insist on that, I shall not hear you any more. The Rules say you must not use those words.]

Dr. Jagan: He is not a liar. He is a prevaricator. The fact is that they prevaricate; they tell falsehoods in the streets; they use the radio to distort historical facts. The fact of the matter is – and I repeat again – the P.P.P. did not, at any time, make a promise to the workers and did not fulfil it. The P.P.P., so far as the workers are concerned, improved on the recommendation of the Guillebaud Commission. That is on the record, but these so-called socialists, these so-called defenders of the workers, tell the workers “I will pay you \$14 a day.” They signed it and what have they done? Cde. Speaker that is why there is a disturbance of the peace and order of this country today, because they are murdering the people. Not only the goon squads on the streets, but the cost of living. They refuse to pay the wage which was promised to them and then they defraud them, they add 100 percent, 200 percent and 300 percent on the foods they import into the country. They have prostituted and distorted the whole concept of control of foreign trade to use it as a means to rob the workers of this country.

Let us look at this Statement. They not only defrauded the workers. Let us take the mine workers, who, at one time, were their staunchest supporters. They not only refused to pay the \$14, but the increments to which the people are entitled. Some were paid in January, and in May this year, they cut it out, stopped it. Look at what they tell the people; look at what they tell themselves in secret, but it comes out in public. This is the strength of the P.P.P. and that is why we can get information like this. This is a letter signed on July 20th, 1979, from P.Q. De Freitas to W.H. Parris, Personal. This is what it says so far as workers are concerned:

“No increased benefits should be granted to the G.M.W.U. or G.B.S.A. employees. The review currently in progress should be suspended, dragged out, filibustered for the rest of 1979. The idea is no payment must be made or accrued for 1979. The Workers Housing Plan should be suspended until we put in place the facilities for which we have already provided funds. We now provide \$2.6 million per annum, for these housing schemes, and we have unspent \$4.6 million.”

This is why there is a disturbance of the peace in this country. People cannot live because of their policies, their wage freeze policies, taken from their masters in Wall Street and the I.M.F. and the State Department. The fact is that when they take the money from the people, they send it out to their masters and they refuse to pay the people the money. The Prime Minister said last night - I heard it over the radio – “that the Soviets told him, the Russians told him personally, that they do not provide foreign exchange. A sum of \$234 million of the \$401 million that they are collecting from the sweat and tears of the workers is going out to pay those who have robbed us, and those who

have put them in power and continue to prop them in power." That means \$234 million is going to pay debts and compensation payments.

They will fool the gullible in the streets. That is why they want to close down the *Mirror*. That is why they do not want us to be heard on the streets. That is why, when we have a public meeting, for which police permission is given, they use the thugs not only to throw missiles, bottles and bricks, but bottles filled with formalin. These people are moving to the stage of fascism in Germany, under Hitler and Mussolini.

Let me come back to the financial question. Two things they are saying to the public today: they have not got the money to pay; it is going to cost \$85 million for them to pay the \$14 a day. They have not got it, but they are paying their masters \$234 million. Let that be known to the public. If we were in Government and a crisis like this, as on our shoulders, in whose benefit do you solve the crisis? The masters, the imperialists, or the working class, there would be no doubt at all where the P.P.P. would decide and it was for that reason that the imperialists decided with the C.I.A. and what is his name there. He is now calling us counter-revolutionaries. *New Nation* has an article, by him, saying we are counter-revolutionaries. Even the former Minister in charge of the police is laughing, because he knows that.

So, Cde. Speaker, it is \$85 million for the workers. They have it. All they have to do is to stop what they are sending out. They cannot, because I asked them: "*do you want P.P.P.'s support? Ninety percent of the people on the streets today – whom you do not have – will support you.*"

Let us deal with foreign exchange now. The bulk of this \$234 million is going out in foreign exchange, in foreign dollars. According to the I.M.F. terms, this year, the Bank of Guyana must increase our reserves overseas by \$200 million. It has nothing to do with the Soviet Ambassador giving us foreign exchange. That is trying to fool the public. You have the power in your hands. Let Vincent Teekah, who has become an economist, give those figures. Analyse them, those are the facts. They not only have the money right here to pay the workers but they have the money, right here, which is going out to pay the sharks in foreign exchange, which we need to buy all the things we need in Guyana today. That is why they do not want the people to hear in the streets; that is why they do not want the *Mirror* to be published and they go about monopolizing the press and the radio and the streets to fool the workers.

Look at all the corruption and the rackets which are going on today— apart from the fact they do not pay the people the money and do not try to control the cost of living. Let us look at someone named Mustapha Ally, for example, they paid him nearly \$300,000. They admitted it. The Minister has not been able to obtain from Mustapha Ally any detailed accounts of cost etc. He finds it impossible to present any logical figures for any settlement of the service by Mustapha Ally. Still, they gave him, for a Sports Complex, the sum of \$300,000. They refuse to debate it. When they try to filibuster with the workers, the mine workers filibuster them, talk them

out. At the same time, we have a statement here of Mr. Parris and Mr. Blackman going on a trip. Mr. Parris gets US\$200 per day for 14 days and his wife, too, has to go along and gets US\$100 per day.

Desmond says I am a kept man. Look at this statement when he went abroad last year: Cde. Hoyte, thirty-one days at \$440 per day. Tell us how much freeness you had over there, how much you paid, out of this, while you were abroad? Look at the Auditor General's last Report. The Auditor General's last Report is 1970. Listen to this:

"In relation to Tender Board, the Auditor General drew attention in his 1968 Annual Report in which he has referred to instances where contracts relating to the Ministry of Works, Hydraulics and Supply were awarded to parties other than those to whom the awards were made or recommended to be made by the appropriate Tender Board."

[The Speaker: Where are you quoting from?]

Dr. Jagan: The *Mirror* of Thursday, June 28, 1979. This is not manufactured evidence; this is a quotation directly from the Auditor General's Report of 1970. That is why we have to worry. That is why I was asking, a little while ago, about Mr. Stoby getting a boat engine. We want to know. Anyway, let us come back to the meat of the question.

The proposition is this. This Government is taking this country around in a vicious circle. It is started out with National Security Act after it detained the people and after it came to power with the help of the C.I.A. That is well known. After it removed the emergency, it brought in the National Security Act and it has so run the country, that the country is today, in a grave economic and social crisis. How is the Government reacting to that crisis? This is the point. We have said, over and over, that the course it is taking cannot solve the problems. Let it take the course which will help the people of this country and which will help the country to develop.

Cde. Speaker, these people are political infants; they do not understand. Do they think that the little army and the police they have and the National Security Act will save them? The Shah of Iran had the fifth biggest army in the world. He had the Savak, the secret police, with thugs operating all over the world, and it did not save him. Somoza bombed the people, committed genocide against his own people, but that did not save him. They are starting on that course.

I want to speak now, to some people. Do they go along with this, Cde. Jack, Cde. Kennard? Cde. Kennard used to serve the Government before, as a technocrat. They moved the man from a good position and made him a Minister and a P.N.C. man, and the man cannot do his work as he used to do before. The same thing they did with Shahabuddeen. The same thing they did with Steve Naraine. Steve Naraine put up a recommendation to the P.P.P. Government to start the M.M.A. Scheme, since 1965. Up to now,

they have not done it. How many times Kennard has been told by the rice farmers, shown evidence, everything? He himself, we understand, has put up reports to the Cabinet, "*treat rice farmers better.*" His mouth is shut now; he cannot come out because he has become a Party hack, unfortunately. We have other people who, one would have thought, had more sense, who have logic, who have understanding, but clearly, they must see the course we are going is not going to get this country anywhere. The Prime Minister now says we must have dialogue with the official Opposition. Shoot the other one, shoot them down.

