

**DR. CHEDDI JAGAN**

**NATIONAL ASSEMBLY SPEECHES**

**VOLUME 7**

**The National Assembly of the  
Fourth & Fifth Parliaments of Guyana  
February 1981 -May 1987**

Dr. Cheddi Jagan  
National Assembly Speeches Volume 7  
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 978-1-907493-32-4



## 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

Approval of Government's Policy in President's Address: 12th February, 1981 .....	1
Approval of Government's Policy in Presidents' Address: 25th January, 1982 .....	6
Approval of Estimates of Expenditure for 1982: 2nd April, 1982 .....	12
Venezuela's Claim to Guyana: 8th July, 1982 .....	23
Approval of Financial Paper No.2: 19th August, 1982 .....	32
Invasion of Lebanon by Israel: 25th August, 1982 .....	37
Request for Leave to Move the Adjournment of the Assembly on Definite Matters of Public Importance: 10th February, 1983 .....	45
Approval of Government's Policy in President's Address: 10th February, 1983 .....	46
Budget Debate: 21st February, 1983 .....	55
Temporary Borrowing by Government (Amendment of Existing Laws and Validation) Bill: 21st July, 1983 .....	64
Importation of Food Items: 31st August, 1983 .....	68
Invasion of Grenada: 28th October, 1983 .....	75
Sympathy on Death of Cde. W.O.R. Kendall, C.C.H.: 8th December, 1983 .....	84
Municipal and District Councils (Amendment) Bill: 12th December, 1983 .....	85
Budget Debate: 7th February, 1984 .....	88
Speech on the deferment of the Labour (Amendment) Bill: 16th March, 1984 .....	97
Labour (Amendment) Bill No. 5/1984 .....	99
National Equivalency Board Bill: 27th August, 1984 .....	108
Sympathy on the death of the Prime Minister of India: 2nd November, 1984 .....	110
Bill - Second Reading: National Agricultural Research Institute of Guyana Bill: 2nd November, 1984 .....	113
Approval of Financial Paper No. 2: 22nd November, 1984 .....	116
Financial Paper No. 3 of 1984 .....	123
Motion: Seizure of Unaccustomed Goods: 22nd November, 1984 .....	128
Motion - Condemnation of Hostilities against Nicaragua .....	133
Budget Debate: 30th January, 1985 .....	140
National Security (Miscellaneous Provisions) (Amendment) Bill: 24th June, 1985 .....	148
Hostilities against Nicaragua: 26th June, 1985 .....	154
Rice (Regulation of Manufacturing and Marketing) (Amendment) Bill: 25th October, 1985 .....	162
National Security (Miscellaneous) (Amendment) Bill 1985 .....	167

Approval of Government's Policy in President's Address:	
6th February, 1986 .....	170
Petroleum (Exploration and Production) Bill: 14th April, 1986 .....	175
Off-Shore Banking Bill: 15th April, 1986 .....	181
Affirmation of the External Loans Offer: 15th April, 1986 .....	186
Sympathy on Death of Cde. A.I. Crum Ewing, A.A.:	
4th June, 1986 .....	189
Financial Paper No. 1/1986: 12th June, 1986 .....	190
Financial Paper No.2 /1986 .....	194
Restrictions on Importation of Wheaten Flour: 18th June, 1986 .....	197
Local Government Elections: 18th June, 1986 .....	201
Importation of Milk 25th June, 1986 .....	207
Motion - Charges of Discrimination in the Administration:	
25th June, 1986 .....	210
Motion - Rights of Dismissed Workers to be Heard:	
16th July, 1986 .....	213
Acute Shortage of Rice Bags: 3rd November, 1986 .....	215
Bill - Second Reading: Local Government Enactment (Amendment) Bill: 7th November, 1986 .....	218
Consumption Tax (Amendment) Order 1986:	
22nd December, 1986 .....	221
Christmas Greetings .....	224
Supplementary Estimates: 29th December, 1986 .....	225
Supplementary Estimates Continued .....	227
Trade with South Africa: 14th January, 1987 .....	228
Budget Debate for 1987: 26th January, 1987 .....	231
Transportation in the Rupununi: 18th March, 1987 .....	240
Sympathy on Death of Cde. Edgar Lealand Ambrose:	
13th May, 1987 .....	241



**DR. CHEDDI JAGAN**

**NATIONAL ASSEMBLY SPEECHES**

**VOLUME 7**

**The National Assembly of the  
Fourth & Fifth Parliaments of Guyana  
February 1981 - May 1987**



## Approval of Government's Policy in President's Address: 12<sup>th</sup> February, 1981

**Dr. Jagan (Leader of the Minority):** Mr. Speaker, the Presidential Address delivered a few days ago was remarkable, not so much about what was said but really what was omitted. Listening to it, one was left with the impression that one was at the hustings listening to an electioneering speech. But the elections – sorry, the selections – are long over and what one would have expected at this time was a proper blueprint, a programme, even if in broad outline which would have given us a sense of direction, what is going to be done to tackle the economic crisis, which is deep and getting deeper and deeper every day, the social-ills of the society and the political sickness in which this country is presently engulfed.

Devoid of any real content, the only thing I can say about the speech is that it was well printed, a very good technical job – wonderful. Devoid of any real content, we would like to say...that the Address draws attention to new Ministries, new committees, new enquiries, new structures under the new Constitution, new threats even, and in the end a new version of the old hackneyed *"produce or perish."*

The nation has been told again and again, ad nauseam, that *"our ability to steer an independent course rests on our ability to build and strengthen the economy and without the highest possible levels of production and productivity and the development of our economy the various new rights to be found in the Constitution will not be realised"*. Every school boy knows. It is a truism that without production you cannot have anything. Without productivity you cannot have. That is not the question. The question we much ask today, and seriously, is why we are in the crisis of stagnation. Why are we going backwards instead of going forward? They have the statistics. Year after year, zero growth, below zero. What we want to know is not what is stated in the Constitution about the rights of the people. We all know that was a gimmick, a gimmick to get through one phase of their difficulties. That is, when they were faced with an election they had to find some excuse to postpone the election and so had to talk about new rights.

The so-called Socialist Constitution has set them out. But what are we now told? Now we are told, having got the elections postponed and rigged and got this whole cabal in here, that if you do not produce, if you do not have production and productivity, you will not have the freedoms or rights which were enshrined in the Constitution. Cde. Speaker that was a fraud perpetrated on the people of Guyana. The Constitution was a fraud and the putting of these rights in the Constitution was a fraud and now it is being established in the President's Address that it was a fraud. In other words, you are back at square one; you have nothing now and you are being told now if you do not produce you cannot get.

People want to know about subsidies, about the cost of living, about housing. You talk about socialism. In socialist countries there is a programme of building houses and subsidising rentals for the working people, for whom houses are not being built, especially in countries like this, by the private sector. Where is the programme? There is not even an outline of this. The rights set out in the Constitution – I think the best we can do is not to mention those at all because they are only paper rights.

The less said about it, the better.

Cde. Speaker, I want to suggest that the regime should take a serious look at what must be seen as the root of our problem and, that is, the inter-connection and interaction between the economic base and the political, ideological, cultural and institutional superstructure. We have to see this link. If we do not see this link then we will be only looking at the situation in a sort of chicken and egg kind of way. Which is first? From the Government side there is a simplistic approach. It goes something like this. If you do not produce you would not get and if you agitate and struggle you will be punished. As the new Vice- President for Public Welfare has put it, if you bring out your guns we will bring our out cannon. Are the cannon going to solve the problems of low morals in the country today?

One of the best blue-eyed boys of this regime has now packed up his bags and left. I refer to Pat Thompson, one-time Ambassador to the U.N. and then later head of Guymine. What did he tell us at the beginning of last year? He said the problem was one of morale. That was the root to the stagnation in our society as he saw it. He said: the key factor to break out of the tangled web – those were his words.

That is what I mean by interconnection between the economic base and the political, ideological, institutional and cultural superstructure. He put it in simple language, *"tangled web"*. The key factor to break out of the tangled web and to increase production and productivity was morale. Workers must feel that their performance was being objectively assessed and managers must be given the necessary functional authority to accomplish tasks assigned them *"within defined overall policy criteria and without frequent trivial nit-picking, irrelevant and unhelpful interference"*.

One would have thought that such an observation from a key person important in the whole structure of the regime would have been given serious consideration in view of the economic calamity in which this country has found itself and that something concrete would have come here. But no, nothing. Vagueness, generalities.

The President and his army of advisers did not pay any serious attention to this question of low morale and political interference and bungling. The rhetoric is there but that is all. Are the Public Service Commission, the Police Service Commission, Teaching Service Commission, working as envisaged in the Constitution, whether the new one or the ones which were there since 1961 or 1964, or after 1966? They are not working.

What is the use of telling us all about the glorious Constitution when

the Constitution is subverted on those fundamental questions? And if you have...interference as Pat Thompson talks about then you are going to have the bungling and the inefficiencies that we heard so much about from the Luckhoo Commission as regards the Electricity Corporation.

Where is the change?

So far as the rights which are laid down in the Constitution are concerned, the only rights which I see that are conferred are those to the P.N.C. elite. This Assembly is a clear reflection of the way the national cake is being distributed. It is a clear description. Let us look at the picture over the last sixteen years. After the 1964 elections the P.N.C. had 22 members from whom their Ministerial team was drawn.

After Independence, the Constitution came, they had three technocrats making a total then of only 25. What is the position today? Today, under the 1980 Constitution, the numbers have grown to 69 including the technocrats, and this number excludes the eight advisers to the President and to the Prime Minister.

No doubt, most of those are also drawing salaries at Ministerial level.

I do not want to speak in the other realms, in which the money is being squandered, about the huge army which has grown; the paramilitary apparatus which has grown and the cost of which has mounted from \$5 million for the police, military and paramilitary in 1970 to nearly \$15 million last year.

Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister was Minister of Finance around 1970, he spoke in this Assembly about redistributive justice, meaning that this Government had, as a matter of policy, to redistribute income so the masses would get something. But what has happened over the years? The slice of the cake going to the working people has become narrower and narrower. This regime has worked up a symbiotic relationship with vested interests outside to whom nearly two-thirds of the money is distributed in the form of debt and compensation payments and the rest is going for a huge bureaucratic apparatus including this one inside here, the Government's ministerial apparatus.

How then can we improve the morale of the country? Talk to the farmers at Moruka. I was talking to one of them today. Four cents for a pound of lemons. How much does the G.M.C. pay for a pound of peanuts? One dollar, until hucksters began to pay more than that and then they raised the price.

Cde. Speaker, we read the other day where the past G.M.C. Manager said subsidies were reduced from the G.M.C. But at whose expense? He was trying to show what a good job he had done. But at whose expense?

I was speaking to someone when I was in the United States recently and he should know. He was in the guts of the thing as an auditor. He talked about the corruption and the waste which went on in there. That is taken out of the hides of the poor farmers. Why don't they set up an inquiry? Why doesn't the Minister of Agriculture – the last one has gone, he is now

adviser. A new one is put in his place.

How many new ones? Why don't they set up an inquiry? In fact, this Parliament should probably set up an inquiry to examine the report of the R.P.A. which was presented to the past Minister of Agriculture and the Prime Minister, then Mr. Burnham. Mr. Burnham told them, the last time he saw them, that he is going to Canada. As soon as he comes back they will hear from him. Up to now they have not heard from him. That was a long time ago.

Mr. Speaker, this is what is causing low morale. Workers cannot live. What do we have? We have a regime dispensing patronage far and wide. Look at it, it is there to see right here in this Assembly.

Of course, one understands it. One understands the basis of this politically. If the masses do not show up to vote for you, you have to bribe and corrupt more people at the top. And so is this the way we are going to get out of the mess? I say it is disgraceful to build up a corrupt system of political patronage and embellish it and present it as a wonderful new era of democracy where it is said they are linking Central and Local Government and establishing real power to the people. As usual, form is misinterpreted as content. How can they, in the face of the verdict of the Observer Team that the elections were fraudulent in every possible way, speak of democracy? Fraudulent in every possible way, "*blatant fraud*," they said.

Because they call it democracy. No decent-minded Guyanese would be fooled by such bald-faced – to use the State Department's verbiage – hypocrisy.

What is now established is certainly not a political system – and I quote the President's words – "*which is to bring democracy to the remotest corners of Guyana ...*" Rather it is to establish a bigger band of nit-pickers and a more extensive and extravagant patronage. What Guyana needs is democracy, not just in form but in content. It has been made abundantly clear by the fathers of scientific socialism that socialism cannot be built without democracy and I mean fundamental, grassroots democracy, not something superimposed upon the people.

We have been saying repeatedly since the 1973 elections, after the army... seized the ballot boxes, that democracy is fundamental to the development of the growth of the economy and construction of socialism. In 1974 when the economic crisis first manifested itself, the P.P.P. at its Congress issued a 16-point policy statement outlining what should be done in the various sectors dealing with the economy and politics and institutions. Unfortunately that was not heeded. The sugar price brought them in a position where they felt – I refer to the world high price for sugar at that time – that would go on forever. But when the crisis began to appear we again pointed out at Enmore in the presence of the then Prime Minister – those 16 points were repeated but emphasis was placed on another point and that is that bureaucratic, administrative and police military methods must give way to normal democratic constitutional methods of struggle in this country.

Mr. Speaker, those things have not been done. What is the end result? The end result is that the regime has embarked on a course of national betrayal. We have seen this with the I.M.F. Agreement followed by the New Investment Code. There is a lot of talk about the Planning Commission etc. etc. Where is the plan? We are talking about industry, another Ministry for Industries way back in 1966/1972 in the Development Plan. Over 16 industries were set out in the Appendix to that Report, the 1966-1972 Plan. Where are they? The time is long past for a policy of drift and mere hope for the future.

That is not going to bring an end to retrogression, bankruptcy and deals, which are undermining our national sovereignty and independence.

The Guyanese people want tangible results in this zero hour. Compare the attitude of the new US President in his State of the Union message to the US Congress with that of the President of Guyana.

President Reagan admitted the terrible mess his country was in and proposed some positive action. Whether the steps proposed will be a solution is another matter, but at least something is being done. Here, everything is being looked at with rose-tinted spectacles by the Administration. There is no self-critical admission of mistakes even when the mess is literally flowing in the streets. And pomp and ceremony and the usual cliches are all we get. We will not be any part in the delusion of the people. The regime must either produce a concrete blueprint of programmes to grapple with the ills of our sick society or it must get out!

**[Minority Applause]**

## Approval of Government's Policy in Presidents' Address: 25<sup>th</sup> January, 1982

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, we have heard from those who support the Government. I took the opportunity after the Friday circus to ask someone who is particularly concerned about what was happening in this country what he thought about what happened last Friday. He said the occasion was resplendent with pomp but the speech was empty. Nothing in store for the disillusioned, the alienated and the discontented. 1981, the President told the Assembly, was a bad year and 1982 will be no better. Of course, in the whole speech there was the usual propaganda and when one listens to Members of this Government, both inside and outside this Assembly, one hears as if these people are just fighting to come into the Government. After 17 years they are still telling us about the glories and the wonderful assets in forestry and minerals and water and charcoal. What a disgrace. We are told about the world crisis. The President said everyone is suffering, east and west, north and south, rich and poor. The Vice-President told us a little while ago that the world has gone crazy, and of course in the President's speech he did not forget to mention the bogey man – Venezuela. He said the threat is real; therefore 1982 will be the year of Defence. Defence of what? Defence of starvation, malnutrition, hunger? Look at it. The headline in the *Chronicle* says 'Guyana barely survives 1981.' Look at it. The *Chronicle* – 20th of this month. "Poverty, rummaging for milk cans and bottles". One past Mayor of Georgetown said this kind of rummaging was going on; she opened her mouth and said too much. Potatoes which were condemned, people were going, children and others were going in the rubbish heap and collecting them for food, because she dared to say that her head rolled. Cde. Speaker, not only poverty like that. Look how they are fetching water. "*Chronicle* – Beating the water problem". Donkey carts fetching water.