With regards to dialogue, the P.P.P. since 1976, in June, on Enmore Martyrs' Day, the first time we had the chance to get on the radio, read seventeen points and we told them: do it. If we do not do it, the economy will become undermined; you will have problems from economic crisis to social crisis to goon squads to fascism. That is the order. Therefore, it is not a question of dialogue. The P.P.P. is always talking, everywhere, here, in the streets. We had talks with them too, but the talks broke up because they betrayed this country when Kennard offered \$1 and Sukhdeo offered \$1 when they went to Bookers. When they settled under pressure at \$102 million at 6 percent interest, twenty years to pay this, the country was caught in a trap, a debt trap. When they sold the country out, they did not see any need any more to carry out any procedures. Democracy! They are now talking nonsense, getting on the radio and making it appear that the P.P.P. is talking ethnicity, race. What we were talking about was to implement the provisions of the Constitution: that the Opposition must have a voice in the Public Service Commission and in places where people are employed and promoted because of their practice of racial and political discrimination. That is what they are distorting. Let me just not read out all of this, but just to summarize it.

Cde. Speaker, we do not have democracy at the Government level: central and local –

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: They don't have democracy at the social level with the mass organisations that the people want. They don't have it at the industrial level, at the factory level so that we could have democratic management and workers' control. If we continue with corruption, if we continue with racial and political discrimination, we cannot see any end to this crisis we have here today. I want to warn these people. History and judgment will say that they are perpetrators of violence and they are using, now, fascist methods which Hitler and his hordes tried to use to kill the working class, but they did not succeed and these will not succeed also in this country.

Constitution (Amendment) Bill: 3rd October, 1979

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, the last time the life of the Parliament was extended, the argument used was that Guyana needed a new Constitution, that the Independence Constitution was unsuitable. The House was not told in what way the Constitution was an obstruction for social change, and up to today this point has not been made.

The last speaker said that the P.P.P. stayed away from the 1965 Conference and condemned that Constitution and is now defending that same Constitution. I am sorry my friend has not looked at the situation from a dialectical point of view for, had he done so, he would have understood and he would have seen that the product of the 1965 Conference was a product of a united team: P.N.C., U.F. and imperialism, and there were a lot of things wrong in that Constitution, to wit, the clause which spoke about prompt and adequate compensation when property, like the imperialists' property, in Guyana was nationalized. In the Ramsahoye draft of 1962 that clause, which had been inserted in the 1961 Constitution by the imperialists, with the help of the Opposition, was taken out but the draft approved by Shahabuddeen, supported by the Prime Minister and the Opposition, restored the prompt and adequate compensation clause in the 1965 Constitution. Ramphal was an agent of the Prime Minister; you know that. Shahabuddeen was an assistant of Ramphal.

The Minister will speak here, but we are dealing with the way the thing operated then, in the legal department, so let us get the perspective clear. The product of 1966 was a retrograde step from the Ramsahoye draft of the P.P.P. Government for the Independence of Guyana and no doubt that is why Mr. Feilden Singh can get up and say we took it from here together, and we came back with it the same way. He is right, therefore, to say there was a lot of hypocrisy for the Government now to say that Constitution is no good. Our case is not that. Our case is that changes have been made in that Constitution, and just to remind the last speaker, when the P.P.P. gave support in 1971 for the nationalization of the Demerara Bauxite Company, gave Parliamentary support so that the Government could have a two-thirds majority, when the matter was put to the vote, they voted against it. That showed that, on that occasion, the United Force wanted to maintain the older order.

Subsequent changes have been made in the Constitution. In 1975 two amendments were made and we say that all those amendments were put together in the Constitution. The Government was permitted to go ahead with its programme, at one stage, to take over, as it did, 80 percent, as the Members of the Government now say, of the economy. There is nothing in that Constitution to prevent the Government, for instance, from going ahead to nationalize the banks, to nationalize the insurance companies, if it wanted

to, which was in its programme also, after miniaturization of the banks; there is nothing in the Constitution which prevents the Government from breaking up the big landlords' estates, from giving land to the tillers. That is our position. We are not defending a Constitution which came out of the 1965 conference.

Of course, there are other things in the Constitution: the Fundamental Rights Section. The Fundamental Rights Section was the Section which the P.P.P. put into the 1959-1960 draft which was taken to London for the 1960 conference. Fundamentally, what came out in the 1962, 1965 or 1966 Constitutions was in the original Constitution. The controversial clause was the "*prompt and adequate compensation*". So, Mr. Feilden Singh is arguing like a lawyer and not like a dialectician, and if he was arguing like a dialectician he would then understand the P.P.P.'s position and not come out with his puerility, naivete.

This is a forum to educate the masses. This is the reality of the situation. The Government says – I come back to the words – that the Constitution is unsuitable. Now, Cde. Speaker, as I said already, there is nothing in the Constitution which prevents the Members of the Government from taking any measure, in this country, to advance social change. They have the two-thirds majority and they know, they are aware, that if they do anything positive, as in 1971, they will get the support of the P.P.P. to amend the Constitution, if necessary.

In fact, what is happening is that they are going backward: with the I.M.F. agreement, a reversal on the Sophia Declaration of 1974. I have spoken about that already, so that the Constitution is not a barrier, has never been, rather. I shouldn't say has never been, has not been in recent times since the amendment and, consequently, we say that it was, as my colleague said, a smoke screen, a red herring brought across in order to achieve the purpose of postponing elections, for the first time, last year.

What was their expectation? They were hoping that things would get better. They fooled themselves with their own propaganda: the I.M.F. deal will bring in the millions - will bring in the foreign exchange. The Prime Minister says that he spoke to the Soviet Ambassador and they do not give foreign exchange so the Government had to go to the I.M.F. How can you blame them for going to the I.M.F. and the Americans; who else will give?

We say that is not the question. The money is right here; \$234 million out of \$400 which was squeezed out of the people; \$234 million, the bulk of that is going out in foreign exchange to pay debts and compensation payments. At the same time, all the banks and the foreign insurance companies are taking money out this country in the form of profits. That is what has to be dealt with and that is not a constitutional issue. That is a political issue and, instead of the Government going forward to take positive steps to deal with that question, it is retreating and bringing the red herring about the Soviet Union not giving foreign exchange.

Cde. Speaker, as I said, the hope was Hope. I remember when Mr. Hope

was Finance Minister. What year was that? Before his job was taken away by this Minister over here, Cde. Hoyte, he told us that in a year or two, everything would turn round the corner, the world economy would become better and we would be doing well in Guyana. "Everlasting Hope," as we said then. Well, look at it, in their own newspaper, *Guyana Chronicle*: "E.E.C. points gloomy picture for 1980". Capitalism is in crisis, getting deeper and deeper in the quagmire and they are always living in everlasting hope that things are going to turn round the corner. Well, it is getting worse and as it gets worse, it is like an aeroplane going downhill – tailspin – and this is where the economy is going at the moment: in a tailspin; every year it is worse. This is not our figure. The Minister of Economic Development gave us last week and my colleague referred to it. The economy is in a mess and it is becoming worse. The question is what to do about it.

As I said already, Cde. Speaker, the I.M.F.'s solution is no solution. They have an extended credit. Last year, they had \$48 million. This year they have \$206.5 million for three years, averaging roughly \$63-\$64 million a year. On the one hand, like a sick patient getting a blood transfusion and on the other hand getting one pint of blood and donating three pints of blood at the same time. This is what is happening to our economy and that is no solution. Any schoolboy will tell you that if you put a patient in that position, he would die.

So, we come now to a solution. Here again we have to deal with dialectics. We have to deal with economics and politics and ideology and institutions. We have to see the connection – interconnection and interaction – first with a Constitution which they brought back. It is not only the Constitution they brought back which they and the imperialists got together and made in 1966, but they got together and put out policies, domestic and foreign, which are today reaping the bitter fruits for this country: the debt and the compensation payments, 58 percent of the current budget.

That is the reality of our economic life and so the economy got into a worse position and that had its reaction on the politics. As the economy got worse, they put on more pressures on the workers: more taxes from 1977, removal of subsidies, cut in social services, dismissal of workers, and as the workers fight back there is more repression, as the workers fight back the class struggle must advance. They fight back and there is more repression. Beat them up in the streets. Call every strike political. Dismiss the workers, okay, but that is not going to solve the crisis. We have a vicious circle and now that kind of reaction, at the political level, is having its reaction on the economy. Let us not fool ourselves. These are laws of social development and people who do not understand do not look at the picture very comprehensively. Then they will not see this. They will live in hope like the utopian socialists, the cooperative socialists, that things will get better, but they will not because our relationship is tied up with the world situation. Constantly we are hearing pleas at home: "produce more, increase production and increase productivity. Produce or perish." That is the new slogan.

The Prime Minister goes abroad. The Minister of Foreign Affairs has just come back from a safari to the United Nations and what do they speak about? Is it the grandson, or great grandson of a slave who brought his forefathers here, the West Indian Committee? We went to London to talk to them to come back and enslave us again. Mr. Jackson also spoke about interdependence. Fidel made a speech at the U.N. on behalf of the Non-Aligned Nations and he made that position very clear. There can be no interdependence between shark and sardines; there can be no interdependence between the imperialist exploiters and those whom they subjugate in the Third World and elsewhere.

Cde. Speaker, every time we hear a speech abroad, we talk about the new economic order. We talk about interdependence, but let us face facts. In this period of intense and deep economic crisis of capitalism, imperialism will not solve its own problems and contradictions by aiding the Third World countries. It cannot and will not. Let us understand that clearly. Merely going abroad to make pleas, is not going to help. What is going to help, what is going to solve the problems is to deal with the question internally and externally in the way it should be dealt with, that is, advance the class struggle at home and advance the class struggle internationally? Say which side you are on.

I heard the Prime Minister's speech at the Non-Aligned Movement. I heard Mr. Manley's speech also. How is it that, at one time, Guyana was supposed to be ahead of Jamaica and now Jamaica is taking forthright steps against imperialism while Guyana is reversing and going back on pronouncements made in the Sophia Declaration? Let me say this. Apart from all of this hope and wishful thinking, merely feeding the people demagogic statements, talking at the street corners and in the columns of the *Chronicle*: that we have a socialist thrust, that we are advancing into socialism and that we shall write in the Constitution, the P.N.C. draft, that Guyana is in a stage of transition from capitalism to socialism, will not help. One of our workers intellectuals – I make a distinction between worker intellectual and petty bourgeois intellectual.

At a T.U.C. meeting, one of our ordinary comrades spoke on the Education Report of the T.U.C. where the same phrase is copied and used verbatim almost, because they have Sancho and some of the other boys, backbenchers of the P.N.C., so they copy everything the master says. So, our worker intellectual got up and began telling them some of the theoretical principles. Apparently, Teekah has forgotten all of those things now; he doesn't talk about them now. So, the man was speaking, do you know what Basil Blair did? He said, "Comrade, is this fellow on the education committee?" He said, "No" "Put him on. You are a member of the Education Committee."

Cde. Speaker, the point I am making, as the regime gets more unpopular, as it loses footing at the street corners, it will become more and more demagogic. Writing it in the Constitution doesn't make it so. Indira Gandhi

did the same thing when she was revising the Constitution and when elections came, although she had won three-quarters of the votes in the previous elections, she only won one quarter at the following election.

I recall the day in this House in 1970, on Republic Day, when they brought forward the concept of cooperative socialism, I pointed to the Prime Minister with the book and I said, "*Time was when we both read this book and believed in its contents, but now, for opportunist reasons you want to forget about scientific socialism and you are talking about utopian cooperative socialism.*" I have the book here. If any one of them wants to read it, I can lend him. Another book. That one was Engels, one of the classics, *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*. What was said in 1970, nearly 10 years ago, today it has come to pass. The P.P.P. speaks from a position of theoretical provision because we take a scientific approach to the question of politics and ideology. But, comrades, if you drift pragmatically from pillar to post, you are going to land the country and its people not only in a position where they suffer as they are today, a lot of them are opting out, running away, but more so, you are preparing the country for a state of tension and turmoil, and Guyana will be no exception in this regard to other countries.

So far as the institutions of the State are concerned, there is no independence at all. The P.N.C. party and the State institutions are all interlinked. Even in the Soviet Union there is no such thing as Party paramountcy. State organs function as State organs outside of the Party. The Party is a guide not a dictator. Socialism does not come from dictatorship. They say their ideas are based – occasionally they talk about Marx, Engels and Lenin. Recently they have been talking about Kim Il Sung, and Mao-tse-Tung, more so.

This is from the Central Committee Report, the 20th Congress, Page 18. P.P.P. Congress, of course. Do you expect me to quote from the P.N.C. Congress? Whoever wants to reach socialism by any other path than that of political democracy will inevitably arrive at conclusions that are absurd and reactionary both in the economic and political sense.

Cde. Speaker, I saw the other day you had reason to complain about it over and over in this House, I hope it is not right, not true, an Order Bill showing the number, showing where things were ordered from Guyana Stores to the tune of nearly \$30,000 for the P.N.C. Congress. What is this? This is not socialism, this is not socialist practice. The Prime Minister quotes that this is done in the Soviet Union. It is not done like that in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has its own Party membership and they carry on their work from party dues. They don't collect from the people, businessmen or from any other Congress. They collect from their member's annual, weekly dues, monthly dues.

Mr. Feilden Singh said that we did not attend the Constituent Assembly because it was a question of money and so on. Cde. Speaker, that is a shallow statement which doesn't deserve to be answered but let me just say for the record, the amount of time that the P.P.P. spends at the street

corners of this country is more than all the time that Feilden Singh and all of them spend in the Constituent Assembly. The P.P.P.'s politics are known in here and out of here, all the time, in the streets, with the people. One of our comrades, only this week in the North West, had to walk and push a bicycle for twenty-five miles. I can't argue with you, gasoline is \$6 per gallon and that type of thing. That is how they are developing the interior.

But let us come to this Constituent Assembly. After all our efforts to stop the Referendum, which was rigged to make it succeed, we said, all right; we came in the House, we moved a Motion that the work, the product of the Constituent Assembly must go to the people. Here is the Vote:- For, P.P.P. – five; Against – the P.N.C.; not inclined to vote – Mr. Abraham and Mr. Singh. This is what we are talking about. That is a matter of principle. When Mr. Burnham was Leader of the Opposition, he put a Motion in the Parliament that this Legislative Assembly recommend that a Referendum be held for the purpose of deciding Guyana's electoral future, but he is not prepared to put this Constitution today to the people. This is our objection. Not only that is our objection but we see also the farce of wasting time in this Constituent Assembly. Mr. Feilden Singh said he will help to record his protest, etc., record his position, but it also has now given the P.N.C. an excuse to now extend, ask for another extension. Because of this circus, because of this show which is now being taken all over the country. That is what you are afraid of. So it is not just a question of whether we take part in the Constituent Assembly or not.