Jackass, yes, alright. That is what you all brought this country to – jackass carts. More hopes. Hope for more power next year. However, loadshedding will continue, explained G.E.C. boss. We bring experts all the way from England. Tell us how much you are paying them every week, every day. After you wreck the place you got to bring them to rehabilitate, and taxpayers got to pay; paying through their noses for inefficient service. That is what the Guyanese are to defend. The President says this is the Year of Defence. He said the People's Militia must be strengthened. A plea is made to the people to demonstrate their patriotism by buying Defence Bonds. And said the President "*survival itself let alone forward movement will require hard work, sweat and blood.*" The President continued:

*"It is no consolation to point to failures, poor industrial relations and missed*



*targets in other countries. Ours is the task of identifying our failures and single mindedly setting out to eradicate the causes thereof without fear or favour."*

Then he went on:

*"The nation looks, and is entitled to look at this, the highest forum, for leadership and sincerity rather than words and empty cant."*

I regret to say that the President himself indulged in empty cant. He failed to give us a real class analysis of the world situation. Like the Vice-President who spoke, we got a distorted view of what is happening, talking about the world has gone crazy. The capitalist world has gone crazy, why doesn't he say that? From 1970 there were three recessions in the capitalist world. So they try to confuse. Instead of talking about the socialist world, capitalist world and imperialist-dominated Third World we get generalised terminologies about east and west, north and south, rich and poor. Why they do not go to Chandisingh and let him give them some lessons in ideology. Maybe he got brainwashed too. The recession, unemployment and unachieved targets, the President said, are part and parcel – what he talked about – of the world crisis of capitalism. That is what he must say here. And they know it but they do not want to say it because they have put their hands into the crocodile's mouth, the I.M.F. and the capitalists.

Of course, they present also a distorted picture, that the whole world is affected. Of course, the capitalist crisis has affected the socialist world; we know that, because the socialist world is not immune from the capitalist world. But I can give you scores of statistics from a paper I have just written comparing the growth rates in the capitalist world and in the socialist world from 1950 to the present time, and more particularly, to the last ten years, where the growth rate in the socialist world is twice as much as in the capitalist world. Why they do not say that? Why they do not say that in the socialist world there is steady advancement in real wages, but improvement of the conditions of the working people slow down because of the capitalist crisis – but nevertheless it is constantly improving. They do not want to say that because they want to generalise their failures by saying everybody is failing, including the socialist world. This is a deception on the Guyanese people, to deceive them, to lull them into a false sense of security.

The words *"hard work, sweat and blood"* are familiar. We heard them before in the slogan *"eat less, sleep less, work harder"*. Ten years ago we heard that. We are hearing it all over again. What the President should have told us was how the working man whose monthly take-home pay after tax in February last year was \$250 and whose expenditure was \$654 – as the T.U.C. pointed out in its Report – was expected to work harder, make more sacrifices and buy Defence Bonds in the face of rampant inflation of probably 40

percent last year. Let them tell us that. They want to make the workers into magicians, like they are. Magicians do not solve economic problems. They can pull rabbits out of the hats but we know that they are not real rabbits. Is the President unaware that at the time Brazil was threatening Guyana in 1975/1976 when things were not as bad as today for the working people, that the Defence Bonds Scheme was a total fiasco? Tell us how much you raised. Let the finance man get up and tell us how much you raised then. Two million dollars? You were hoping to raise \$13 million. Now you are beating the same drum all over again and now to this National Assembly, the highest forum which, according to the President, the nation looks to for leadership.

Cde. Speaker, you may have seen the press statement that we issued on our non-attendance last Friday. We said that we were not concerned with pomp and ceremony. We have referred to the many, many questions which remain unanswered in this Parliament. We referred to the many Motions which have not even been put on the Notice Paper much less the Order Paper. So if we want to talk about this Parliament we have to go back because this is a complaint not only which we are making now. It is something which was made years ago.

I remember in 1971 in this Parliament when we gave support to the Government to help to nationalise DEMBA. We gave them Parliamentary support so that they could get a majority. The President got up in the Assembly and said the following. This is from an article called "*The Peace Plan*" of the *Argosy* at that time, written by Rickey Singh. It stated:

*"The Parliament is to meet more often on Wednesdays to allow debates on Opposition Motions and Questions and the Public Accounts Committee of the Parliament which scrutinises the expenditure on public funds is to meet more often as requested by the Opposition group."*

In 1971 we were complaining – probably before that – about the way the Parliament functions. Cde. Speaker, you know you always say that your hands are tied. The then Prime Minister said, "*Okay, it is going to work like a Parliament*". Up to today it is not working as a Parliament. How all of a sudden the Parliament becomes the highest forum in the land? To do what? To draw salaries? Look how many of them. That is not all the Prime Minister said then. He said many other things and I want to refer to some of those because if an attempt was made to get genuine cooperation in this country – the Vice-President said a little while ago that instead of cooperation there was noncooperation, there was sabotage – we would not have been in the mess that we are in today. Listen to some of the things they were supposed to do: Representation on Boards, Corporations and Committees. This is what the Paper says:

*"The Opposition P.P.P is to have representation on all Government Boards and*

*Committees, including the Bauxite Corporation, to be set up, and Dr. Jagan is to be consulted by Mr. Burnham on appointment on such Committees."*

It is better not to talk about the Elections Commission because you know, Cde. Speaker, what is the opinion about that. I do not want to talk about that, the thing they all call Elections Commission. It is dead like Jackson who is dead with it. Then we have this talk about anti-corruption and anti-discrimination. It said Dr. Jagan is to submit to Mr. Burnham proposals for the creation of a permanent anti-discrimination, anti-corruption Committee. This Parliament subsequently set up a Parliamentary Committee, but it never functioned, it never completed its work, it is dead. You wanted to kill it. That is why you all have made corruption a way of life in the country. Fair employment practices – the Government will pursue a fair employment policy and make no exception with respect to Guyanese trained in the U.S.S.R. or the Eastern European countries on P.P.P. scholarships. All of them gone, most of the hundred odd have left the country and gone away because they would not give them jobs. Last year they raised, after ruining the country, salaries by 39 percent because they say there was a brain drain. But the brain drain is due not only because jobs were not given to those people who were trained in socialist countries but also because they are fed up. People who are in the service are fed up because of political interference. What Pat Thompson called *'nit picking'* fed up.

What about the question of peace? There is to be no denial of the right of peaceful demonstration. It is here. In Europe hundreds of thousands of people are marching, complaining about how many billions are spent for the arms race. Those people are marching and influencing policy on disarmament. In Guyana if you march in the street you get a burst head. Only recently it happened. Mr. Burnham said here that there will be no denial of the right to peaceful demonstration. It is a report of what he said in the Parliament.

[**The Speaker:** Dr. Jagan it is reported that he said that because you said that was Ricky Singh's statement. I am not concerned with that; the important thing is a report is different from what is said in Parliament. ]

**Dr. Jagan:** I am sorry we do not have the Hansard or else I would have read from it.

[**The Speaker:** Comrades, please let's hear Dr. Jagan, when you all were speaking he was not interrupting.]

**Dr. Jagan:** The Vice-President said all workers including sugar workers have had recognised the union of their choice. Cde. Chairman, that is here. The Government then led by the Prime Minister said, to use his exact words, *"to make arrangements shortly to ascertain which Union sugar workers would*

*prefer to have so that there will be made an end to the current jurisdiction dispute.”* In 1975 for the purpose of Union recognition there was a seven-week strike in the spring crop and six weeks in the autumn crop. If this was fulfilled there would have been no strike. Yet he is now talking as if this was a grant to G.A.W.U.; actually G.A.W.U. won the poll which Carrington conceded. That is why his head was rolled. Now they are trying to undo what Carrington had done; he had agreed to a poll which G.A.W.U. had won by 98 percent of the votes. And then they have other things here too. He said that the Privy Council will go, but in the place of the Privy Council there will be a Caribbean Court of Appeal.

Judges and Magistrates giving ‘cowboy’ decisions, political decisions. Look what happened in the treason trial. Director of Public Prosecutions like that should not serve in this country.

[**The Speaker:** No, Dr. Jagan, if you want to bring a Motion you have to do that, you cannot attack the Director of Public Prosecutions.]

**Dr. Jagan:** I will bring it, but when will the Motion be put on the Order Paper. Will you allow me to speak? I want to put the records straight because today you hear a lot of talk about sabotage, noncooperation and so forth and only recently one man who goes by the name of journalist put his foot in his mouth named Carl Blackman and this is what he said, this is the *Sunday Chronicle* 17th January 1982 – after they fire him they bring him back to write nonsense, this is what he said *“the prospects are daunting, it is too much to ask Opposition parties to change into good little boys and help in the battle for survival. Many of the strikes over the past years were aimed not so much at improving the lot of the workers but rather at oiling the wheels of chaos. Many of the recent fires though categorised as accidents seem more like sabotage designed to wreck the economy.”* How is it the P.P.P. had called for enquires into these fires. Why is it we are not hearing anything, why are they being covered up, why? Probably it has to do with corruption. Burn up the records, all the thieving that is going on, so nobody can prove anything. Yes, I repeat the strikes in the sugar industry, two main ones – one had to do with recognition would have been avoided if the Government had carried out the promises made in 1971. The second one – if they had paid the people and not robbed them through the levy-the 135 days strike in 1977 would have been avoided, and now the Yankees are saying that the Cubans instigated the strike.

That is another matter. Today we hear that efficiency lagged as also did production. But the seriousness of the situation has not been revealed by the President. If efficiency has lagged, we have to ask: Whose fault? If Cde. Hamilton Green – I am not talking now about the Vice-President – the one-time General Secretary of the P.N.C., takes on the placement of people, bypassing all the institutions of the state to put round pegs in square holes, how do we expect that they will become efficient?

We have moved from a “*Year of Consolidation*” in 1971 to a “*Year of Defence*” or the “*Year of Survival*”. That is what we have.

The Minister told us of the difficulties of the world in recession but what he studiously avoided to tell us was that the products – rice, sugar and bauxite – have not suffered in any way so far as a shortfall of market is concerned. There is no shortfall in international markets for our products. You have not been able to produce. Why? He said that we will give rewards to those who deserve them. What about the rice farmers? The rice farmers have gone to the previous Ministry of Agriculture. The previous Prime Minister put out statistics, cost of production, income, and showed that they were losing over \$300 a bag for rice. The Prime Minister met them before he went to Canada and said he would see them when he came back. Up to now he has not seen them. That is the situation today.

In the rice industry, what is the position? 16,000 families out of 49,000 have dropped out of rice. For the spring crop of last year, 45.6 percent of the land was cultivated. In the autumn crop, 49.5 percent of the land remained uncultivated. This is a fact of life. Why? Because you have treated the rice farmer in a way which does not follow what you are saying, namely, that you will reward those who are producing. The result is that they leave, and the trek to the city is there and you want to send those in the city back to the land. Tell us what happened to Matthews Ridge where we had the Manganese Enterprise.

How many millions were poured into that and what happened there?

The same thing can be said in sugar. They reached the 95 percent target in sugar but from a recovery rate of about 11 to 12 tons of cane to one ton of sugar, it has now gone to 15/16 tons. Why is that? Not because the workers are not cutting the cane, but because they have round pegs in square holes. They have destroyed the cultural patterns which existed before. They do not know anything about them. They say that we sabotaged. What about the bauxite? The P.P.P. has never claimed that Linden and Kwakwani were its strongholds. How is it that this year the President said that if we reached 75 percent of production for 1981 we would be lucky? Therefore, I think the Government should seriously begin, if the Members are real patriots, to examine its conscience and not come here with more and more platitudes, with more and more inane statements about all our forestry and charcoal and this and that, statements which have been heard ad nauseam in this Parliament. For those who, like the *Chronicle* and the present Vice-President, say that the P.P.P. is not cooperating let me just point this out.

## Approval of Estimates of Expenditure for 1982: 2nd April, 1982

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, the Vice President for Economic Planning and Finance has given us a Budget with a lot of facts, with a lot of figures and, as he put it, pointing out a perspective for the future. But when we divorce it all from the verbiage, basically the reality remains: the country is bankrupt.

As we listened to the speeches, three lines appear:

1. Put the blame on others – the world crisis – so we are told – the bad weather, the mismanagement, the inefficiency. Somebody else, not us, not the ruling party.
2. Like Mohammed Ali they beat their breasts: *"We are the greatest."* No problem. Everything is going to be solved. Hope for the future.
3. Epic appeals, as the *Guyana Chronicle* puts it, for cooperation.

The *Guyana Chronicle* of the 30th of last month, in an editorial, said that every recent Budget sets out (1) production targets which are quite modest compared with previous performance and *"certainly attainable"* – to quote the words of the Minister. Reasonable and attainable, modest. (2) Epic appeals to the nation to rise to the prevailing challenges. Then the *Guyana Chronicle* concludes:

*"But neither the Vice-President nor his Government nor this newspaper (which the latter owns) could escape the reality that those epic calls have not succeeded in getting our people to produce those modest targets."*

**Verdict:** We must ask ourselves, why? Why the stagnation? We hear about all the plans but when we boil it down – stagnation. We will come to the production figures just now. Who is to pay for it all? The working class, the working people. More pressures on them every day since the I.M.F. Agreement was signed. Subsidies went; social services were cut; higher taxation was put on. Last year we had two Budgets. The second once came in to reduce the deficit and at the end of the year the deficit was bigger. More taxes, more subsidies cut out and this year, what was avoided last year, the T.U.C. was fooled to drop the demand for 25 percent wage increases because the Government said, *"If we were to give that there would be 17,000 dismissals."* The axe is now falling. Where is that going to get us? The targets are not met because you cannot keep hitting away at the people, hammering them. Even our friend, Mr. Feilden Sing, says no whip can make the people produce. That is a law. Slavery was abolished simply because of that.

It became uneconomic as a system. You cannot whip the people and expect them to produce.

Theoretically the problem is that there is a basic contradiction which is facing the P.N.C. and the Members of the P.N.C. cannot resolve it. This is the problem. First, theoretically they know that a demoralized and alienated work force is a bottleneck to production. They know that. Some of them have studied a little bit of Marxism but, to put theory into practice, practically, they do not want to give up their privileges and those of the imperialists who prop them up, and they want to hang on to their power come what may, and to the fruits of office.

This is the basic contradiction facing the country today and so it is sinking all the time. Put more pressure on the workers! Increase the alienation! That is what is happening, but they disguise it with rhetoric.

The Vice-President says we must continue to be guided by the objective of building a socialist society. The Minister of National Development said that they have fulfilled the conditions for socialist development. He read from blueprints. He read the 29 points, or whatever it was. Generalized statements. They have fulfilled them, they claim.

- (1) What is the objective of socialist development? How do we measure it?
- (2) How is income distributed?
- (3) What about the people? How much are they involved? Where is the democracy?

Let us examine it under those yardsticks of income distribution and democracy and then we will see if we are building socialism and whether we can build it at all the way it is going now. All of you who have been reading Lenin go back to that – income distribution. If we look at the structure of the Budget, we will see, when we divide it into three sectors –

- (1) the bureaucracy, the salaries;
- (2) the debt and compensation payments;
- (3) the social service, the third sector.

This has been constantly declining in percentage of the Budget. From 45.5 percent in 1964 it has declined this year to 23 percent. Last year it was about 30 percent. This is why Mrs. Jagan said this afternoon that Health is only getting 4.5 percent of the Budget and Housing is getting less than one-half of 1 percent.

They tell us about the problems of the Soviet Union and Cuba. They are all failing to tell us, but we were reminded by our friends from this side – free medicine, free education, free everything, stable prices; in spite of the whole capitalist crisis wages are going to go up. If there had been no capitalist crisis maybe they would have gone up by 25 percent in the five years, but they are going up by 14½ percent. That is progress.