The fact of the matter is, in the Constituent Assembly, we know that what the P.N.C. wants will be put there. That is a fact and therefore the P.N.C., if it didn't want to have the excuse that the work is not finished, to extend the life of this Parliament for another twelve months, could have presented the Constitution long ago. That is what is going to be done eventually, but let us see what is going to come out of this Constituent Assembly. The P.N.C. has put out a Draft. What is that Draft? The elected members – sixty-five or fifty-three of them, twelve other members – ten coming from Regional Councils and two from G.A.L.A. Cde. Speaker, I remember when Mr. Burnham and I went to England to protest the suspension of the Constitution, one of the organisations, which sent a telegram and forced the British Government to suspend, was the Village Chairman's Conference and G.A.L.A. is the successor to that body – that is what it did. So then the T.U.C. comes along as a willing tool of the P.N.C. and says, "*T.U.C. must have as many as G.A.L.A. has, so many of the members*". So we are going to have not only the emasculation of the Parliament and the control of it through fraudulent elections but the President will have unlimited powers, unlimited.

Nixon was not impeached. He was saved from impeachment by resigning, saved from impeachment before the bloodhounds. The President, under the P.N.C. constitution, if he was placed in a similar position as Nixon found himself, he will not have to resign, he will dissolve the Parliament. That is

the kind of dictatorship that is being proposed. Tell us what is there in that Constitution which can advance the social progress, the social trend in Guyana? What is there in that Draft which is not there right now, except to put in all those dictatorial provisions which will put more power in the hands of one person?

Cde. Speaker, all this talk about a socialist Constitution for a socialist Guyana is a lot of bunk, is a lot of nonsense to fool the gullible, to delude the people and to buy time. They know that their popularity today is nothing. It is at its lowest ebb and so they want to buy more time, as in the case of Local Government elections, perpetual postponement, and a one-party State and the facade of democracy.

I think that the Members of the Government at this time of our lives, if they are really socialist as they claim, if they really have any feeling for the people of this country, for this nation, they should stop and examine, see what the realities in the country are. They must know that people are crying out, they must know that people are suffering. Look at the prices that people have to pay in the Rupununi for gasoline, for milk, for essentials. How are you going to develop the interior, how are you going to develop agriculture? From all quarters now people are talking, the working-class is speaking. They claim that they are socialist, that they are the vanguard Party. Well, if they are the vanguard Party, behave like the vanguard. The role of a vanguard is to unite the people. Take steps to unite the working class and move the country forward. Fight against imperialism.

So bad has the situation become that the T.U.C. was forced, although controlled by the P.N.C., to call a special conference last year, in November, and it has called for a political solution which the P.P.P. has been calling for donkey's years, more particularly since 1977 when the crisis first manifested itself. Nothing was done. This was after the P.P.P. proposal in 1977, in August, was rejected. At a meeting in Mexico which I attended, the Minister of Information was there. What did he tell the crowd? P.P.P. is not serious. If the P.P.P. was serious about national unity it would not have gone to the press. It would have gone to the party. Cde. Speaker, in the period of critical support, the P.P.P. had talks with the P.N.C. and it was clear that the P.N.C. was not concerned because at that time the members thought they were rising high with sugar prices and so on. Myopia, because they cannot see far ahead. They were riding high but now the T.U.C. has come forward with that resolution.

At the last conference, recently concluded in October, another resolution was passed, a special resolution out of the floor of the conference and it says,

"Whereas the T.U.C. is placed in the invidious position where it cannot escape the effects of political controversy.

And whereas the economy of the country will continue to be in a precarious position unless some measure is made to bring about broad working class unity

among the workers ...”

The T.U.C. finds itself in a dilemma and it is asking itself what is its role. Soon after the Special Conference last year it came out on a decision and called a general strike on the N.I.S. increases and the Widows' and Orphans' Fund increases but the P.N.C. leaders, the Prime Minister, cajoled them, no doubt, threatened them.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: You don't threaten them? What did you do to Mr. Feilden Singh after the Referendum? You said, he beat up Panday, and you were bringing the police, the same police. No doubt that is why you forced him to go to the Constituent Assembly. He is now trying to tell us he is not there because of money. Ask him how he got there.

The T.U.C. finds itself in a dilemma today. It is getting a bad name. It is under pressure from the Government and pressure from the workers. It therefore passed a Resolution saying another Special Conference should be called to see how means could be found, etc. They had other organisations. My colleague, Cde. Collymore, has referred to the signatures of sixty-six prominent people who are in commerce, in industry and in different places, some are even in Government. I don't want to name them because I would steal a lot of time from you. There are some people here who work with the Government; because they see that the thing is going downhill. Therefore, the citizens have now come together and they have invited the P.N.C. and other parties, other political forces, to a meeting this Saturday.

I am not going to dictate to the P.N.C. I can't, but I would like, at this zero hour to warn of these methods being used merely to perpetuate the life of this Government. If these were going to solve the problems of the people, we would say all right. The evidence is there. The situation is getting from bad to worse and will continue to do so. If there are any nationalists on that side, if there are any socialists, if there is any anti-imperialist, this is the hour that they must come out and speak out with some of their colleagues who find a time and place. The time has come to call a halt to all this nonsense. We have put the Motion in the Parliament, largely because, as I was saying, the Minister of Information went to Mexico and said we are not serious about national unity, if we were serious we would not have just gone to the press conference. In other places, they are saying the same thing. They go to other conferences, P.P.P. does not want unity. Okay. They can make propaganda abroad to this effect but all of that is not going to help because clearly it is showing that all over the world people are beginning to understand the realities of what is happening in Guyana and no amount of P.N.C. propaganda is going to wipe that out. No amount of fiddling is going to help to solve the economic and financial problems of

the country and put this country on the course which can lead to social change and social progress.

Cde. Speaker, everything has a time but we would hope that better senses will prevail in this country and we do not have to have the genocidal wars like in Vietnam and Nicaragua, where hundreds of thousands of people are being shot, where villages and towns are being bombarded. Imperialist troops are coming at critical times, last year and this year, to talk about training in jungle warfare. Has the Prime Minister forgotten that when they suspended our Constitution in 1953 one of the charges was that we were supporting Mau Mau terrorists in Kenya and bandits and terrorists in Malaya? The British have more experience all over the world, so far as fighting terrorists is concerned, than perhaps any other force, in jungle or whatever. The Americans are there too. They are handing out money. They are now coming back with the Cold War in this area because they see progress and change and they want to turn back the clock of history.

The last Ambassador said they are so confident about this Government, they had promised \$12 million in one year and they gave \$30 million. One of their previous Under Secretaries of State said they are not concerned about the road Guyana is taking. Let us not fool the people about how anti-imperialist you are and how progressive you are. The fact of the matter is this country is now reversing course and it is not going to solve the problems of the people of Guyana. The hour is now when progressive forces in this country must come together if this country is to be saved, and from this forum, we call for, we make a plea to those people who have the interest of this country at heart not to rely mainly on force and terror. The writing is there on the wall. The imperialists know that their puppet dictators are falling like ninepins all over the place. At times they kill their puppets to get them out of the way, like the one who was in the Dominican Republic for 30 years, Trujillo, and Chu, whom they brought from Japan as a playboy and whom they put in the Presidency in Vietnam. They had to kill him to get rid of him.

Let us understand this is the reality of today's politics. Their imperialists know that we are suffering. Imperialism is also going to try to turn this country back and the progressive forces of this country have to watch. In the Caribbean today, they are afraid. Nicaragua, St. Lucia, Dominica, Grenada, since Cuba. They want to have a new axis, so they start with Trinidad, Barbados, St. Vincent, with Antigua, St. Kitts, Dominica. Because of devastation from hurricanes, Dominica looks for aid and Seraphine has said that, "*Those who are giving us aid have questioned the ideology of the Government*", and so, what happens? Senator Rosie Douglas – gone. Minister Martin – gone. So is it the way you want to go? Is it the way Guyana will go? The way that puppetry is reversing?

Cde. Speaker, we say at this time Guyana faces great dangers when imperialism is in a counter attack. It is now time for guile to achieve its objective, not only bribing but bringing the fleet again into the Caribbean waters

as in the days when the flag used to fly all over the place, and all patriots of this country must stand up and speak out against this kind of new Cold-War manoeuvre and threat to the sovereignty, security and peace of the Guyanese and Caribbean people.

Constitution (Amendment) Bill – Bill No. 11/1979: 15th October, 1979

Dr. Jagan: Look at the stupidity. Perhaps, it is not stupid. This is the class interest that they are showing up. What have they done now? They mentioned that rice production went down in the second crop.

This is how the money is going down. They had a formula before, two to one. Two bags of paddy make one bag of rice when you mill it. Consequently, if you pay the farmers \$1 for paddy, you pay to millers when you buy the rice from them, \$2 more. What is the formula now? One dollar to the farmer, four dollars to the miller, to mill white rice and six dollars to the miller to mill parboiled rice. This is what you call downright State robbery. They are killing the farmers. Farmers were getting \$1 bonus, now they have wiped that out. How, in the name of God, do you expect production and productivity under these conditions? It is the oil price, all the imported prices, all the inflation that cause the farmers' production cost to go up. It is this kind of downright robbery. They are running the rice mills. The Government does three-quarters of the production. It controls the silos and everything and it is now robbing the farmers in order to pay inefficient production. As I said, it was two to one and the Minister knows it is one to four, one to six. Now the consumers will be called upon to pay, the poor consumers on whom you have a wage freeze. Everything is going up for him and now you are increasing the price of rice. It is this kind of nonsense that is going on in this country, and this is why the Rice Development –

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: I am finished with rice, but I think I have made the point that all these things are failing. This same with electricity, read the Luckhoo Commission Report. That is so shameful, disgusting but they did it to show that it was not their fault, that it was the fault of the managers and the technicians. However, they have to accept responsibility because they have corrupted the whole system by interference with the concept of party paramountcy in hiring and firing. The General Council of the Party meets and they say heads must roll. Manager this, must go, not the Public Service Commission or the Police Service Commission or the Judicial Service Commission. They do not mean a thing now. The result is that taxpayers now have to find \$5 million to put here. Square pegs in round holes because of the Government's interference with State function. The party is interfering with State function. The party and the State have become one. Only a few days ago we saw where they said that the Minister of State, for Information, is now going to be in charge of Information for the P.N.C.

The Minister should tell us, in detail, what this money is for. This brings me to the point that we should introduce a new practice in this House where we should have an informal meeting, a Finance Committee or something, where these matters could be gone into in great detail.

If you mention it, I will tell you that is for a rigged Constitution. I am talking about making this House more efficient so that the country will know, so that they will get more information. I wish to close.

In our view, all this is a waste of money. It is going to go further down the drain and the taxpayer will have to foot the bill, whether it is the poor rice farmers, or the consumers, or the sugar workers, or the bauxite workers, as consumers and as wage workers, or selling produce. They will have to pay for all of this. What should have happened, in fact, and we were asking for that at that time when the Presidential Commission was appointed, was for the Opposition to have been part of that Presidential Commission so that we would have known not only what we read in the papers or in the report, but we would have sat and heard the details of what was going on so that we can properly understand, when requests like this come, whether it will have any impact, at all, in helping to solve the problem.

Cde. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, in connection with item 18, Cotton Textile Mill, what is the position with respect to the cotton input, production of cotton, whether the mill will be completed by this year end and whether we have the cotton which was expected to be produced in the country for this mill, because our understanding is that we do not have the cotton, whether it is expected to import cotton for this mill on completion?

On item 20, the construction and installation of equipment for the Vegetable Oil Plant, presumably, this is the plant from the G.D.R., the German Democratic Republic. It seems that it took us 15 years to get this factory up because I remember, in the time of the P.P.P. Government, a contract was negotiated for a factory and it was cancelled by this Government. So, we are now back to square one.

I would like to ask the Minister, however, whether this factory will be utilizing oil bran from coconut, and also from rice, and whether it would also be taking care of the new nuts, palm oil nuts, from Wauna. I know, in the case of Wauna, the Minister of Agriculture, some years ago, when they withdrew the subsidy on coconuts, indicated that the better oil to go in for would be palm oil because one would get more per acre than from coconut.

The position, now, is that we have the coconut industry practically ruined and we are now importing huge quantities of soya bean oil to replace oil which we have not been able to produce because the policy, with regard to coconuts, was reversed. First, we did not have the subsidy which was given in the P.P.P. time and, secondly, the price to the local producers did not increase to commensurate with the price that West Indian producers receive. So, now we find ourselves importing coconut oil from the West

Indies and supplementing the shortfall by getting, I believe, oil on loan from the United States of America, soya bean oil.

Therefore, I would like to know whether this mill will also be utilised in extracting the palm oil on which so many hopes were put, some time ago. I understand that palm oil has already been produced by the farmers in that area and generally, because there is no mill to extract the oil, a lot of wastage is taking place. Perhaps, between the two Ministers concerned, we will be able to get the answer to this sore question of shortage of edible oil for the people of this country for which we have to pay so much foreign exchange.

Division XXX, Ministry of Trade and Consumer Protection, Subhead 2, (New) Buildings

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Chairman, this Subhead is for the construction of new walls to enclose an open area and roof valley over the boardroom. It seems that what we need is a new Board not just a boardroom and enclosures because this Ministry should be closed. It is not performing its tasks in the interest of this nation, to wit, this Ministry has refused to give a license to the *Mirror*, New Guyana Company Ltd., for the importation of newsprint. It made an agreement, some time ago, when it said there will be only one importing agency to import newsprint, that the *Chronicle* newspaper company would supply on a minimum requirement basis of about 12 rolls of newsprint every fortnight to the New Guyana Company for the publication of the *Mirror*.

Such a letter, such an undertaking was given by the then Managing Director of the *Chronicle* to the Caribbean Broadcasters and Publishers Association. In other words, it was an undertaking given not only to the New Guyana Company, but the letter was read before that Caribbean regional organization. From 10th August, the Chronicle Company has refused to grant this newsprint to the New Guyana Company. This Company then applied for a licence because the Chronicle Company kept saying it had no supplies. The New Guyana Company then said, all right, if you have no supplies give us a licence and convert \$50,000 out of the \$62,000 approved, by the Bank of Guyana, for the importation of newsprint. This is not being approved. Then, another licence was put in to get an importation without foreign exchange. That was refused. The Caribbean Broadcasters and Publishers Association then said they are willing to give 500 tons of newsprint, which five newspapers donated to the New Guyana Company. An application was put in for a licence and the Company says the Ministry would not approve.

What kind of Ministry do we have? Where is the credibility? They say they do not have newsprint, but you can see tons and tons of newsprint in the printery. They have tons and tons of newsprint in the warehouse and there are photographs showing newsprint being transported from the wharf to the Chronicle Company. Yet, they say they do not have newsprint.

The Ministry of Trade also had given an undertaking not only in writing to the Mirror Company, but an undertaking was also given by Mr. Blackman, when he was Managing Director, to the Broadcasters and Publishers Association. I was there talking to the Minister when he told me that such a letter went to the New Guyana Company, and Mr. Blackman was waiting downstairs when I came down, and a letter was handed to him which he took to the meeting of the Caribbean Broadcasters and Publishers Association. Mr. Chairman, you cannot tell blatant lies that you do not have news-

print. If you do not have newsprint, then you do not have foreign exchange. If you do not have foreign exchange, then why is it you do not allow the Company to bring in the newsprint without foreign exchange, which is a gift? It is clear that this Ministry is carrying out the policy of the Government which is to deny the right of freedom of the press. Here is it we are spending nearly \$1/4 million, so far, to write a completely new Constitution which gives these frauds the right to postpone elections for fifteen months, and now they want to postpone them for another year. Their credibility is at the lowest level: both in this country and internationally.