I have to here two statements which I would just like to point to, not to read them. We just heard from the "Crown Prince", the Minister of Health, that in Cuba they do not have free medicine. They have to pay for the drugs. He does not tell us how much they have to pay. He tells us they have to pay for kindergarten. The Head of W.H.O. recently visited Cuba. Let me read what he said at a Press Conference in Cuba.

[The Speaker: Dr. Jagan, can you tell us from what you are reading?]

**Dr. Jagan:** This is a paper which I have written. I am not telling you my view. I am reading from a paper which I have written and I have a right to quote from it. If you want, I can bring the original source any time. I am not quoting what I said. I am quoting what somebody said which is in this paper. This paper is called "*The Caribbean Industrial Economic Development and Industrialisation*". This is on page 46. The gentleman's name is Haltdan Mahlier, Director of W.H.O. This is what I say.

*"In August 1981 he said that the W.H.O.'s goal of "Health for All" in the year 2,000 was already a reality in Cuba. A single index: Infant Mortality Rate, he added, is enough to attest to the extraordinary success of the work done in this respect"*.

He has a large quote here. I don't want to go into it because that would just waste time.

Let me quote another one because we will come to that just now: Why we are in this trouble? Dr. Gunnar Myrdal, no Marxist, no communist, but recognised as one of the greats in the field of social science, attended a World Conference of Economists in Cuba. He held a Press Conference. This is what he said, I quote:

*"Cuba is an outstanding success among underdeveloped countries. It is notable from an economic point of view for it has carried out the greater part of the transformation which I as an economist would recommend to developing countries"*.

I will skip out a bit and come to this part:

*"Moreover, you have gotten rid of unemployment. For these reasons, if anyone were to ask that where there has been success in development, I will tell them to look at Cuba. Not that you don't have difficulties, you have, but what is special about Cuba is that you have coped with these problems in the most difficult circumstances that any underdeveloped country has had to face, including the terrible U.S. economic blockade which has lasted for more than twenty years."*

Which blockade are you facing? You tell us about the world crisis and



the prices which they manipulated as if you expect imperialism to solve your problems. That is imperialism.

Imperialism hopes to solve the crisis of world capitalism/imperialism by pushing it to the Third World. Do not come here and gloat about that. That is a law of capitalist development. The fact of the matter is that Cuba faces those same marketing conditions. Cuba is worse off in a sense than we are, because of what she inherited. Before the revolution, 85 percent of Cuba's export income came from one product. We had a diversification of gold, diamond, sugar, bauxite and timber. On top of that they had a blockade. It alone is costing them \$700 million alone. So do not tell us that the whole world is in a crisis. Don't tell us that. That is nationalisation for your failures. But, anyway, we are not here to complain about your failures. Today we are in a crisis and we want to see what is to be done. What is the root of the crisis? A Budget deficit which is growing year by year. The figures are written in the Estimates. They are listed here: \$217 million in 1979, \$340 million in 1980, and an estimated \$500 million in 1981, but it got to \$700 million, and they are hoping to keep it down to \$453 million next year. Budget deficit. Why? Why? Let us ask ourselves that question because the people are being made to pay for this Budget deficit. What is the cause of it? One is the over-bloated bureaucracy, and another is debt and compensation payments. We told them any years ago, about the over-bloated bureaucracy, but they did not listen. You put all those people there now you are dismissing them. But whom you are dismissing? The small man at the bottom. The big boys are here. Look at them all over here. Look at them! That is why my colleague said, okay, if there are to be cuts let us start in the right places. Extravagances must be cut out. Cut down the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as we said. Cut down the number of Ministers by half.

[Laughter]

**Dr. Jagan:** Cut down the Vice-Presidents, we need only one, and one is too much. Reduce the salaries like Bishop did, by some 30 percent.

We were told that the Ministry of National Development is doing so much. Last year, they targeted to reach \$10 million in revenue. They got \$2 million instead. They are spending over \$20 million. If we want to make savings, okay, let us hit those who can afford to pay. Cut the National Service, cut the Foreign Service and delete all their privileges. Stop all this: taking horses and aeroplanes to North West and Matthews Ridge; chartering aeroplanes; refurbishing them with beds and all kinds of things. That involves millions of dollars, not only for the Budget, but for foreign exchange. Cut all that out. Cut it out! Cut out all the corruption and all the big overseas allowances of \$400 to \$450 a night. Cut it out. If you want to talk of sacrifices, that is where it is got to start.

Now we come to number two. Two elites are being served in this place. One is the local elite and the other is the foreign elite, at the expense of the

people. The foreign elite is now taking 75.2 percent of all revenues collected from the sweat and tears of the people. Imagine that! We are warning them. When Hope was the Minister of Finance, he said that we have the capacity to borrow and they kept borrowing like mad. Today 75 percent of the current Budget revenue is going - \$462 million is going to pay debts. When we told them long ago to talk about rescheduling, and we were warning them about this, they said we were crazy. Well, they may very well refuse to reschedule their debts, and then they will find what Brazil found when they went to the U.S. in the mid 1970s. Then what do you come to? You cannot solve this problem now. You are so deep in the hole.

Cde. Speaker, the two Heads, salary payments and debt payments, alone are more than the whole revenue. They gave you the figures for the two Heads in 1981 that was \$675 and revenue was \$558 million. For this year, the two Heads add up to \$686 million and the revenue is only \$614 million. Where is the rest of the money for the people? The money is going to the two parasitic elites.

Therefore, we say solve the crisis. If they refuse to reschedule unilaterally, cut it by  $\frac{3}{4}$  million. Pay them a quarter, and tell them to wait. This is not our problem, they created it. My colleague said that the debt payments and the compensation payments take up one-third, that is 30 percent. That came from the Budget speech. Who gave them all this compensation? When I told the then Prime Minister to do what Allende did, he said, "*you want what happened to Allende to happen to me*". Then, Cde. Speaker, the point is that they revised the DEMBA payments unilaterally. Almost double the amount unilaterally. In Parliament, Mr. Burnham announced \$100 million, no interest, 40 years and above to pay. When the pressure of imperialism was put on them, \$100 million went to \$107 million, no interest went to 6 percent, and 40 years went to 20 years. The original clause was that if you do not make any profit, you do not pay. When Kennard and Sukdeo – he is in jail now – went to negotiate with Bookers, they offered \$1, they changed it to \$102 million, 6 percent interest and so on. If we are in problems today, it is of their making and therefore, we are saying we are going to go back to you. There is only one way not to penalise the worker – penalise the imperialist, cut it down. Tell them you will pay them later.

We speak for the majority, no matter how much you twist and turn it and make minority into majority in this Parliament. We will back you and the people in this country will back you if you stand up and fight imperialism. But that calls for guts, political guts and now we want to see whether you have the guts to fight the big boys and fight the corrupt and privileged in this country and help the poor. That is the only way to get this country moving. Now we come to the other one. That is the Budget problem. But we have another one called the Balance of Payments deficit, the shortage of foreign exchange and that is also growing like a mountain. \$279 million in 1979, \$258 million in 1980. Last year planned at \$314 million.

It went to \$558 million and they are hoping to have it this year at \$303

million. Even if they meet all those targets that they put in the books which were never realised before they still have this deep hole. What is that causing now? Not only no food for the people, basic food, no raw materials for the factories, for the paint factory, for the garment factory and other factories, no spare parts for transport, machinery, agricultural machinery, for industrial machinery, foreign exchange for capital equipment and people are thrown out of work. How can you increase production and productivity when you are squeezing the workers every day, throwing him out of work and at the same time you do not have the means of production to carry on production? Aren't you just beating hot air when you talk about production and productivity? How does productivity come? Productivity comes from scientific and technological revolutions and that means money – foreign exchange, because we do not produce them here. But why talk? What is the answer then? 41 percent of foreign exchange earnings is going for oil. 41 percent of foreign earnings is going to pay debt payment. How much is left? 18 percent is left for all the other things, to satisfy consumers and producers of Guyana, to raise production and productivity. You can see that the situation is impossible. I am only hearing, ad nauseam, about how oil prices have gone up. Let me quickly say they are now admitting the railway uprooting was a blunder that caused us more importation of fuel. Forget the price. More importation of fuel. They failed to the Tiger Hill Project which the P.P.P. would have started in 1965, and in 17 years they have not done one hydro project in this country, even though this country has tremendous potential for hydro electricity. Not one. So why bleat, keep bleating about this oil crisis. Anyway that is taking up 41 percent. We cannot do anything about that. Except now they are going for conservation. We will see how that will work.

Let us deal with the main problem now. The main problem, even if you conserve 10 percent, some Minister said \$40 million, that is chicken feed according to the trouble you are in. Come back to the debt problem. 41 percent of foreign exchange is going to that. Therefore, if you cut it by  $\frac{3}{4}$  not only will you save on the Budget deficit but you will also have foreign exchange to bring your goods into the country. I repeat, that requires guts and it requires two things. We will cooperate if you begin to fight. It requires another thing – diversifying our economic foreign relations, not only to talk about it. That is important - revolutionary democratic countries particularly of the Third World such as Ethiopia, Mozambique and so on, but more particularly the socialist world can help you. Experience has shown, when you want to fight imperialism, when you want to grow and develop they are your most reliable allies and realistically the only ones who can help in this situation.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we say therefore, I repeat reschedule. If that cannot be done voluntarily, then unilaterally. Cut down by three-quarters. Cut out the extravagance. We will show you how to do it and where to do it. You have our technical advice on that.

[Laughter]

**Dr. Jagan:** For free. Now, low foreign exchange earnings. We are told the reason by, my good friend, Mr. Hope, why we have low foreign exchange earnings is because of low prices. But what about production? We heard from the Agricultural Minister how productivity per acre has doubled since 1969. But what he forgot to tell us is that with all that and with all the millions they are spending, hundreds of millions, in the agricultural sector today the production of rice is the same as it was in 1964. What the Minister forgot to tell us is that 9,000 rice farmers have quit; that for the first crop of last year, 45.6 percent of the land remained uncultivated and for the second crop 49.5 percent. Have you asked yourself the question why? Why are farmers leaving Guyana and going to Surinam to plant rice? Why? You are telling us about all the reorganisation here and there and all the rigmarole and bringing one man from Corentyne to come and sit in Georgetown now. He is the cause of the problem in Corentyne. How will he solve it in Georgetown? The real thing is to involve the people, the rice farmers, as we were doing. How is it that the P.P.P. in seven years, 1957-1964, increased production by 74 percent?

How? Try to answer that question. We did not have much money. We still had bad weather in, these days. Things did not change suddenly. The drainage and irrigation system is better than it was then because you are squandering a lot of money. Spend it wisely but spend it. But the back lash is the debt payment as I was telling you. Mr. Speaker, I would like to come to this point. The sugar. We see the production. What we have to ask is really how the money is spent. What is got from the people? How the income is distributed in this country and what is really done with foreign exchange that we earn? As we all admit the answer is more production and productivity. But you are not going to get it the way you Therefore, to stimulate production we have to satisfy the consumer first of all. We cannot have consumers wasting time It is not that consumers are refusing to eat substitutes for local products. There is none to be had! How long have we been hearing about urid dhol and mung? What happened to blackeye peas? What is the use cutting out flour when the people eat three times more rice, when you can sell the rice to buy foreign exchange? Even the Soviet Union imports grain because no country can become completely self-sufficient, no matter how big they are.

The only difference is that they have money to pay for it. We are bankrupt. So what I would say is that we must satisfy the consumers. We must make those adjustments which I mentioned to satisfy the producers too because producers and consumers are interlinked. You cannot divorce them, they are the same people.

I come now to the next point which is democracy. The theoreticians on that side will tell you, Lenin made it clear over and over, that you cannot build socialism without democracy, you cannot increase production with-

out democracy and you cannot distribute if you do not produce. Our colleagues have spoken on this question. At the political level, the Central Government, Regional Government, Local Government there is no democracy in Guyana. It is no use telling us about the glories of the democratic regional system and what is written in the Constitution. Tell us how it works down at the bottom. I am sorry this gentleman McGowan is not here. Ask him what happened at the meeting held at Manchester. Six people turned up. You rigged elections to get there. We are not talking about form; we want to talk about the content of democracy. That is lacking.

Cuba has got the same form that you have got, but in Cuba the people are elected democratically and those who are elected have to go to the people every month and report. They can be recalled. You have got that? So there is political democracy, social democracy. The past Prime Minister got up in this Assembly in 1971 and said machinery will be created to let the R.P.A. play a useful role in the Rice Board. It was never implemented. So we have rice stagnation. You have to recognise the organisations of the people. Do not impose bureaucratically just like you run the Government from on top. There are Rice Action Committees in place of democratic rice committees of the R.P.A. That is the problem. The trade union principle has the right of collective bargaining. The workers must have the right to select the union of their choice and that union must be recognized for the purpose of collective bargaining. Where has it gone? Let us take the case of G.A.W.U. for twenty-five years it fought for recognition. It won it by struggle. If they did not struggle they would not have gotten it, and because the Minister then gave a poll his head got rolled. Having been forced to recognise G.A.W.U. they sought to destroy it in the 1977 strike but they failed because of international solidarity and local solidarity.

Then they sought to wipe out the whole idea of collective bargaining through the T.U.C. which they control through fraud in union elections and manipulation. They hope they have jettisoned collective bargaining all over the place. They are trying to teach us now and tell us about anarchy. Industrial democracy is not there, social democracy is not there. Where is the workers' control? My colleagues spoke about that already. We need workers' control not only at the lower levels but at the top levels, in the Board of management like GUYSUCO.

Mr. Feilden Singh asked how all these losses have come. Is it sugar, is it soya beans, is it palm oil, is it experimentation here and there? Let us know. We cannot know unless workers are there. What about the contracts? Yesterday my colleagues spoke about corruption. The only way to stop corruption is to put the workers in control, to check. I told the Minister of Consumer Protection that the way to stop black-marketing is to bring in the communities and let the trade unions at the local level to check on all the distribution systems. You do not have that. There is no democracy in the country and that is the reason for the failure and the alienation because that is compounded with the pressures and the people.

I do not want to go into the other things because my colleagues spoke about them already; corruption, racial and political discrimination which affect management. It is no use talking about head rolling. The P.N.C. subverted all the institutions of the State which were supposed to work independently and which had to deal with promotions and appointments and put their cronies all over the place. Today they are trying to put the blame on them.

Cde. Speaker, let me go on and say this: What Guyana needs is a political solution. We said this long ago. There could be no solution to the economic and social crises without a solution to the political crisis. We said this at our P.P.P. Congress in 1972. We put forward eleven points which must be done to achieve this. We repeated it in 1974. We elaborated to sixteen points and in 1976 when the previous Prime Minister and myself were at the Enmore Martyrs' Day Rally I took the opportunity on one of the rare occasions when I could get on the radio to read out the seventeen points. I said it was not enough to get together. You have to lay the foundation. One Minister told us today that there is an interconnection between domestic and foreign policy. We would like to say that there is also an interconnection and interaction between the base and the superstructure. The superstructure caused the economy to go down and now the economy is affecting the superstructure. Unless you make fundamental changes at the superstructural level, in politics, in ideology, in culture, in institutions, you cannot solve this problem. There is no way out. But what did they do? They rejected it.

Not only did we make calls for a political solution, but even the year when they signed the I.M.F. agreement the T.U.C. Secretary Joseph Pollydore, in his Report at the special conference, warned that there would be no end to the burdens which the people would have to bear. At the end of that special T.U.C. conference in October/November 1978 they called for a political solution. What did Mr. Pollydore say? They took their proposals to the Constituent Assembly and he said afterwards that not one iota of their views was accepted. Pollydore has written another Report which was given to the meeting last Sunday and what did he say? We cannot only constantly talk about external factors. Had the Government listened to the T.U.C. then, they would not probably have been in these problems today.