Request for leave to move the adjournment of The Assembly on definite matters of urgent public importance - Settlement of Refugees in Guyana: 24th March, 1980

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, I wrote to you today, on a matter which I consider to be of urgent public importance, with the hope of getting your permission and the permission of the House to have this matter discussed today as an adjournment Motion.

This matter, I refer to, has been in the attention of the public for the past fortnight, but this House has not been informed officially, and there seems to be a great deal of speculation about it. I refer to the proposed settlement of refugees from Asia and it seems that an attempt is being made to set up another state within the State, somewhat like the last Jonestown incident.

What is more, this organisation which is dealing with this outfit, we have, I think, to get from the Government some word as to its background. I know from what I have read that, Mr. Billy Graham's son is involved in this incident. Mr. Speaker, you may not be aware of it, but Mr. Billy Graham's Latin America crusade was financed by the C.I.A sometime ago. We know that the Mung tribe which is supposedly coming here is viciously anti-communist and, indeed, the area where they were settled formed what was called the "*Opium Triangle*" for the production of opium, in which it is also said that the C.I.A was involved. We know also, I have this from good sources, that the U.S State Department is involved in this and, therefore, we would like before another tragedy is created in this country, a full debate to take place in the House so that the Guyanese people could be fully aware of what is being done in their name.

This Government has signed all kinds of Agreements which have never been debated in this House. And I hope that the opportunity will be given to the House to debate this matter which is of great importance to the lives of the Guyanese people. I now ask for leave for the suspension of the Standing Orders, to permit this matter to be discussed on the Adjournment of the Assembly.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: I am merely raising some comments. Cde. Speaker, you know we have been having discussions with you, time and time again, on the way this House is being run and you have always said that you cannot call the House or that you cannot put the items, such as, Questions and Motions on the Agenda, and when an opportunity like this arises, you do not respond. This is why I have always said in this House that you are behaving like a puppet.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: I repeat, you are not behaving like a Speaker. When was it that the Government put before the House a letter of intent? At what time did they put such a statement? If the Government had put such a statement in the House –

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: I am not taking my seat. You should depart from the Chair for your behaviour. You are misbehaving. How is it, about this Motion, when you ask the Leader of the House to tell us when –

[Interruption]

Motion to Increase the Liability in Respect of Guarantees: 21st April, 1980

Dr. Jagan: Cde. Speaker, our colleague, the previous speaker has set out in perspective, what has been happening in the last few years, particularly, since 1970. From time to time, we have been warning this House of the direction in which the country is going, and the difficulties which will be faced by the people. I recall, in the beginning they laughed us to scorn, so to speak. We were told that we did not know what we were talking about, but we are heading, as I said several years ago, more and more in the direction of Latin America where the rate of inflation is growing. Last year it was 51 percent compared to the previous year which was 41 percent, a 10 percent increase in one year.

In this paper – this is the *PRELIMINARY BALANCE OF LATIN AMERICA ECONOMY, 1979* by the CEPAL INFORMATION SERVICE of January, 1980 – it speaks of the problems facing Guyana. It says:

“Furthermore, the rate of inflation continued to be very high in historical terms in Guyana, 18 percent, and Jamaica although in the latter country, it declined remarkably from 49 percent in 1978 to 25 percent in 1979.”

That is, Jamaica has declined, but in Guyana it says – let me read it again, “. . . continued to be very high in historical terms in Guyana, 18 percent”.

The problem there is, largely, due to the fact that this Government has been deluding the people and themselves in talking about development, while it is carrying out so-called “development” by deficit financing. Year after year, the Budget is in deficit and the Government keeps borrowing and borrowing and this is why the rate in Latin America is so high today, apart from imported inflation. That is one factor, but we must not only refer to imported factors, such as, oil prices. We have to talk about internal factors too.

Years ago, I remember, since the days of the Kubitschek regime in Brazil, they were warning about deficit financing when Kubitschek wanted to build the big city in Brasilia, borrow more money and build. Then there was warning. What happened last year? Brazil paid \$10 billion in debt payments and the total exports were valued at \$10 billion. Ten billion dollars worth of goods exported last year, the Member is shaking his head, and ten billion dollars in debt payments.

This is where this country is heading, progressively.

The rate of inflation is growing because of the deficit financing method which we are employing and, further, hiding the reality from the people by lumping together the Recurrent Budget and the Development Budget.

What is more alarming, indeed, in the Recurrent Budget is the fact that to pay the debts, as we showed last year, was nearly three-fifths of the total

revenue. Let him deny that. And that accounts for the continuous decline in the social services, public services and so on, and the high taxation and the removal of all subsidies. The Government keeps borrowing more and more. The obvious answer is not to borrow more and more, but to put your house in order. Soon, we are going to hear that the public corporations are no good, nationalisation is no good and State ownership is no good. Let us denationalise. Let us sell them all out. That is going to be the next cry.

We do not agree with the thesis that nationalisation is not a good thing nor that the public sector is a bad thing in terms of development, because there are some who want to propagate capitalism, who put forward this thesis or who want the public sector, merely, to be an adjunct of State monopoly capitalism, under which the State continues to help the monopolies which are growing - the local monopolies and the foreign monopolies. What is to be done? My colleague pointed out that this is not the way. Let me go back to the time of 1971, when the Government was to nationalise "DEMBA". It was then said that there would be workers' participation. Mr. Pollydore, the General Secretary of the T.U.C, as recently as 1978, pointed out in his Report that workers' participation was promised and that has not yet been implemented. Why is the Government afraid to allow democratic trade unionism in the country, free and fair elections in trade unions and to have industrial relations which mean dealing with democratic trade unions and not only that, having the workers in the position of decision-making, both in management and also in terms of determining policies and plans for the future? That is not there up to today.

Secondly, my colleague spoke about corruption and round pegs in square holes. Why have they, for instance, refused to allow the Auditor General to have the work of all State Corporations and to bring it under the control of the Public Accounts Committee? Why not? The Government does not want to do that because it wants to pass on benefits to its friends, so the "2:35 - 2:45 p.m."

Organisations, such as, Stoll, Thomas and Dias - Thomas who was the first Economic Development Minister - could replace the foreigners who did the work before Fitzpatrick Graham.

In other words, we replaced imperialist capitalists with local capitalists. That is all that is happening, and so we have instead of money flowing down to the people in these corporations and the profits coming to the Treasury, they are being leaked out in all kinds of ways through under-hand deals and corrupt deals. That is why the Members of the Government do not want the corporations to come under the purview of not only the Auditor General's Department, but also the Public Accounts Committee. They do not want the Reports to come here. They are developing a new breed of capitalists performing all kinds of services and selling services to these corporations, the time has come to call a spade a spade.

We had a stinking example in the Report of the Luckhoo Commission, stating that the previous firm of the Prime Minister, Clarke and Martin,

was not only the legal representative of the Electricity Corporation which is loading \$2 million a month, but was also the legal representative of the contractor of the Canadian Company to the Guyana Electricity Corporation. What a disgrace! And we know that, today, very few people can come to Guyana and get anywhere unless they first see Clarke and Martin. This is how rackets and corruption are working in this country and that is why these corporations cannot pay.

What is needed is a thorough examination, not only by people like Lionel Luckhoo, but with the Opposition involved. Why did the Government not put the Opposition on the Commission? When the Government nationalised the enterprise in 1971, the Prime Minister said that the Opposition would have two Members on the Board of Directors, but not one was allowed there.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: He is saying, "*too irresponsible*". They do not want people to see all the dirty things which are going on - not the Opposition, not the workers - and they allow shady deals to continue. Read the Director of Audit's Report, the last one, where he talked about Tender Board procedures being violated and contracts being awarded to people whom the Tender Board did not choose. In fact, the Tender Board's selectees were thrown aside and the People's National Congress, no doubt, through the Ministry put their own there. I should not say, through the Ministry, through the Minister who put them there.