We have to see it in that context. The P.N.C. not only rejected our proposals, they called us Mensheviks and all kinds of insulting words. Now we see the Prime Minister is calling for cooperation. Pollydore referred to that cooperation. He went on to say that so far as the trade unions are concerned if they become abject slaves, if you want them to become just yes-men then you are not going to have any solutions to the problems. If they were not made into yes-men like the Transport Union they would have opposed the closing down of the railway which was done unilaterally. That is one example of yes-men, company unionism which they have instituted.

We are told instead, now, that we are encouraging strikes, that we are

behaving anarchistically, that we are saboteurs, anti-nationals, troublemakers and all kinds of fancy names. Let me repeat another law of historical development: where the working class is oppressed and suppressed the class struggle is bound to advance, whether you like it or not that is a law of development. That is the law they want to forget in the thesis of cooperative socialism – the concept of the class struggle. It is not the P.P.P. making the people fight, the people are fighting because their bellies are empty inside.

That is what is happening and because their living standards are declining. No matter what you say, rhetoric does not improve that.

So Cde. Speaker, the class struggle will go on and let us make our position clear – the class struggle has two dimensions, one is the international class struggle. Imperialism is still taking the biggest tribute in this country, let us not forget that. They Philips Brothers sit behind the scenes and they draw five percent from every ton of bauxite, every ounce sold in this country. Bookers and Philips Brothers in London, not only draw compensation and interest but they get commission from purchasing agents, from buying agents, from selling agents etc.

Imperialism is the number one enemy. If you want to fight imperialism – any day you will have our support. We make that pledge. But if you decide to fight the working people in Guyana –as night follows day they will fight back and we as the vanguard party of the working class have a duty to protect them and to lead them to battle, whether you like it or not. That is a fact of life and let us remind you too – repression is not going to solve anything, even Uncle Sam cannot bail out the puppets now in El Salvador and Guatemala. So understand that – the days are different now. Imperialism cannot rule, willly nilly, and bring in the marines as they used to do long ago. Don't depend on them, but fight them and you will have our support. If you fight the people, you will have to fight us too. We will not shirk our responsibility and we will be there leading the working people in their struggle against state capitalism. P.N.C. capitalism is a new one, P.N.C. capitalism. Instead of state stores we have P.N.C. stores. We why do we not state stores if black-marketing is rampant? Why P.N.C. Stores which wholesale and retail all over the country? These are corrupt. They are using the state to fill their pockets and that has got to stop if they want to set an example to the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the Government to face the facts, they must face the reality which we are in and no amount of wishful thinking and breast beating will bring results if you don't have the confidence of the people. Be honest and admit that the P.N.C. has little support. Tell us how many people were at all these meeting you held all over the country. How many you got?

Not how many you carried to the meeting. People were not there voluntarily. Even if the 1982 targets are met, and over the last few years history has shown that in no year have they been met, the financial estimates have



worsened when the year ends. Even if they meet those targets, they are not going to be able to solve their problems because of the big Budgetary deficit and the big deficit in Balance of Payments.

The danger of capitalism is there. You cannot retreat further. Unfortunately for you President Carter has gone. Carter would have allowed your vacillation and a little meandering.

But Reagan does not want that now. You have to line up with them and so the danger is that while you talk about socialism even the little gains that have been made in that direction will be lost. And so Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying there can be no economic or social progress without the people. Socialism cannot be built without the people, and the country is steeped as it is in trouble. They can only be solved with the help of the majority party in the country - the P.P.P.



## Venezuela's Claim to Guyana: 8th July, 1982

**Dr. Jagan:** Mr. Speaker, the first question we must ask is what is the P.P.P.'s position with respect to the Venezuelan threat? The P.P.P. has taken the following position:

(1) Essequibo is an integral part of Guyana. There is no doubt about this. According to international law all that has been stated on many occasions.

(2) We have said over and over that there should be no hurling of invectives such as "*fascist*" and "*slavers*", "*conquistadores*", "*terrorists*", or "*bandits*" and talk about war economy. It is our view that we must keep down the temperature. The Prime Minister just gave us comparative figures about Guyana and Venezuela. We can see that militarily Guyana could never be a match, especially under the present conditions when the people are not united.

(3) We had said when all this hysterical mouthing that the Venezuelans are coming – while we cannot say so a hundred percent – it will not be so. It is most unlikely that Venezuela will commit aggression against Guyana. In fact, we would like to say from this rostrum that if we are in trouble today and if there is anxiety in Guyana today among the Guyanese people especially in the days before the Protocol came to an end when there was all this talk that the Venezuelan invasion is imminent, the P.N.C. and Government to a large extent are contributors to this fact. Let us go back on this issue. This matter was dormant for many years. Let me say before I go to that, that we must see today the border questions as being part and parcel of imperialist and reactionary intrigues all over the world. Imperialism and reaction can no longer, willy-nilly, so easily as they did in the first part of this century, send their gunboats and occupy areas all over the world to impose their rule and their exploitative system. Today they use more subtle methods.

The border issue is one of them. It came up first in the early sixties when the P.P.P. was in the Government. It was raised as a part of the destabilisation exercise against the progressive government in Guyana. Actually, the Venezuelan Government had a progressive position after the overthrow of the Venezuela dictatorship from 1948 to 1958 and President Betancourt told me personally that they would neither raise nor renounce the claim. They would not raise it because they were a progressive Government. They would not renounce it because, as they told me, it would allow the jingoistic elements to make political capital. However, the Betancourt Government was thrown out in 1958. This matter was raised in the sixties, particularly after the Venezuelan Government changed its position toward Cuba, the same

Government which immediately after the Cuban revolution give Fidel Castro in Caracas one of the biggest hero's welcome. When pressure was mounted on the Venezuela Government and on other Governments in the hemisphere to isolate Cuba, the Venezuela Government succumbed. The Foreign Minister of that Government refused, at a Conference in San Jose, Costa Rica and he was forced to resign and his Party to come out of the Coalition Government. It was in that context of cold war pressure against Venezuela that the Venezuela agreement was signed. We asked to go to Geneva as a part of the delegation. They refused and they signed.

It is that Geneva Agreement that the Venezuelans are now holding on to.. They are saying, *"If there was no claim at all, why did you sign?"* Why? That was a blunder of the first order, for had the Guyana Government taken the stand of the P.P.P. that the matter was closed, on Independence in 1966 such a declaration would have been lodged in the United Nations and, in the same way we see Britain committed to the defence of Belize, such a declaration would have been made and internationally supported.

Unfortunately, the Geneva Agreement has clouded the waters and now, while the Guyana Government is sitting tight and saying, *"Come and tell us why the Award was null and void"*, the Venezuela Government is saying, *"We are not talking about history and all that"*. They bring in a dead man, Mallet – Provost, as evidence. They are saying, *"If you felt the Award was sound, why did you sign the Agreement?"* They are talking about a reasonable settlement under the Agreement. That is where it is now. But more than that. Let us put aside the Geneva Agreement. What happened? Venezuela took over, first of all, the whole of Ankoko. Half of it belonged to us. Secondly, the reactionary Government of Venezuela, at that time under President Leoni of the Accion Democratic Party, made a decree not only that Essequibo belonged to them but all the waters belonged to them and they sent their naval craft to patrol our waters. That was aggression. Those two acts constituted aggression against Guyana's territorial integrity and sovereignty. We urged the Government to take it to the United Nations Security Council for a debate and a discussion. Nothing was done. Why? Because in that period, 1964 to 1968, the Guyana Government was hand-in-glove with imperialism and even a little beyond that period it was working in concert with imperialism, and American imperialism did not want the matter to go to the Security Council lest it be embarrassed to decide either on the side of Guyana or Venezuela and, recognising how much interest it had in Venezuela as distinct from Guyana, naturally it would not have wanted to put its vote on our side even though by law we are on the right side. So the matter never went there.

Let me repeat: When the aggression was committed, this Government did nothing to protect our territorial integrity. Then came the Protocol of Port-of-Spain and we have to look at these incidents of Venezuela in the context of what was happening.

First, imperialism was angry that its political/ideological friends, the

United Force, had been expelled from the Government in 1968. It is said that because of that anger they supported a rebellion in the Rupununi savannahs which was led by people close to the Government who also raised the border claim against Guyana, when the P.P.P. was the Government.

What was the position then of the P.N.C.? Regrettably, the P.N.C. was part of that conspiracy. The P.N.C. in the election campaign of 1964 put out propaganda in order to win the elections: *"Please do not vote for the P.P.P. because Venezuela is not friendly to the P.P.P. and if the P.P.P. wins, Venezuela will march into the country"*.

There was no recital then of the Award of 1899 and no patriotic stand which should have come then, because at that time the present ruling party was hand-in-glove with imperialism and world reaction. I mention that for the record. What was our position? The then Guyana Government and the British Government allowed the Venezuelan Government to look at the records in the archives of the Foreign Office. They sent three Jesuits who were economists and who were versed in international relations to look at the record. They looked and found nothing and we said: *"The matter is closed"*. But the new Government of the P.N.C./U.F. were persuaded, no doubt pressured, to sign the Geneva Agreement. We advised them not to sign anything. They had some justification, but that is beside the point. Imperialism was angered by that expulsion of the United Force. It was also angry because of the nationalization of the bauxite industry which came in 1971 and the compensation which was offered. Under pressure that compensation was revised upward without even parliamentary sanction. It was in those conditions that we had further interventions across the border which we are hearing about now again. It was in that context that those things were taking place. Even at that point, instead of going to the Security Council when there were incursions, they did not do so. Instead, they buckled to imperialist pressure and increased the compensation to DEMBA.

The Prime Minister referred to Trinidad and the role of Dr. Eric Williams. Mention is made today about the statement made by Dr. Eric Williams in 1975 when he talked about Venezuelan imperialism. But we must put that in the proper historical context in that the P.N.M. Government of Trinidad was speaking for the Venezuelans, for the Trinidad bourgeoisie which was extending its arm all over, including Guyana, and obviously was concerned about Venezuelan bourgeois penetration in the Caribbean also which is going on right now. It is in that context that one must weigh that statement of Dr. Eric Williams.

Let us go back to 1970 when Dr. Eric Williams' Government was threatened by a revolt of 60,000 people in the streets, led by Geddes Grainger, when his Government nearly fell, when an army mutiny was threatening, and when the Americans came to his rescue by bringing their warships in Trinidad waters. The British began parading their fleet in the Caribbean Sea and the Venezuelan Government moved up their troops to the Northern Coast near to the border of Trinidad. Imperialism came to the rescue of

Eric Williams. In that context, since they did not want to go to the United Nations Security Council to charge aggression, Eric Williams became the broker of imperialism and said, "*Sign the Protocol.*" Sign the Protocol and put this matter in cold storage. So that is how the protocol came into being in that historical context.

When Eric Williams played a leading role in making the Protocol of Port-of-Spain, he was not talking then about imperialism. He had just a few months before had the active support of imperialism and Venezuela which was then playing a reactionary role. Now we must not get too heated up about Venezuela, and we must not be jingoistic about it too because there is a very complex situation in Venezuela. We must take a realistic view of what is going on there and examine the position of Venezuela to the world revolutionary process as a whole. The two wings and tendencies in the major ruling parties in Venezuela are C.O.P.E.I. and the Accion Democratica. One is Christian Democratic and one is Social Democratic. But let us put it this way both are influenced and have a lot of links with the Venezuela bourgeoisie. The Venezuelan bourgeoisie itself has contradictions. One wing is linked to imperialism, and another wing is in contradiction with imperialism and one is for expansion in Guyana and the Caribbean. This is the Venezuelan bourgeoisie.

In these two parties, C.O.P.E.I. and A.D., there are wings. Leonie of the A.D. was reactionary, while Perez took Venezuela on an anti-imperialist position.

Simultaneously, when this Government moved in the 1974 – 1976 period to nationalize foreign companies – sugar and bauxite – the Perez Government had moved to a similar position and nationalised iron ore and the oil industries in Venezuela. Venezuela became one of the leading members of O.P.E.C. and as a result of it there was American aggression against all O.P.E.C. members including then, Peru, Ecuador and Venezuela, when they were removed from the most favoured nation status. That was incidentally a period when Guyana came under imperialist aggression mainly although Brazil and Venezuela became their friends. Not only became their friends politically and gave them political support, but gave them a loan of nearly \$30 million. So let us not just become jingoistic and hysterical about Venezuela. Even in the C.O.P.E.I. Party, President Caldeira, before he lost to Perez because of the general situation in the world in the mid '70s, called for a new economic international order, the coming of O.P.E.C. into being and so on, and began to play a progressive, somewhat anti-imperialist, role.

Unfortunately, there has been a change in Washington which has caused a change also in Venezuela. From Carter to Reagan there has been a change. The Reagan administration charges the Carter administration for selling out American interests - by selling out, meaning allowing Somaza to fall, allowing the Shar to fall, signing the Panama Canal Treaty which is going to cede sovereignty of the Panama by the end of this century to Panama.

That is the view of the Reagan administration; perturbed about changes particularly in the Caribbean and so they also began pressuring this Government.

Pressure was there from 1974 to 1976 because of the anti-imperialist position then taken. But Carter released that pressure when they got the Government to sign the I.M.F. Agreement and go backward, more or less to the 1971-1973 period. However, their own rhetoric did not take such an ideological position, their own rhetoric influenced Washington. In the Santa Fe document, produced by the Reagan advisers who formulated Reagan's policy for Latin America and the Caribbean, they bracketed Guyana's Government and Manley's Government in the same category and deemed the P.N.C. Government as Marxist/Leninist. We who know what Marxism/Leninism means know that that is not so. But untutored people who are sitting around Reagan do not know the difference. They took what was said and so pressure began to mount, and this Government began to shift back to the outright reactionary position of 1964 to 1970. We see now the bankrupt position to which they have brought the country. They are now telling the World Bank that we are prepared to submit. Part of that pressure not only came directly through the World Bank or indirectly through the World Bank and the I.M.F. but also through Venezuela. It is in this context we have to see the threat.

Mr. Speaker, the same Government of C.O.P.E.I. which went along with the strategic thinking of Reagan, supported El Salvador with its warfare regime and brutal dictatorship there because of ideological connections with both C.O.P.E.I. and Duarte's party, the Christian Democrats. But that was not the only reason. They were going along with the new strategy of imperialism, American imperialism, by "hawking" around Reagan. Let me just read one statement to show how this is so. Reagan's view in the Caribbean, Latin American and Central America now is this. They claim that there is a threat to the area by Soviet expansionism and that Cuba is an agent of Soviet expansionism. Cuba, through Cuban terrorism, they say, is moving in to the whole area and must be stopped. More than that, the justification for action is that the Caribbean is the sea route for vital raw materials like oil, bauxite, some foods like sugar and cocoa, etc. and the United States cannot do without having control of the sea route. The Venezuelans have also projected a similar thinking.

This is a quotation from *El Diario de Caracas* of April 7, 1981. *El Diario de Caracas*, is closely associated with the ruling C.O.P.E.I. party, and published a document entitled "*Problems of war and strategies in the Caribbean*" mimicking U.S. psychological warfare propaganda about Soviet military superiority, the Soviet menace and Soviet threat and referred to Cuba as having military superiority. It warned against aggression by Cuba and the danger that Cuba may block the flow of Venezuela oil to other parts of the world either by intercepting the tankers, destroying the refineries or even destroying the Venezuelan army and taking over Venezuela. It is in this context

that the proposed purchase of F16 fighters must be seen. The Prime Minister referred to F16 fighters and protested to Washington. Clearly, if Venezuela wanted to attack Guyana, do you need a sledge hammer to hit a fly? Do you need F16 fighters? This is not to speak disparagingly of our brave military men.

[Applause]

**Dr. Jagan:** Can you match 6,000 P.L.O Palestine fighters, brave, willing to die with 80,000 troops with the most modern weapons of warfare? Well, Venezuela with or without F16 fighters is capable if they really want to attack Guyana. That is why we have said deep down the temperature, keep it down.