Cde. Chairman, that is the reality and, therefore, I would suggest at this late hour, what is needed is a house-cleaning operation and that means immediately the workers through their unions must be brought in to control. Not just control operations, but to look at finances, purchases and sales. How is it, I mentioned in this House, a Vice President of a Rice Action Committee could rent equipment from the Rice Board at subsidized prices and rent out his own at higher prices? They know about it and they do nothing about it. I even mentioned the name of a man named Jaipaul in Berbice. How do you expect the corporations to work well in those circumstances, how? House cleaning, I said, is number one. The workers through their trade union democratically-elected leaders, must have a right to control and see accounting - as I said not only purchases, but also sales.

Some people are getting rich, becoming millionaires overnight, and becoming distributors. One named Sampson in Regent Street. How is it, Minister, answer, how is it there are many half-millionaires developing in the country? Yes, there are the rackets which are being operated, and that is why the corporations are losing money. They tell the workers, sanctimoniously, they get up on the platform and say "*We are losing money, therefore, sorry, we cannot afford to pay you any increase. Five percent, we are being generous, we are even losing and we are paying, we love you so dearly.*" This is what

they are doing. Meanwhile, the rackets continue, therefore, the number one solution, workers' control. The second -

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: Forget that. You do not want any National Front because you do not want to put a stop to corruption. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the second thing is to carry out, immediately, an investigation into all of these corporations, and the Opposition must be involved.

The Opposition speaks for the majority of the people of this country and they must see what is happening. It is important to see that, because if the Opposition is not involved then we cannot know of all the rackets. You remember, Mr. speaker, years ago when I mentioned that flour - which was milled, which was supposed to be distributed - the distributor was supposed to be the Guyana Marketing Corporation, a State body, we agree with that, suddenly was not distributed by the G.M.C. A subcontractor in the name of Greenland Cooperative Society was employed at twenty-five cents per bag and Greenland had no facilities. What was alarming about that was that Greenland had no trucks. We saw the same racket with fisheries, where the fishing was given to a Ministry and it was done through the People's National Congress outlet. Flour is now being distributed by what is called K.S.I - Knowledge Sharing Institute. What they should call it is profit sharing. That is the wrong name. What is being done is a fiefdom being created, a P.N.C fiefdom, using the State to help their friends to get rich and to help themselves to get rich. Therefore, the second proposal of the Opposition is that there must be an inquiry into all these corporations and that the Opposition be represented. That is important if we are to stop corruption. Our Opposition Members are not on any Board, as far as I know. In the case, I remember, of the Bauxite Company they went behind the backs of the P.P.P -

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: Do not worry with that. We know of lots of people who were P.P.P, Chandisingh was there, Teekah was there too, we are talking about the P.P.P as an organization and as an Opposition. The same way we talk of trade unions, we have to deal with the entity, not individuals, and that is absolutely necessary. Those two things we should start out with.

Mention was made about cooperation. They are willing to cooperate. Well, here is an area where the P.P.P is prepared to cooperate. Let us forget about National Front and National Front Government. Let us start now on these areas where we are all concerned, the people are concerned. As I have said already, the projection is that we are heading towards a situation as in Latin America where we have not only high inflation rates, but a growing debt problem, like Brazil. A few years ago, the capitalists upheld Brazil

as what is called the model, they talked about the "*Brazilian Miracle*" and today all of that is faded. We do not want to get there and reap the social consequences which are illiteracy, for instance, moving from 40-50 to 80 percent, and other social consequences. This can be stopped in Guyana, but the only way to do it is to have anti-corruption methods. We are asking the Government also to bring in legislation, integrity legislation which the Prime Minister promised since 1971. Jamaica, Barbados and Trinidad have enacted legislation since then, on this question to stop corruption.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: Yes, you can take it as far back as the fifties, if you wish.

These are our proposals. First, the enactment of integrity legislation, secondly, Commissions of Inquiry in which the Opposition is represented and the public is involved, thirdly, democratic trade unionism and workers' control in management decision making and looking into accounts - only in these ways we feel we will be moving - and lastly, I should say representation of the Opposition on the Boards of management in all corporations. Those are the four steps which we recommend for Government consideration and if the Members of the Government want to talk about cooperation, this is where it should begin.

Request for leave to move the Adjournment of The Assembly on definite matters of urgent public importance - Inquiry into the circumstances of the death of Dr. Walter Rodney: 5th August, 1980

Dr. Jagan: Mr. Speaker, I wrote to you today, indicating that I proposed at today's sitting to move the suspension of the Standing Orders, in order to allow me to discuss, and the House to discuss, a definite matter of urgent public importance. I refer to the death of Dr. Walter Rodney which, as you are aware, has been the cause of concern both in Guyana and within and outside of the Caribbean Region.

There has been a paucity of information on this question and, of course, complete silence on the part of the Government. This has resulted in a great deal of disquiet, and organisations have been calling for a public inquiry. The Guyana Human Rights Association, backed by many organisations – responsible, not puppet, organisations which are controlled – has called for a public inquiry by an international body.

The P.P.P supports this view and we think that on this very important matter there ought to be a top level international Commission of Inquiry composed, say, of the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations, Human Rights Commission of the O.A.S, CARICOM, the World Council of Churches, and the Caribbean Bar Association. I do not think that anyone can question the legitimacy or the status of these bodies, and I hope that you, Mr. Speaker, and the House will agree to the suspension of the Standing Orders so that this matter can be discussed.

There is in Guyana today, as I said already, great concern about this matter because this does not seem to be an isolated event. Today –

The Motion was not allowed.

Local Democratic Organs Act: 18th August, 1980

Dr. Jagan: The Attorney General in replying to certain points made by my colleague, Reepu Daman Persaud, used the old technique of the “Jesuits” in being evasive. I heard my colleagues criticizing the procedures in bringing this Bill to Parliament, and making the fundamental point that the State Paper which has been laid in this House was not debated, so instead of answering this question, why the State Paper has not been debated, he answered using the Jesuit technique of speaking about what day the Bill was tabled. That was not the point, and my colleague made the point that this Paper should have been debated for many reasons. We on this side of the House have found it to be a pretty good Paper. Is that the reason they do not want it debated? On page 5, it says:

“One of the most serious defects of the system...”, they are speaking of the present system, “...is it that its focus does not include the vast majority of the citizens as active participants in the management of those areas of activities which they perceive to be vital to their welfare, wellbeing and, indeed, their very existence? As a result, most citizens have come to regard Local Government as something which does not involve them in a direct and personal way.” That is very true.

“Rather, they tend to see it as a fringe institution, comprising a few citizens’ styled ‘Councillors’ who can afford the luxury of spending their time on insubstantial matters, not germane to economic existence. The system itself stultified the growth of local democracy and prevented citizens from assuming, or even recognizing, their full civic responsibilities. Thus, the great reservoir of human resources available for national development remains virtually untapped.”

This expresses the frustrations of the P.N.C regime over the fact that the Local Government System has not functioned during its terms of office. In this Paper, more or less the same tone comes through and there is the need expressed here to change the Local Government System. That I think there will not be too much disagreement with, but where the P.N.C regime makes its fundamental error is that there are other reasons why the system did not work and, for the same reason, whatever system you put cannot and will not work because a system cannot work without representative Government. It is impossibility. All the rigging in the world, all the fancy things, Local Government will not work unless there are free and fair elections and unless the ballot is used properly. So you can all stand on your hands and or jump out of the window, or do what you want. This Bill has no meaning, it cannot work. All of you know perfectly well that it cannot work. You know that the programme of production and productivity remains the

same for the simple reason that the people want representative Government and will not have any representative shoved on them.