But a new element has come into the Venezuelan politics and that is the Falkland Islands issue. The Government here has said that Venezuela supported Argentina because they want to use that in parallel to the situation of their own claim on Guyana. But that is not recognising Latin American nationalism. One will remember when Nixon visited Venezuela in 1958 he was nearly killed on his ride from the airport. From the time he landed, crowds of people were there, they spat on him and they nearly killed him. Only because the car was very sturdy it did not break up under the impact. That nationalism must be taken into consideration and today we see not only Venezuela but many Latin American countries supporting Argentina not because of right but because the Falklands had belonged to Argentina since 1810 and Britain committed aggression, not against Spain, but against Argentine in 1833 when it took away the islands. So both historically and also because of their own struggle with imperialism up to the early part of the century Latin America, including Venezuela and Argentina, had many common links. We must take that into consideration.

The whole Falklands issue is coming to a close now. The whole of American politics in the Latin Americas is in a state of shambles. The role that Venezuela was playing prior to Falklands is now changing. Venezuela is now applying for full membership in the Non-Aligned Movement. You will hear our friends probably saying that because of our influence in the Non-Aligned Movement they want to go there and establish some influence. That is not necessarily so. As I told you already, Venezuela is also anti-imperialist. They shift from time to time according to cold war pressures and according to the pressures of Washington, and even within the same party. What are we going to see now in the coming elections next year? This Party, the ruling party, C.O.P.E.I. has become very unpopular. Those of you who think oil is going to save us, look at Venezuela. Plenty of oil! But that is not the answer. The Government is very unpopular.

One thing they have in their favour is Caldeira, who is not just a party man but a man of national prestige and a former President and a man who in the latter part of his term of office took a progressive return. He is likely

to win the coming elections. If not he, then it is Perez of Accion Democratica. We know the progressive role that Perez played. Perez supported the Nicaraguan Revolution and so we must see therefore that the Venezuelan situation is not one with which we must become emotional and with which we must begin to spar words which can endanger our own situation because when one raises up the temperature in this country you at the same time giving grist to the mills of the reactionaries in Venezuela and those people, right wing parties, also have influence in the military. We know that in certain countries it has been to the people's frustration, when the rightist and centrist parties move to the extreme right. If we are not careful in the way we deal with the situation, we can give grist to the mills, as I said, to those reactionary forces and we must understand too that the Government faced with an election also flexes its muscles to see what advantage it could get in the coming elections. Land is always something which politicians who cannot win support, who do not have support among the people look to, to bolster their support. We saw this recently in England in the Falkland Islands issue and the Thatcher Government.

The Guyana Government perhaps had its own reasons for escalating this question. Like the Venezuelan Government, it wanted to do so because we all know that this Government also is isolated because it has decided to go along with imperialism and imperialist prescriptions dictated by the I.M.F. and the World Bank. Thus, the Guyana Government has escalated this so-called threat, escalated the danger in order to:

- (1) Divert attention from the pressures imposed by the International Monetary Fund.
- (2) Improve its image abroad. We know that the Guyana Government's image abroad was dirtied, sullied, after the Walter Rodney assassination, after the rigging of the last election. So it would like to put something else in its place and make the Venezuelan issue the number one question in the international arena. That is what it is trying to do to improve its image abroad.
- (3) Whip up some support at home.
- (4) Divert attention from the wages issue so they can have a wage freeze this year, as previously in 1979, and a wage restraint as in 1980 and 1981.
- (5) Use Venezuela as a scapegoat for its failure to implement the Mazaruni Project. Why haven't we had a debate in the Assembly on the Mazaruni Project? Why doesn't Mr. Jack, the Minister in charge of Mines tell us that the World Bank's advice is that the project was too large for our foreseeable needs and that we needed a big buyer if the project is to be financially feasible. Venezuela said they have no interest, they have their own sites and Brazil said the distance is too far. The Prime Minister told me this. So that they have to use Venezuela now as a scapegoat, especially after wasting about \$100,000



to build a highway, hard currency, with a lot of machinery lying idle, rusting – the road to Mazaruni, like so many other roads which have gone down the drain. Trees are taking over again.

- (6) They have escalated this so-called danger in order to expand the military and paramilitary forces to keep them in office. From \$15 million in 1970 for the army and the police, this year it has gone to \$116 million, \$100 million more when the people are starving. They are going around telling the people that the arms race must be linked to development, disarmament must be linked to development. They are criticising others who are spending money when they are doing the same thing here. If they were really serious about the war danger, how is it they have not once gone to the Security Council and asked for a debate? We have asked them over and over for that. Every day they are stating how many aggressions have taken place. Why haven't they gone? Any country which has an aggression against it goes immediately and builds up support in the United Nations. That is more practical than hearing a secret talk in the corner with some body somewhere.

What has been done to unify this country? Cuba fought imperialism, defeated the Americans by arming all the people in the militia and the Committees for the Defence of the Revolution. Grenada, little as it is, is doing the same thing, standing up to imperialism. What are we doing? We are retreating and fooling the people that the Venezuelans are coming. They should have come already. Ask Urmia Johnson, she said so, the Assistant General Secretary.

[Laughter]

**Dr. Jagan:** When I told Dr. Reid, he said, "*but you know, who she is?*"

[Laughter]

**Dr. Jagan:** And last, Cde. Speaker, the poor people who are starving cannot make two ends meet. They are being coerced to buy Defence Bonds. Because the treasury is empty they are fooling the people that we have to defend the country. What \$10 million will do? Look at the propaganda. The amount of \$10 million was the target. A *Chronicle* headline stated that we have over fulfilled the revised target. Now to be serious...

[Laughter]

**Dr. Jagan:** – I am asking you to be serious, not me. Seaga is now gyrating and saying he is willing to lend his good offices to solve this border problem. Imagine! Seaga! Seaga now wants to step in to play the role Eric



Williams played in 1970. Please do not take this to mean I am attacking Eric Williams. He had his own pro-imperialist and anti-imperialist gyrations. This is a fact because of the nature of the petty bourgeois to vacillate.

Seaga who is the U.S.A.'s man in the Caribbean – Belafonte gave him hell last night – is now saying he is going to intervene. What does this mean? That we will put the matter in cold storage for another twelve years? We say that this issue hanging over our heads like the sword of Damocles is not in the interest of the Guyanese nation. We must seek a speedy solution. We have told Government we must stop going in for all kinds of manoeuvres. We must end them in this one issue. You must take the Opposition in full confidence because we are committed to the proposition that Essequibo is part of our territory. We must try to get this matter speedily settled. Drift is not in our interest. Right is on our side. Caricom supports us. The Non-Aligned Movement supports us. World public opinion is on our side. The Non-Aligned Movement represents the majority of mankind and the majority of states in the world. Those who stand for the rule of law are on our side, because the 1899 Award is an international treaty. The rule of law, international law, is on our side.

So we say, let us bring the matter before the Secretary General of the United Nations as speedily as possible to work out a speedy solution and not to allow this matter to be drifting and to be used by imperialism as in keeping with its strategies wherever it is necessary from time to time, to make border issues become a weapon and to use proxy states like Israel to attack those who want to go forward to build a new future. If we are to build it, we may differ how to build it, but we must not allow imperialism and the reactionary forces abroad or anywhere near to us to manipulate our situation. Unfortunately, the P.N.C. in the past allowed itself to put Guyana in this position today. As quickly as possible, if you are patriots you must find a solution to this problem.

## Approval of Financial Paper No.2: 19<sup>th</sup> August, 1982

**Dr. Jagan:** I listened to the Minister very carefully in his presentation and basically one gets the impression that the Government finds itself in a position where these State Corporations are virtually bankrupt and agencies to which they are indebted are refusing to permit them any further loans. The Minister put good colouring to it by saying that they want to affect tidiness in fiscal responsibility and to bring out managerial effectiveness and so on. He mentioned also that this exercise is due to the fact largely because of external factors such as depressed world markets. Clearly, this is only one factor, one of a series of factors which have led to this bankrupt situation.

The time has come for the Government to discontinue this kind of exercise, a slight-of-hand, three-card tricks exercise, and try to find some way out of the very serious crisis facing this country. Effective management has to do not only with people but it has to do with the selection of those persons as well as appointment and promotion. We have constantly referred to the question of discrimination in appointment and promotion. When is that going to stop? When are nepotism and discrimination going to stop? Then there is the question of markets. We have there too to see where we are marketing our products. In the case of the two, we are dealing first if all with Agriculture, we have no problems there. Perhaps we will come to this

In the case of bauxite, we know that the sole agent of this Government is Philip Brothers; a company, a US company, which is closely tied up with South African based giant monopoly Anglo-American Corporation. We know the position taken by the Government so far as apartheid is concerned.

Yet, the Government refuses to take a stand on this fundamental question of racism and apartheid. It supports resolutions in the United Nations and elsewhere, but when it comes to effective action – not to have dealings with this body, it continues on the other hand to work through Philip Brothers.

We are told that imperialist pressures are being placed on this Government. Every day we are being told about this. What do you expect? If you have an imperialist agency looking after your bauxite, trying to find markets and best prices, working hand in glove, being an agency of imperialism, what do you expect? And yet you complain. Cde. Speaker, there is no logic in that argument. Therefore, let us look at all the things which are causing the difficulties to these corporations. Let us try to correct them one by one:

- (1) Get rid of Philip Brothers – this will be in keeping with the wishes of the Guyanese people and the declarations of the ruling party and

Government so far as apartheid and South African racism are concerned.

- (2) We say we should have effective management by stopping number one, the continuing policy of racial and political discrimination which is going on. The subversion of the state institution such as Public Service Commission, Police Service Commission, Judicial Service Commission and Teaching Service Commission must be stopped!

Right now, the Trade Union Congress remarked the other day that in the retrenchment exercises which took place there was discrimination. I am taking up with the Prime Minister right now, the case of a teacher who has about twenty years service – no fault found with his work and he is dismissed because he does not belong to the ruling party. How are you going to get effective action when these things go on.

We now come to the other question which the Government pays lip service to and this refers to the area of the Minister of Labour. That is worker's control? It is no use telling us we are pursuing socialist objectives. Ask all the ideologists on that side who understand anything about socialism. How do you build socialism? Through worker's control. Not only state ownership of enterprises but through workers control. Where is there workers' control? The Labour Minister is an expert on this question. He has read a lot about it. He has been to the Soviet Union. He has seen how it works. Why is it the Government is unwilling to exercise this. Why?

We say bring in workers control in all state Corporations. If you do not want to do it in the private areas, we say start now because the difficulties facing these companies are not only markets. If you produce inefficiently, your cost will be too high. If you produce inefficiently, you will not be competitive.

The Vice-President told us in his Budget Statement that we lost bauxite markets because we could not meet the suppliers' wishes and maintain our obligations under contracts which had been made. Therefore, let us try to put the things which need to be corrected in order first.

We know that the I.M.F. ceilings have been broken continuously. They have not been met largely because of stagnation in production and productivity and this has nothing to do with the markets. It has to do with production and productivity. Therefore, trying ceilings such as overdraft ceilings have been exceeded. Why? Because the Corporations are not managed properly.

Recently, we heard in the newspapers of the terrific losses being made due to bribery, corruption all over the place in the Rice Board; at Mahaicony Abary, in Wakenaam and elsewhere. Mr. Speaker, how many times have you not heard me speak about corruption there, the mismanagement in the Rice Marketing Board etc. Have we lost markets for rice because the prices have gone down? Why is it today the Americans are taking over our markets in Jamaica? Not only with food gifts, but also thirty percent of Jamai-

ca's requirements in ordinary rice was sold by the United States because we cannot supply it. Look at Barbados. People have told me that Guyanese rice is in a bag in a corner somewhere and other packaged rice is all over the shelves. When you look at the bagged rice from Guyana, it is like dog rice.

That is what they have done to the rice industry. How could you come and tell us you are pursuing socialist objectives? What has happened to the R.P.A?

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to repeat the facts of life. Despite the difficulties during the seven years of the P.P.P. Government rice production was increased by 74 percent, sugar and bauxite by 50 percent. Forget price for the moment. Had they continued at that rate of progress, they should have exceeded it because of all the loans that they have got and all the other advantages which came from independence. Where you could diversify your markets, where you could have all kinds of other facilities. What is the position? No markets. Production is where they are failing. Therefore, all these slight of hand tricks are not going to help us at the moment.

There is also the callous stupidity Cde. Speaker, where they are converting rice into flour and stopping the importation of flour. O.K. let us take the arguments. We do not have foreign exchange. Therefore we cannot buy flour. Rice is earning foreign exchange. It may not be American dollars but it is still foreign exchange. Foreign exchange earned in the Caribbean can be used to buy fertilizers and oil from Trinidad.

Cde. Speaker, there are other ways of getting wheat too. There are such things as triangular trade. When we negotiated a deal with the Cubans, we sold them rice, we sold them timber. We did not want sugar but we could have got a generator and cement to build a hydro station. Through their sale of sugar to the Soviet Union they could have get the generators and all the equipment necessary for the hydro project at Tiger Hill.

Therefore, had they used their brains, for which they are being paid for so highly, then we would not have been in this mess, this stupidity, of converting rice which you could sell outside, not only in the West Indies. There are markets elsewhere in the world, not in the United States only. Petro dollars are as good as American dollars now. Arab countries want the rice but we cannot supply. This is a fact. And so they continue to grind rice into flour. Maybe the rice is so bad that nobody outside wants it. Maybe that is the explanation. I don't know what other explanation there could be for stopping the importation of flour and converting rice for which there is a ready market.

I notice that the Minister did not say anything about the price of rice in the external market. They have admitted in fact that the price is very, very high. But what is happening? They are losing that market as they lost the bauxite market, the bauxite monopoly, especially in calcined ore. They are losing the rice market in traditional areas where we had exclusive contracts. I want to know how it is that Jamaica can break the contract and buy

rice from the United States. Let the Minister answer that. Let them answer this question. How is it that Jamaica is buying rice from the United States, which is contrary to the spirit of agreement which was made by the Guyana Government and which persisted for many years with the Caribbean? I was at one time involved in those discussions and I know. I know the time was when I was involved in that too, when we stopped the Jamaicans from buying "Uncle Ben's" packaged rice because we were in a position to supply them. In fact, our packaged rice then, super rice, was a better quality rice than the U.S. produced "Uncle Ben's."

I repeat: This is an exercise in futility. The Minister says this will not involve any transfer of funds. Obviously, because we have no money. Guyana has no money. They have cut the Capital Budget; they have cut the Current Budget. Other charges have been cut by 41 percent and so this is just a kind of exercise to clean off the slate for the corporations which are heavily indebted at the moment – to clean off the slate and then the corporations will be in a position to borrow again. And when those companies look for money, they will then have to look not to the corporations but to the Guyana Government which is supposed to hold equity.

Cde. Speaker, a day will come when those companies, or those corporations and financial institutions abroad will not go along with this exercise because they will see not only corporations going bankrupt, but also a bankrupt Government. Then equity, all this legerdemain and sleight of hand, will mean nothing. They will all stop. So we repeat: Put your house in order, carry out those things which we have mentioned and last, but not least, diversify your foreign trade, establish close links with the socialist communities and other revolutionary democratic states. Take a firm, not a vacillating, hiding, but a firm anti-imperialist position. Don't only say that you are being attacked by imperialism, take a consistent anti-imperialist position. Show where you stand and that you are resolute about it. I am sure that if you do so you will be helped. Other countries like Ethiopia and Angola and others, which take clear-cut positions, are finding a solution to their problems. However, we are not doing so.

I would urge that the Government give serious consideration to those steps we have proposed.

Finally, I have sent today to the Clerk of the National Assembly a Motion calling for an investigation into the operations of the Guyana Sugar Corporation, the Guyana Rice board, the Guyana Mining Corporation and Guyconstruct. We have read elsewhere that Guyconstruct is bankrupt. We don't know why that is bankrupt. It does not have to do with any external markets. It has contracts from the Government. One state corporation getting contracts from other state corporations and yet it is bankrupt. This Government clearly should resign because of its inefficiency and incompetence. We don't fall for all these tricks.

Secondly, I would like to say this: These Parliamentary Motions that we put, also Questions, are not answered, are not brought up. As you know,

Cde. Speaker, I have taken this matter up with you several times. They do not want to bring them up. We hope they will bring this up for discussion and approve of it because this is in the national interest. This is what the financial institutions and the World Bank and others will be in favour of too, to see not only in the words of the Minister that they want managerial effectiveness, but to see that it is done. Some years ago we had a presidential commission to look at the electricity corporation. It was headed by Sir Lionel Luckhoo. You know what he said! Even though it was a Government controlled committee, it made a lot of strictures.

We are saying now: Let it be a Committee from this National Assembly, selected by this body.

In the United States if such a Bill were brought to this House it would go to a Select Committee, a Finance Committee, before investigation is mounted into all the operations of these agencies. There would be public hearings on these Questions. That is how bourgeois democracy works, but this so-called "*socialist democracy*" or "*socialist dictatorship*" is operating on the basis of everything below the ground. What they are forced to do is just to give some excuse outside that things are bad. What we want now is a thorough investigation by Committees from this House into all these agencies because I repeat: the Minister is giving glib excuses about external markets. These do not apply to rice; they do not apply to Guyconstruct. There the problem is deeper and that applies also to sugar and bauxite. We need to find out concretely and to put a stop to all the ills which are facing these companies, otherwise I regret to say there are going to be more serious problems in this country.

This country is taking a dangerous turn today. It is succumbing to imperialist pressure and I regret to say the conditions of the working people will inevitably worsen. The class struggle will inevitably sharpen and that will lead to an explosive situation in Guyana.

Sufficient people on the side of the Government understand this very well. In the interest of our nation, our country and people, we are asking that such an investigation be mounted now. Bring us into it without hiding anything. Let us not have to read about the corruption at the Rice Board in the papers. Let us find out where it is and let us see that those people are properly punished and take such steps as may be necessary to bring back these Corporations into bloom and into the full activity so that we can solve the problems of Guyana.

[Applause]

## Invasion of Lebanon by Israel: 25<sup>th</sup> August, 1982

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, Israeli Zionism supported by US imperialism is posing the major threat to progressive states and to the National Liberation Movement in the Middle East. Israel continuously flouts world opinion and all recognized norms of international behaviour by refusing to give up Arab lands captured in the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. It further refuses to recognise the Palestine Liberation Organisation and to discuss a settlement of the outstanding issue of a Palestinian homeland.

Israel banditry knows no bounds. Immediately after its creation in 1948, the newly founded Israel state launched aggressive policies right away by depriving the Palestinian Arab people of their homeland, officially recognised by an international body – the United Nations. Later on in 1956, 1967 and 1975 Israel pressed on to achieve its expansionist ambitions with regard to the Arab states. Israel's attitude towards the United Nations resolution on the setting-up of an Arab Palestinian State was seen on June 5th last when 85,000 Israeli troops including reservists, together with 1,000 armed vehicles attacked Lebanon through the United Nations guarded frontier and later, began persistent shelling by the air, land and sea the P.L.O. camps and Lebanese villages. Their primary objective was to liquidate physically the 300,000 Arab people of Palestine origin living in Lebanon and to wipe out the P.L.O., their sole legitimate representative.

Israel is seeking a military rather than a political settlement to the Middle East problem. It seeks to impose a so-called administrative autonomy over the 1.5 million Palestinians inhabiting the West Bank of Jordan and the Gaza Strip. In fact, what was being sought was annexation of these lands with the aim of closing the question of a Palestinian state. All these actions and manoeuvres are being carried out with the direct support of the United States of America, within the framework of the agreement on strategic cooperations with Israel.

Israel's aggression against Lebanon and its drive to liquidate physically the Palestinian resistance fighters and the Lebanese National Patriotic Movement must be placed within the context of:-

- (1) the Camp-David Agreement
- (2) the Concomitant Egyptian-Israeli separate "*Peace-Treaty*" and
- (3) the US-Israeli Agreement on "*Strategic Cooperation*" in the Region.

First I would like to say a few words about the Camp David Accord. This was aimed at promoting the military and political interests of the United States and Israel in the Middle East.

It was aimed at turning Egypt into a stronghold of United States military presence. We have seen where bases in Egypt will now provide facili-



ties to the American Quick Reaction Forces in order to hit out wherever it becomes necessary.

The Camp David Agreement is aimed also at substituting US occupation of Sinai for Israeli occupation. It is aimed also at splitting Arab unity by pulling Egypt – the largest Arab nation from the other Arab countries and at the same time disuniting the Arab countries and bringing them singly one by one as they now propose to do with Lebanon into the Camp David Accords.

The Egyptian Israeli Separate Peace Treaty is silent on two fundamental questions –

- (1) The liberation of all Israeli occupied Arab territories and this might include Lebanon which has just been occupied.
- (2) The right of the Arab people of Palestine to independence including the establishment of a Sovereign State. This Israeli Egyptian Agreement is silent and this is why Israel can now launch out this genocidal attack against the Lebanese people, feeling that the most powerful state in the Arab world especially from a military point of view with its hands tied, Egypt will not attack.

The so-called strategic cooperation between US and Israel – places Tel-Aviv under a sort of American Military umbrella. It provides US military, political and diplomatic assistance to Israel. It encourages Israeli expansionism in the region.

The excuse by Israel for launching this vicious attack on Lebanon was the danger of so-called insecure frontiers and so-called terrorism by the P.L.O.

The events during the war proved quite the contrary for the following reasons:-

- (1) Most of the people killed were civilians including women, children and aged, not just military P.L.O. personnel.
- (2) Most of the targets bombarded were residential areas. In fact, in the course of the war, fourteen P.L.O. camps and thirty two Lebanese villages were razed to the ground.
- (3) Many cities were reduced to ruins while hundreds of thousands of people are left without shelter, food and medical supplies. Now there is a strong possibility of an outbreak of disease as a result of the war.

Cde. Speaker, as a result of this barbaric aggression, a 25-member commission from sixteen countries was set up to carry out an investigation and what they found was indeed very alarming. These include the use of personnel bombs that they call scatter bombs. When they drop they scatter shrapnel and injure people, who under severe distress die within a few days.



Bombs which look like apples or bananas are thrown and this has the effect of hitting particularly children who, thinking that they are fruits, go to pick them up and then they explode in their faces. This is the kind of genocidal attack which has been launched by Israel. Indeed, many of these modern weapons of war are now coming from the west and being tested by Israel, the front-line agent of imperialism in the Middle East, in the same way that we saw some western weapons were tried out in the Falklands War, the Malvinas War.

The Twenty-Five Member Commission condemned the attack as genocide reminiscent of Hitler's genocide against the people of Europe. Hitler exterminated Jews and other so-called "*inferior nations*" and now we see the same Jews, under expansionist Zionism and backed by the United States imperialism and other imperialism, are perpetrating the same kind of fascist methods and genocidal attacks against innocent people. One is reminded of similar kinds of genocidal attacks against the Indians in the United States before it became the United States of America. We see that kind of barbarity in our own area, in El Salvador and Guatemala. Nearly 35,000 people have been brutally murdered in the last two and a half years in El Salvador. And Guatemala, a greater number, about 100,000 people, have been butchered in that country also.

We must therefore see a total world conspiracy of imperialism operating on many fronts. We saw it in an earlier period in Vietnam when attempts were made not only to destroy people with napalm and personnel bombs but also to defoliate the whole country throwing insecticides and weedicides, the foliants which were aimed at completely liquidating the people and the country of Vietnam. This kind of extermination is now going on all over the world in different theatres, beginning with Lebanon.

Therefore, we must see not only the attacks which are taking place now but what is intended.

What about Lebanon itself? We have just heard over the air that a new President was appointed, Beshir Gemayel, and the propaganda is that he is a young man and he will bring dynamism and so on to solve this problem. But the fact of the matter is that Gemayel comes from a family with a feudal background and was linked to the fascist *falange*. This alliance was dominated at one time by the National Liberals headed by the Chamoun family but through some manoeuvring the National Liberals were displaced and Gemayel's organisation the *falange* movement, came out in the forefront.

Let us not think that this will be any answer. Lebanon, as we know, is a divided country, with Muslims and Christians. At one time a settlement was made to try to arrive at a President who would hold the balance evenly and represent both communities. That agreement is now shattered. There is no pretence and we understand that the Muslims, the Arabs, boycotted the meeting for the election of the President.

What is intended by these new manoeuvres? As I said already, to put

Lebanon firmly in the Israeli/US imperialism axis. This is what is intended now. No longer a neutral state with any pretence, is also intended to restore the Lebanon Sectarian Constitution which was brought in in 1940 but which Government must speak out very strongly against because it can reach near to us also if we do not stand up and shout against these atrocities.

What are the objectives of Israeli's Zionism and imperialism? These can be cited as follows:

1. To strengthen imperialism's chief outpost, Israel, in the Middle East;
2. To root out the national liberation movements of the Arab people and more particularly the P.L.O. Imperialism is worried about the anti-imperialist thrust which took place, beginning in the 1970s, in Algeria, in Iraq, in Syria, in Libya, with the nationalization, particularly, of oil resources which American imperialism looks at as its vital interest;
3. To increase the U.S. military presence in the area and deprive Arab countries of sovereignty, subjugating them and placing their national resources under the control of western countries and their monopolies. We know that imperialism, after these nationalisations, particularly of oil and particularly after the Iranian revolution when the Khomeini Government nationalised about \$8 billion worth of properties, reacted by setting up a Quick Reaction Force which could move quickly to any theatre in the world where they feel their so-called "*vital interests*" are threatened. At that time it was set up with 110,000 people, today with 200,000 people. The Middle East is a vital area because of its oil riches and the monopolies would like, the western imperialist countries would like, to turn back the clock, to go back and get hold of those resources. We must add our voice against this attempt to turn the clock back.
4. Imperialism, Zionism, wishes to make Lebanon into a puppet state as Egypt was made under Sadat, the traitor, and to have Lebanon do as Egypt under Sadat did, that is, to sign the Camp David accord. This accord is dead but they want to resuscitate it and therefore if they can get a few puppetstates, beginning with Lebanon, then they can revive it, breathe some new life into it.
5. The objective are to disperse the Palestinian people into other Arab countries, have them become assimilated in those countries. So the problem of a Palestinian people, a Palestinian nation, will disappear and the question of a Palestinian homeland will also disappear. That is the aim of now dispersing them, through Habib, dispersing the Palestine people, I believe into eight Arab countries, all over the place, so that their unity, their nationhood, will be destroyed. This is the objective of imperialism and we see now how Israel collaborated with Habib and American imperialism to get this formula to be ap-

proved and now American troops are going into the area to police this exercise, to disperse and divide the Palestine people and to destroy them.

6. Israel to become a regional metropolis with the Arab states becoming the suppliers of cheap labour and cheap raw materials. Imperialism's plan for the Middle East is to make a situation similar to what existed under Hitler's Germany when the whole Eastern Europe, now socialist countries, were dependencies of Greater Germany, imperialist Germany, and when Eastern Europe was producing raw materials and cheap labour – Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and all those other countries. This is the imperialist plan for the Middle East – to make Israel into the metropolis and the others dependent appendages, not only to provide cheap raw materials and labour but to put their resources and their sovereignty, their control of their own trade etc., their financial institutions and so forth, under the control of Israeli hegemonism which is linked, of course, with western imperialism. The Israeli metropolis will place under its control the economies of the whole region, its financial institutions and will monopolize trade of the Middle East with the rest of the world. These are the long-term plans.

And so Lebanon is going backwards. Clearly when the new President talks about the reconstruction of a new Lebanon and an end to the settling of scores, this is only rhetoric because we know that during the whole period of slaughter which took place during the past two months, this falange alliance was collaborating with Israel, based on the East of Beirut, to shut off water and other supplies to West Beirut, the Muslim quarter, where the Palestinians are residing. So, Cde. Speaker. we cannot expect very much out of what has just happened. The Palestinian problem should be settled within the context of a political settlement for the whole Middle East. Israeli troops must pull out of Lebanon, and American imperialists and other imperialists must keep their dirty hands out of the Middle East. Cde. Speaker we have a situation where another aim of the Israeli was to be implemented, fortunately, they did not succeed in doing so.

They were provoking the Syrians with the hope that Syria would attack, but being in no position to face the onslaught of Israeli might. We are well aware of the fact that Israel is supplied with the most modern and sophisticated US weapons, and the United States uses its veto in the United Nations to stop any kind of sanctions against Israel, and to stop the supply of these sophisticated weapons. In that context, Syria had to think twice and thus did not succumb to the provocation of Israel.

The fact, however, is that the Arab World is sorely divided. This is regrettable and the Arab countries have to face responsibility for what has recently happened. Imperialism is out, as we can see now, to scuttle every international movement which can help the National Liberation Struggles

of the people of the Third World. Recently, we saw the manoeuvre when not only Libya was attacked, its planes were also attacked in its own territorial area, but the O.A.U. Meeting which was supposed to be held in Libya was sabotaged. No doubt, one sees here the hand of imperialism.

Going back to the Angolan crisis in 1975, we saw then that the O.A.U. had a division of 22 on one side and 22 on the other side as regards support for Angola. On this occasion, since a two-thirds majority of the O.A.U. is required for the meeting to be held, neither the summit meeting nor the foreign Ministers meeting could be held because imperialism had enough puppet states, as was shown in the Angolan crisis. Twenty-two of them! That is half of the total that they can use their leverage on in order to frustrate the aims of unity, perhaps united action as was the case on Africa in the Saharian Movement in Southern Sahara. This is because Imperialism does not want to give recognition to that liberation struggle and movement. And knowing that Libya was rendering strong support, the imperialists resorted to sabotaging the holding of that conference. Well, we have to see the machinations of imperialism everywhere. They are fighting in all the theatres of the world. They are not only fighting in the Middle East, in Africa, they are using South Africa to harass Angola and Mozambique so as to deny the independence of Namibia. In the Far East, they are launching out attacks against Vietnam and Kampuchea.

They are arming Pakistan, giving support to the counter-revolutionaries in Afghanistan because they want to frustrate the wishes of the people in India and other surrounding countries, to go on to take an anti-imperialist position and thus serve the interest of their people.

In our own area we see the hand of imperialism. In El Salvador and Guatemala today they are brutally murdering people. I was just reading the *Time Magazine* which reported how El Salvador is sending people to the United States for training so that they can go back and kill people. The C.I.A. in 1954, threw out Arbens' Government. Now Reagan's Government is talking about terrorism in this hemisphere and the Soviet Union and Cuba supporting terrorists, when they overthrew the Arbens Government, an elected Government. Since then they have propped up one dictator after another, brutally murdering people, 100,000 over the last 15 years.

Incidentally on this question may I just refer to the role of Israel in this area? The United States is sending the most sophisticated weapons to Israel. Israel at one time was arming South Africa. As a result, the O.A.U. came out against Israel and no doubt that is why the Guyana Government took such a strong position against Israel. But Israel is also now becoming the supplier of weapons for imperialism in our hemisphere, in El Salvador and in Guatemala. So we must not think of Israel only in the Middle East.