That is the simple answer to your questions, as to why Local Government has not worked and why there will be no improvement in production and productivity. This is not going to solve a thing. You did not want to discuss the Paper because, from the Paper all the essential factors will come out and so instead what do we have? A stupid Bill here – the Local Democratic Organs Bill. I hereby anoint it S.R.P, Super Rigging Procedure. That will be the name that I will call it because it has no other meaning. This is for super rigging and, unfortunately, it seems to be what the Members of the P.N.C want. If they want it they will get it, but they will also get other things that will follow because there is inevitability in all things on this earth.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: You are the elitist.

I want to speak about the Elections Commission. This Bill deals, to some extent, with the Elections Commission in a way that I find perhaps fitting to the role of the Elections Commission. In fact, the clothes fit the body. In this Bill, the Elections Commission is going to be allowed to furnish each person, who has been elected a Member of the Congress with a certificate. In another section, the Elections Commission shall furnish the Councillor, who has been elected with a certificate, and again on page 24, the Elections Commission shall furnish each person who has been elected with a certificate.

That is just about the extent of the functions of the Elections Commission, but it was not so intended and, as one of my colleagues said, it is not what is said, it is what is done. I think this is an old copy of the former Constitution, but for my purposes I cannot see that there is much difference, since the words are more or less the same. We do not have a new one on hand, but the Elections Commission, as we all know it, has been given the function:

(a) of exercising general direction and supervision over the registration of electors and the administrative conduct of elections; and

(b) shall issue such instructions and take such action as appear to it necessary or expedient, and these are the main words, to ensure impartiality, fairness and compliance with the provisions of this Constitution.

And this, of course, is what it does not do. As my colleague pointed out, I am reading from my old Constitution, but the new one is identical.

Thirteen years ago when I was on the Commission, I think the gentleman opposite was on the Commission too.

[Interruption]

Dr. Jagan: I said I was on the Commission and history has a way of repeating itself. I read from the Minutes of October 25, 1967, and I quote what the Chairman said - the Chairman was Sir Donald Jackson, he was drawing the attention of the Commission to the publication of the Bill No. 21 of 1967 - and I quote:

“He said that those Members of the Commission who were present the last time the Commission had gone to the Ministry of Home Affairs, would remember the course that the meeting had taken. He, the Chairman, Sir Donald, had a distinct recollection that it had been stated that if any legislation was involved, the Commission would be afforded the opportunity of seeing the draft legislation before it went to Cabinet in order that the Members would be on a position to state any views that they may have. At the interview with the Minister, the Chairman said that his impression was that the Minister substantiated this view, but when the Bill was published quite recently the opportunity to discuss it and submit their views was not afforded by the Commission. Sir Donald Jackson had learnt from an Information Services Release that the Bill would be before the House on October 26 1967. He had no idea as to whether the First Reading of the Bill would be moved then, or when the debate was going to take place.”

As I said, history has a way of repeating itself because at the last meeting of the Elections Commission, which took place on Friday, the Commission had no knowledge whatsoever of this Bill that is before us today, and when they met today they had no knowledge that we were meeting at the same time to deal with it, which means that the Elections Commission is still being treated in the same old way. Legislation that has some relevance to the Commission is not even sent in draft from the Elections Commission for them to consider it.

This has been the pattern from the very moment the Elections Commission was set up, and from the moment that the People's National Congress regime made it a farce and began their super election rigging procedures. I can remember, very well, at the very beginning, I pointed out to the Commission that was their job to grapple with the whole machinery of registration and elections or else we would have rigging, and so it is. From the very beginning, the P.N.C would not go through the Public Service Commission to select the key personnel for registration and later for those conducting the elections. Everyone has been hand-picked as they are today. All the personnel involved in the registration and elections are all hand-picked. Many of the people, who manned the polling stations the day before, were on the streets campaigning for the People's National Congress.

This is only one aspect of the rigging. The same Electoral List, which we had in those days, which was rigged and padded, which was not a proper list in any form in any country and in any language, we're going to have it

again today, and we are going to have it tomorrow again. It is going to be a list that has no relevance to reality at all.

I can remember the 1973 Election. I quote from my book *“Army Intervention in the 1973 Elections”* where I pointed out, that in some areas there were padded votes. For instance, in Pipiani in the interior, 277 voters were registered, but the place was deserted and not one person lived there. In Old World where 383 people were registered as voters, the occupation of 63 was listed as Seamstresses. In Yakusari, one man runs a mining claim and the highest number of adults and children at that time was 100. Yet the voters listed showed 277. What was scandalous about the whole voting procedure in the far off areas, was that exceptionally large numbers of voters turned out. For example, in four districts, the average of voting was 95.87 percent, yet in Mazaruni Potaro and North West District transportation is difficult. Right here in the city, the voting average was very low and people had to walk only one or two blocks. We know this because the city was under high surveillance, but in the remote areas where the P.N.C operators, those who were hand-picked, conducted the elections from beginning to end, you find that they had 95.8 percent in voting, where travelling is almost impossible.

I can remember, too, that we had the incident at New Hope, East Bank Demerara. A small community of some 700 persons and there were 100 persons whose names were on the registered list of voters, but no one could find them. Persons living in the village for 20 or more years could not recollect ever hearing the names of those persons. Occasionally, in any community, there will be one or two people no one knows, but 100! And when the period for objections and claims to the voters list was announced and my party challenged those 100 names, we had to pay a deposit of \$5.00 each. The Returning Officer for the district discounted 7 applications as being incorrectly prepared, but he sent out notices by registered post for the 93 remaining names to attend the hearing, and in the presence of the legal representative of the P.P.P, the Returning Officer produced the 93 letters which were returned to him undelivered.

They were stamped by the postman, *“Could not be found, and removed from the district.”* The Returning Officer refused the lawyer’s request, to invite the postman to the hearing to question him as to how he came to the conclusion that they had removed from the district, and the 93 objections were overruled and the names remained on the list despite declarations of witnesses, from the area at the hearing, that the persons never lived there. And so, on and on and on the tale can go of padding of lists and all the forms of corruption.

I can remember on voting day 1973, we were inundated with hundreds of people who came to say they went to the polls to vote, but they found out that they had already voted - someone had said that they had signed their names on the postal ballot, but they had never signed their names on anything. So the wholesale rigging, I don’t have to name every form of

rigging, but this is what we are going to have again under the Local Government Bill and I come back to the main point, what do you achieve except holding on to these tainted seats in this House that has no meaning. There will be no changes in Local Government Administration or the reactions and responses of the people, until we have free and fair elections and until we have Representative Government.

I spoke of the lack of consultation with the Elections Commission, which is a crying shame, but the impotent Elections Commission seems prepared not to bother about it. Money, they say, is the root of all evil. You will know what I mean, money and you. At any rate, we made the point that there was no consultation with the Elections Commission - there was no consultation with anyone. The people of Guyana were not consulted, the people in all the districts of Guyana were not consulted. Why the indecent haste to bring this all of a sudden? For 37 months the P.N.C has been dragging its feet, trying to make up its mind if it wants elections or not. I suppose, who knows? The Members of the P.N.C are the only ones, who know if we are going to have it or not. No one knows, but anyhow, now the pace gets hotter and someone says rush it through, they rush it through, But why no consultation with the people? There has been no consultation at any level and this is a crying shame.

I would not have more to say on this Bill because there is not much else you can say, except that it is part of the whole rigging process. It's an abomination! I would close with these words, even the longest rope has an ending, there is a pattern of living and there is a pattern of life, and all things are connected. There is a beginning, but my friends, there is always an end.

[Applause]