Israel is right here in our zone. What is more, imperialism is now not only trying to murder the people in El Salvador and Guatemala but also to destabilise Nicaragua, Grenada and Surinam. Imperialism is on the war path all over the world. Honduras, a puppet state is being used to attack—

at moments some of the good side of you comes out. I was going to make the point that this is home. Right now imperialism is manoeuvring to expel Grenada from Caricom as they did Cuba. They expelled Cuba from the O.A.S. in 1964. Therefore, this is coming to home. That is why I am giving this geographic perspective of imperialism's action. We must not see only Israel, we must see imperialism. I mention this because I want the Guyana Government to take a stand, not only for the Foreign Minister to go to Non-Aligned Conferences to make speeches. Speech alone is not enough. We must mobilize the people of Guyana. What is the Guyana Government doing to mobilize the people of Guyana, to get them in the street, to march against imperialism, to march for peace, to march for disarmament? Nothing. When they were fighting imperialism they went to the World Peace Council - -

Yes, the Government has something to do with it. As I said they are going abroad making nice statements. But we want more than that. We are calling for the Guyana Government to take firm action. I remember one year they went to the World Peace Council meeting and they had to get a wheelbarrow to come and fetch the petitions to take them to the rostrum – petitions for the Stockholm Peace Appeal. Where are the petitions campaigns now? Where are the rallies? We ask them not to be silent; we ask them to speak out. Much is at stake now. They themselves claim that they are under pressure. Unfortunately they do not have the guts to stand up and fight. They are succumbing to pressure. You know that they signed an agreement with the World Bank, you know that or you do not know that but they are retreating. I am asking them not to retreat. Let us not retreat. Let us stand up! I want the Government to see this in relation to everything else, not only aggression, but disarmament, and the question of peace.

In this score we would like the Government to take some fundamental position:

- (i) Not only to speak in favour of disarmament and peace but to take positive action. Here we try to get on the radio, not to attack the Government but to speak on these matters. We cannot get on the radio; we cannot get in the newspapers. Let them show they are really and sincerely anti-imperialist in that sense.
- (ii) We are asking them to oppose vehemently any manoeuvre of imperialism to expel Grenada from CARICOM.
- (iii) Not to allow themselves to be used by imperialists to create any problems for Surinam
- (iv) To support immediately by declaration in this Assembly the call of President Brezhnev that all states must make a declaration that they will not be the first to use nuclear.

Some of the imperialists want to use nuclear weapons, if necessary. They are talking of a limited nuclear war. But we know the dangers of that. Once it starts it can become a world war. I now end by asking the Minister in

response to my remarks to make categoric statements on these fundamental questions I have raised so that the Guyanese people will know, the same way we spoke jointly on the Venezuelan question on imperialism that this Assembly should be united because this is the sentiment of the Guyanese people.

**Request for Leave to Move the Adjournment of the  
Assembly on Definite Matters of Public  
Importance: 10<sup>th</sup> February, 1983**

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, I wrote you today on a matter which I consider to be of great urgency and importance. Great hardships are being created today to a large number of people and particularly young people. They are denied the possibility to get education. Physical hardships are being experienced. There is a variation of what used to happen. That is why I thought I should raise it now. Previously when mass games was first introduced students used to practice for a couple of hours a day but today they have to be there from nine in the morning to three in the afternoon. There is no proper provision for children to get proper medical attention when they are injured and all that time is wasted. Why is it that you have to have mass games from November, or whatever time it was, to February. Is it only for the glorification of the President or is it in the interest of the students?

## Approval of Government's Policy in President's Address: 10<sup>th</sup> February, 1983

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, a great deal has been said by the last two speakers about the merits of the President, and this year it seems that a great deal of fuss is being made including what I said already about coercing children to glorify the President. Unfortunately no one has very much to show in terms of achievement after 18 years of misrule in this country. No one minds glorifying someone, but it must be for deeds. What are the deeds? What has been achieved after 18 years? The country is in a mess. What has been given to us in this speech? Nothing. It is empty. On one page says:

*"Tremendous difficulties and inconvenience which we have experienced."*

We who? Are we talking about the masses or are we talking about the ruling P.N.C. elite and a parasitic class which has emerged around it? What difficulties are they facing? Next, they have put blame again and again on others. They blame the world crisis. There was a picket line the other day when the T.U.C. who brought them to power was picketing against them for the first time in eighteen years. They said it was the I.M.F.'s fault. They were warned about the I.M.F. but they went into it and said it was the only road they could go. That was in 1978 – the year of survival. Next, there is talk about putting the economy on a war footing. Let us talk about will, clear perceptions and priorities, and that there are all essential. Of course, there are the usual pleads and threats. As to priorities, they are set out: agriculture, fisheries, forestry, gold. First of all the priorities are not necessarily correct for real development from a strictly planning point of view and development point of view. This Government blundered in the early period when they concentrated on infrastructure. When we warned them it was no use, telling us about the debt of the Third World. Sure, there are certain factors from the capitalist world crisis which contributes to this problem with them. But what is equally important is in the wrong planning strategies which imperialism sold to some of those to whom they put power in their hands and as a result economies now cannot produce enough to pay for those debts shortages. The figures are there for all to see what production level we have reached. Had the planning strategy been correct from the very beginning this country today would have tripled production level perhaps in the three main sectors of the economy, and we would not have been up to our necks in having difficulties to pay those debts. That is the first thing. More extraction of natural resources is not the way out. This emphasis cannot save Guyana. Primary producers alone extracting natural resources will keep you in a stage of dependency – capitalist dependency and when you are in that position, when world capitalism is in crisis, obvi-



ously you are not going to get out of it. What is needed is a balanced industrial agricultural growth and a planned proportional development of the economy. That is what is laid down by the people who talk about building a socialist future. That is what is laid down. This is elementary. Why is not being implemented here? After all these years of mistakes and being told what is correct, why is it they are not doing so? Obviously, they have got the country in such a mess now, that they are not any longer even free even if they want to do it. They have to succumb to orders, political orders from outside.

As to perceptions, I said the priorities were wrong, perceptions in the past were wrong, they were clouded because of orders from imperialism and now we see letters written to the World Bank and to the I.M.F. about what direction our economy will now take. It was not just voluntarily written, orders came too. That is what is wrong. Now dealing with perspective, the President said we will provide the people with the essentials as distinct from luxuries and fripperies. Since when milk, oil, soap, bread, kerosene, gas, peas are fripperies?

Since when? You can't get them so you can't provide them to the people, now you are talking about providing essentials. Why are they not here? The fripperies are the things taking place like taking planes to the Commonwealth Conference in Australia, to Cancun in Mexico, there is another one now going to Delhi. Those are the fripperies! Cut them out! By the way, Cde. Speaker, I understand the delegation to the Non-Aligned Conference will be fifty-five. Recently there was one to Jamaica with a delegation of forty-two. They went on a specially chartered plane. The plane was taken from the New York run to go to Delhi. I saw a rationalisation in last Sunday's *Chronicle* saying that it is cheaper to charter than having the delegation go to London then having to pay hotel bills and then having to go on again, what ridiculous nonsense. I understand it would cost us nothing because we have the Guyana Airways plane going to New York. I also understand that the Indian Government is putting up a special Super Jet Air-liner to take the delegates from New York all the way to India. Let the Minister of Foreign Affairs answer. I am told the Indian delegation wants only a few, both for the purpose of expenses and also hotel accommodation – perhaps not more than twelve or even less. I am told that the invitation is for one week and they want to go for three weeks to tour India with the jet. Cde. Chairman that is what I would call frippery that is not essential. This is adding salt to the wound of the people, like putting lemon and adding salt. This is what is happening in this country. Disgrace! Perspective. Nothing has been done to achieve the aims set out in this so called Constitution. The right to work? Instead of the right to work we have dismissals and probably more coming at the corner. Free medicine, free education; see what level they have gone to. The right to leisure, people have to scrape and earn now from two or three jobs to earn a living if they can find them. Land to the tiller, where is that? "*Tremendous difficulties,*" to quote the Presi-

dent, let us say what the T.U.C. said about this. Mr. Pollydore, Secretary to the T.U.C., said the average worker, Cde. Chairman, is eating only one meal a day and the children are going to school with tea only in the morning. Children are going to school with tea only in the morning and what does tea mean? Not tea as we were accustomed to having it here. Congopump and bush tea and sugar water. They cannot afford green-tea any more. Oh, the Congopump has got more nutritional value than the other tea we are accustomed to? Maybe. Cde. Speaker, the same T.U.C. said last year in February that the average worker's income after tax was \$250, but he was spending \$654 a month. A subsequent report in July of the T.U.C. special subcommittee said that the workers standard of living fell from January 1981 to mid last year by 25 percent. They recommended a minimum wage of \$29.70 per day. The workers are not getting \$12.71 per day. That is what they have given the workers and they are talking about fripperies and something else. Cde. Speaker, it is an insult to tell workers who are in that condition about fripperies and luxuries. They cannot even get the barest essentials. They cannot find them and they cannot afford them. That is a fact of life in this country today under this regime. The perspectives. At one time they were talking about a socialist future. I have not read any word about socialism. They are dropping that from the lexicon now. Their masters are telling them to forget about socialism. Will. The will to survive. The workers must tighten their belts some more. They have to discipline themselves. Okay, but what about the political will of the Government? That is what we have to talk about. Political will to solve financial problems, to redistribute income of the poor, to find political solutions, to have a policy, regional and international which is in favour of this nation in keeping with patriotic sentiments and aspirations and in keeping with internationalist's obligations.

First of all, political will to solve financial problems. They now say it is I.M.F.'s fault. In 1978 at a special T.U.C. conference from September to October. I presented a speech and said the I.M.F. road is not the road to follow. Yet the Government signed it. They followed it. Cde. Speaker we have said that what is necessary to solve the financial problems is a revolutionary, not I.M.F. pro-imperialist way. That is not the way. A revolutionary way on behalf of the people. That means if we want to put the economy on a war footing, if by war footing we mean that we want to mobilize our financial resources then the P.P.P. has stated what must be done. It is not that we do not have the money. \$624 million was estimated to be collected last year in revenue. But out of that, \$462 million was to pay debt and compensation payments, \$224 million was to pay salaries.

Well in this booklet "*Strengthen the party, defend the masses, liberate Guyana*" the Central Committee Report of the P.P.P Congress, I would like to read to you about what we said about the question of solving in a revolutionary way, not in the I.M.F way, to bring about immediate relief and raise morale. Page 31 says "*we propose to shift the burdens from the backs of the poor*

*to those who can afford it. The high lifestyle, extravagance, and privileges of the P.N.C ruling class must be cut, and the tribute going to Imperialist vested interest must be slashed. The national cake must be distributed in favour of the masses. To cope with the chronic Budget deficit it is necessary to suspend debt and compensation payments or drastically reduce to one-quarter of current payments. The means reduction from 462 million to 115 million in total debt payments and from 195 million to 49 million in foreign debt payments. Unless forced by mass pressure the imperialist will agree to rescheduling of debt only on a condition of surrender of our national independence."*

That is dealing with debts. That is a big problem now all over and many countries are now talking about socialist and Marxist debts, about cancelling the debt, about refusing to pay the debt so much so that imperialists themselves are now faced with that kind of development and banking collapses. The international banking. They are now moving to put money in the I.M.F. Increase it by 50 percent and so on because that was called for a year ago and the US rejected it. Now they are forced to come around with a proposition to put more money in the I.M.F so they can lend more. Only last night the Brandt Commission made a statement on this question and the whole capitalist world and the dependent world hooked to it is likely to collapse if something is not done to rescue the international banking system to which a lot of money is owned and they are faced with default from Third World countries. That is a revolutionary way, not to sit around and fiddle with a lot of platitudes as in this speech. I go on to point No. 2 which sets out our solution:

### **Cut out the extravagance of the P.N.C elite -**

- (a) Reduce Vice-Presidents from five to one
- (b) Cut the number of Ministers to half
- (c) Cut Ministers and super-scale salaries by half
- (d) Reduce overseas trips and allowances by half ( I just refer to one of them - the Safari to the Non-Aligned Conference)
- (e) Reduce purchases of arms and freeze the recruitment of police and army personnel. ( Recently some more guns came into the country, heavy machinery, heavy ammunition, For what?)
- (f) Reduce the Ministry of Foreign Affairs by half – expenditure increased from 3 million in 1972 to 16.5 million in 1982.
- (g) Abolish National Service or severely restrict it – 186 million spent since 1974 with negligible results.
- (h) Reduce Information Services by half
- (i) Abolish the Ministry of National Development now merged with Regional Development.

Take drastic steps to end corruption. If that was done it would bring us

400 million under the two Heads – the cut in the bureaucracy, the cut in the political elite, and the cut in debt and compensation payments.

With that it is possible to do things to help the people to raise morale. Mr. Speaker, many things need to be done and everybody understands this. In this country today the morale of the people is extremely low and it is no use just making pleas. They are falling on deaf ears. People are going away; they do not have their hearts in things. How will you do this? We have suggested:

- (1) Increase the wages to a decent minimum wage.
- (2) Increase N.I.S. pensions and benefits to contributors because those benefits are very low at the moment and the N.I.S. has a lot of money.
- (3) Increase the old age pensions to at least \$100 a month. We should raise also social assistance from \$20 a month.

Recently an old person came to me. They have cut her social assistance from \$20 to \$10 and when we raised this with the office dealing with this they said people have to go and help themselves, and there is a likelihood that there will be further cuts from the \$10 they are getting. This is a disgrace to people who have contributed their labour to the building of this country. This N.I.S. should pay unemployment relief to thousands of workers who were sacked by the Government and others who cannot find work.

We should have a school-feeding programme. How could children learn when they have to go to school with bare tea? Let Hamilton Green tell us how he is going to solve that problem when he speaks. We demand also that there should be an urgent works programme. In the crisis in America in the 1930s they started a programme under the Roosevelt era to help the unemployed people. It did a lot of good.

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** We also want a comprehensive training programme to train people with additional skills because that is another area where things are falling down in this country. Things are not running properly because lots of the people with skills are going away. Therefore you have to motivate the people to stay here. Therefore, give them a chance to live decently and also train them so they can do the job well. Those are some of the things which we advocate so far as the motivation of the people is concerned

In addition to that, the political will – there has to be recognition that what is needed in this country is a political solution. Without that you can talk and read lectures to us, as the last speaker did, of all the glories of decentralisation. But it is all going down on paper. It means nothing because nobody is listening, nobody is concerned. You can set up all the machinery you want, Local Government, decentralisation, and it is not going to work.

We have just put out an open letter to the Ottawa Mayor. We asked her if she knew that Local Government elections were not held here since 1970 when they were rigged. She came for twinning, Georgetown with Ottawa. We want to ask her if she knows that and all the other frauds which occur here from time to time.

Incidentally, on that score, Cde. Speaker, what did the Canadians say in the Report of the Sub-Committee on Canada's relations with Latin America and the Caribbean. I will read you some sections. Section 31 states:

*"Mr. Burnham has virtually blocked all peaceful avenues to social and political change."*

Section 28 states:

*"In the opinion of many the Burnham Government is in a sense an administrative dictatorship which robes itself in the vestments of democracy."*

Then it goes on to recommendations. It states:

*"The Government should not terminate but reduce its aid to Guyana and direct its development assistance to small projects in the private sector; and convey to Guyanese authorities its extreme disapproval of their human rights policies and practices."*

Their friends who brought them to power see how they are wrecking the country. They are no longer prepared to throw good money over bad. It is a waste of time; they are trying to put it somewhere else.

Unless that problem of democracy is solved in Guyana, I mean real and fundamental democracy, and there is the observance of human rights, we are not going to solve anything and we are just beating the air. A lot of trumpets and show and palaver going on are not going to rescue the situation. Then we come again where bold leadership is necessary, political will. If you want to develop out of the mess which is facing the world today it cannot be done under dependent capitalism under which countries like Guyana, Latin America, Central America are caught. Even socialist orientation, much of the transition from capitalism to socialism which is written in our Constitution, requires close links with the socialist world. Let the former theoretician Chandisingh tell us if that is not true. I am circulating a booklet on that question now to my Executive. This is one of the theoretical principles of Marxism/Leninism which they said they subscribed to some-time ago. But where are the links?

The President, when he was Prime Minister, went to Moscow in 1978. He was offered unlimited credits; he was offered help to rehabilitate the bauxite industry, to buy bauxite. He was offered help to develop the gold industry. Nothing has been done except to buy some Lada cars and give

them to all the big shots. Because they do not want to move in a revolutionary way in foreign policy, they use imprecise language like "North/South," not capitalist/socialist or imperialist/socialist, "North/South." This we know is a term which is used but it is not a precise term because the north also has socialist countries, not just capitalist. We hear about south on south cooperation but surely that alone is not enough. Most "Third World" countries are underdeveloped. Most "Third World" countries are not opposed to having south on south cooperation. We agree with that. But that is not enough.

It is necessary for "Third World" countries, in their struggle against imperialism to fashion a new world international order, to have close links with the socialist community. Without that it is impossible. But we do not hear anything about that in this document. We hear the talk of imperialism. Only one time in this paper has the word 'imperialism' been mentioned and that is by the way. What we have inherited is in the past, but there is nothing about the struggle against imperialism in this paper.

Then we come to nonalignment – fooling the people that we are going to a conference jamboree. But what did Mr. President say? In Page 24 of this same booklet, L.F.S. Burnham called for the Caribbean to be transformed into a zone of peace, free from the machinations of the great powers. In the same vein, the P.N.C. Youth arm - the Y.S.M. - called on the big powers to desist from all overt and covert military action in the region. When they were getting pressure from Brazil in the mid 60s, they did not talk like this. They changed from their original line of two super powers to imperialisms and they developed close links with the Soviet Union and Cuba. That is a fact. But now the Minister gets up on the radio and says – the great powers or superpowers are trying to take advantage of the Non-Aligned Movement. I am writing a letter to the *Chronicle* to deal with this question of nonalignment and I hope they will publish it. It makes a lot of sense, you can read it. I will send you a special copy.

Stop talking about major powers, great powers and equal blame – stop talking. Cde. Chairman, the Non-Aligned Movement has a spectrum from the right to the centre to the left. The P.N.C. historically in the last eighteen years – started out on the right, then moved to the left and now has gone to the middle. They have gone to the middle – to an equidistant position from the "two great powers." that is the kind of language they are talking about now and it is manifested...

### [Interruption]

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, they are retreating and this is shown up in the kind of language they use now. They deliberately do not work to be precise that is why they have to use language like that. That is where imperialism – the United States - want the non aligned movement to be a neutralist or

rightist position. At least, they condemned it. John Foster Dulles said it was an immoral movement. You either have to be with us or you are against us – you cannot be nonaligned. But Carter and Kennedy were a little more clever. They wanted to woo countries like India and so on, to see if they can bring them to the middle, centre position – equidistant from the so-called super powers the great powers, and that is where the P.N.C. is moving.

Now the next item – regional cooperation, here again bold leadership is necessary. I heard over the radio last night or the night before – that Maurice Bishop was attacking the United States for selling arms to Guatemala, for murdering people inside Guatemala and for threatening the independence of Belize, and that he had sent a letter to all the Governments in CARICOM. I hope you will have the guts – not you Cde. Speaker, they will have the guts to come out and agree with Maurice Bishop and say that United States imperialism must be condemned for saying that the human rights position is improving in Guatemala when people are being killed and slaughtered and that more weapons must be sent there now. It is a disgrace and we must speak out if we are interested in the region and if we are interested in humanity. Don't sit idle. Last but not least world solidarity.

Cde. Speaker, the whole world is threatened today. The President in his speech talked about the destructive capacity and then he went on to speak of the danger facing the world. He says *"the world seems to be in disarray – that is on the economic side and teetering on the brink of disaster, if not of a holocaust."* The reference of course is the danger of a nuclear war. *"We read of missiles, costing billions, whose destructive capacity causes the most fertile imagination to boggle"* and so on. On this issue I do not think we should have any difference.

Vast amounts of money are being spent for the arms race and here again we must not talk about equal responsibility. The fact of the matter is we know that the cold war was started by imperialism. N.A.T.O. was created by imperialism. The Warsaw Pact was a defensive pact created by socialist countries. Ask Chandisingh if that is not correct. All over the world, the balance of forces has shifted against imperialism – Reagan who was a witch-hunter when he was a Hollywood second grade actor, was in the camp with Nixon who hounded the Hollywood Tent. By hounded I mean their names were black listed by the Un-American Activities Committee. They lost their jobs as screen writers, as actors and so on. Reagan was one of them then persecuting those people. Incidentally, one of them having lost his job wrote in a pseudonym – a film script for a film called the *'Brave One.'* It won an Oscar award for screen writing. Only when the man presented himself to get his award was it realised that he was the one who had been witch-hunted.

Times have changed. Here again we must not only sit down and talk about equal blame, and the super powers or the great powers are spending billions. The fact of the matter is the Soviet Union has taken the initiative on many occasions. The last time under President Brezhnev, the Supreme



Soviet put out a peace appeal. Unfortunately, we could not get it debated in here. There is another one now and I hope the Minister of Foreign Affairs will agree that we should have a debate in this House on that question so that we can register here – at least unitedly that we are against the arms race. We are against the non sense called '*zero option*,' we are for the breaking down of nuclear weapons to a level where there can still be equal security on both sides, so that both sides can feel safe that the security will not be in peril.

Cde. Speaker, those are the points which I want to make today. If this country is to get out of the mess that it is in, you need bold leadership and those points which I mentioned are absolutely necessary. Take Grenada, Nicaragua, Cuba, the Revolutionary Democratic Countries, Ethiopia, Yemen. This is the course they are taking in the Third World.

Yes, Surinam, too, was fighting imperialism, calling imperialism and talking about transnational corporations. They are not like you, bowling and scraping. We want to avoid going down, sinking further. We are in a vicious circle at the moment. There is no doubt about that. Cde. Chairman, if they examined their hearts carefully they would see that they are dejected. They do not have any spirit in them and they are calling on the people for spirit. Look at them! What they need now is a spirit similar to ours on this side of the Assembly. If the Government Members had it, they would have something moving – the spirit that comes out of revolutionary confidence, revolutionary practices, and revolutionary policies. That is what this country needs. They do not have it today and therefore we think this government should scrap the seats of power and let us have a new deal in Guyana.



## Budget Debate: 21<sup>st</sup> February, 1983

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, in listening to the debate, the Members of the Government side tried to put a good face on what is happening but no one can deny the fact that Guyana is in a mess. We can talk about luxuries and fripperies and so on but it is a fact that the basic essentials of life are not available to the Guyanese people today. It is not merely a question of comparing the P.P.P. time and the time now or comparing Guyana with other countries. The Government usually tries to give the excuse that we are caught up in a world crisis. The Minister of Finance in the Ministry of Economic Planning and Finance and the Vice-President, Agriculture reiterated these points. There was a little variation in the line from the Minister of Foreign Affairs. He said that there was a crisis of international capitalism and because socialist countries relied heavily on western technology, linkages have been created between the economic activities of the socialist countries and international capitalism. We have been saying all along, we want to make the record clear that what we see happening in the world today is a world crisis of capitalism. But because this Government has said that what is going on here is a socialist revolution, that Guyana is in the transition from capitalism to socialism it wants at the same time to say not only that the capitalist world is in crisis but the socialist world as well.

As I said, Mr. Jackson, Minister of Foreign Affairs, perhaps a little bit more objectively tried to put the record straight because we are trying to debunk the argument of world crisis. However, even the argument put forward by the Minister of Foreign Affairs is not completely correct because the socialist world has resisted by and large getting into the grip of western technology. This was a continuing argument I know between the Soviet Union and some other socialist countries. Poland is an example. Romania is another example. The fact that Poland and Romania particularly, apart from imperialist subvention and C.I.A. intrigues which we all know about, moreso than other socialist countries are in trouble. The more trouble, relatively, is the fact that Yugoslavia is another example, they have taken in more western technology. On this point we have to see that socialist countries are trading within COMECON and over two-thirds of the economy and trade is within COMECON. Only a relatively small portion, less than thirty percent or around that is with the capitalist world. Therefore, we have to put things in perspective when we are talking about this question otherwise we will be misleading to Guyanese nation. We will be misleading the people. I repeat, the socialist world is not in crisis. The President in his speech said that the U.S.S.R. had an industrial output 40 percent short of target, and grain production was over 25 percent short. What he failed to say is that the rate of growth of the national income in

1982 was 2.6 percent, industrial production was 2.8 percent and that agricultural production was 4 percent. He did not say that in a period, for instance 1970 to 1981, that the U.S.S.R.'s national per capita income increased 52 percent as against 24 percent for the U.S.A., 35 percent for France, 29 percent for West Germany and 16 percent only for the United Kingdom. So let us put things in perspective and properly, objectively, scientifically, otherwise we are only trying to find scapegoats for the problems which are facing the nation. No solution will be found if one is only trying to find scapegoats.

We have in this context statements being made still about a socialist revolution in Guyana. P. H. Daly in the *Sunday Chronicle* fulminated on the 20<sup>th</sup> of this month about a socialist revolution and socialist democracy. The Prime Minister in an article in the *New Nation* on the 23<sup>rd</sup> January said:

*"Now we realize that the anti-socialist attempts to destabilize us have been a blessing in disguise."*

Again implying that what we have here is the construction of socialism. The Vice-President of Agriculture said in the *Sunday Chronicle* of the 20<sup>th</sup> February:

*"Under the sensible and wise guidance of our Leader, Linden Forbes Sampson Burnham, the socialist transformation of our agriculture will be realized in our lifetime."*

Cde. Speaker, all this is just rhetoric about socialism. The P.N.C. has brought the economy of our country to a standstill and it is only a change in policy from socialism to capitalism that could bring the country back on its feet. In other words, it is either he does not understand or he just therefore swallows the rhetoric of the P.N.C., or for good reasons, for purposes of imperialist capitalist ideological warfare, to give socialism a bad name, he refers to what is happening here as socialism. Whatever the reason, it is clear that this kind of thing goes on and, indeed, socialism is getting a bad name.

I do hope that at some time in this Assembly and in the press, the mass media – because we are told the mass media is independent, we are told that communication for development is necessary that is why the Government took over the radio and the newspapers. That is the justification for ownership and control, important for development. Therefore, I challenge the Government not only that we should have a debate on this question, whether Guyana is in a state of transition from capitalism to socialism, whether this is a socialist Government, whether there is a socialist revolution in Guyana, but to open newspapers and the radio for us to have a full-scale debate on the question. If these are socialists then let us discuss what the ways to socialism are, not only to ascertain whether we have socialism

here but what must we do to arrive at building a socialist society. That is fundamental because the Guyanese people are suffering and we have to find the correct way forward.

The Prime Minister asked that the P.P.P. should not involve itself in what he terms subversive activities but must join the P.N.C. How can we join, how can we support anything when there is only rhetoric. Let us have a debate objectively on the fundamental issues and see what is necessary even for socialist orientation.

Cde. Speaker, I need not remind you that we are celebrating Mashramani. In 1970 when the Republic Day was created they talked about cooperative socialism. This was going to make the small man the real man. The nation would have been housed, fed and clothed by this cooperative socialism by 1976. I remember on that day when I lifted up Engels' book, "*Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*", I pointed to the then Prime Minister and said, "*you choose now, for opportunist reasons, to forget what is in this book*". So let us have the decks cleared on this question. If you are practising capitalism or whatever version of it, dependent or otherwise, let us have a spade called so we do not have nonsense like what was said by the U.F. spokesman, that it is better we revert from socialism to capitalism for a solution.

It is necessary if we are to move forward in this respect that we have not only rhetoric but we understand the reality of what is happening in the world. The reality is that the capitalist world is in crisis and the Third World is being dragged down in the depths of the crisis because the Third World by and large is linked up with the capitalist world.

We hear a lot about underdevelopment. Some theorists now talk, in discussing this question of underdevelopment that is historical development of capitalism, before the era of colonialism there were underdeveloped countries, plenty of resources, no development. But as capitalism developed and it took in more and more territories simultaneously you heard of development going on in the capitalist countries – United Kingdom, Germany – and underdevelopment in the Third World countries. That was the process, two sides of a similar coin and this process is now under dependent capitalism. And in the crisis of world capitalism we see that not only the capitalist countries are in serious trouble. I have a clipping here from the *Chronicle* which speaks about two million Americans sleeping on river banks and under bridges. Translate that to the Third World with dependent capitalism and we have a world situation, because while they may have 15 percent unemployment, the third world countries have 30-40 percent as in Latin America and the Caribbean, and therefore, we have to identify the enemy. We have to identify the enemy, not give socialism a bad name, but identify our status.

Cde. Speaker, I say, all the rhetoric put aside, our economy, despite the fact it has nationalised 60 percent of the economy in the state sector, despite that, the fact of the matter is our economy is still dependent – it is linked to the capitalist world and that is why sugar and bauxite particu-

larly are in trouble today. That is why they are talking now of abandoning it. Put it aside for the time being and look to agriculture. Look to agriculture. That is the new strategy.

We told them when they started out in 1964-1972 that they were embarking on the Puerto Rican model and that cannot save our country. They came forward with the concept of cooperative socialism. Utopianism – all of that has helped to bankrupt our country. I do not want to go into the Puerto Rican mode and the mess that Puerto Rico is in today. The statistics are all there.

Today, I think it is wrong while we are not saying that agriculture must not be developed, it is wrong to talk only on reliance on agriculture to save this country.

Cde. Speaker, let us see what the Government said. I am referring to this because we cannot just hope and sit and pray. We have to look at the things realistically. What is likely to happen in the next two years or so, in the near future.

I would like to read from a book here called *'Party life'*, the fortnightly journal of the Indian Communist Party, an article by G. J. Rama Rao. In a world capitalist economy brief review, it says on page 31: *"In the June forecast the real growth of G.N.P. of the O.E.C.D. members is put at half percent for 1982 and "recovery" which involves a G.N.P. growth rate of at least 2½ percent is put off until 1983. And, characteristically The Economist July, 10<sup>th</sup> "cautions: 'prepare' for it to recede again, like Tantalus's grapes".* The economist wails *"after slump number two, in 1979-1980, recovery has proved infuriating illusive"* – then he goes on about unemployment. *"Inevitably unemployment in the O.E.C.D. has increased to about twenty million or so and nearly half of this number is accounted for by the USA alone"*. According to the Economist Intelligence Unit forecasts, in about six European countries, 'West Germany, Italy, Belgium, France, Britain, Holland' unemployment will continue to rise. *"By 1987 more than eleven million people are unemployed, equivalent to 10½ percent of the labour force"*.

So, not only do we have a deep ongoing crisis, but from the bourgeois press itself, from the bourgeois analysis we see that this crisis is going to continue in the foreseeable future. Therefore, what should be the strategy of this Government if we want to get out, seeing that in our economy, bauxite and sugar particularly are dependent on the world capitalist system? What are we to do if we are to get more out of this? Our strategic aim must be to change course, to develop new economic relations, trade and economic relations with the socialist countries and with the revolutionary democratic countries which despite their little troubles are not seriously in crisis. They are not in crisis. This is a strategic necessity and it is no use if we just flounder from one place to another and think that agriculture is going to get us out of the mess.

Cde. Speaker, therefore, my answer to the Prime Minister about cooperation is we are putting up proposals, let us see you act on them intelli-

gently and objectively. No question of political struggle at the moment. We are talking about this nation – to save it. See where we are going and to whom you are tied and see what that is going to go to.

Incidentally, Cde. Chairman, I did not tell you about the banking system. The United States American Bank of Noxville collapsed on February 14<sup>th</sup>, 1983, the fourth since January. Forty-two banks collapsed in 1982 compared with forty-three in 1940. Another quote: “Prominent US and European bankers now believe that a year from now no more than one hundred big banks down from 1,100 today will be actively participating in large syndicated loans to foreign countries,” according to *Business Week*, another capitalist big magazine. So that what we are tied up to is really a decaying system and if you do not want to be dragged further in the mire than what we are in today then take a strategic decision to move in a different direction. Don’t only come now and blame the I.M.F. Pollydore said you did not consult the T.U.C. when you went into it. Why now, when the T.U.C. is demonstrating for a 13 percent rescinding of electricity charges, you wave a placard in front of my face and say it is the I.M.F.’s fault.

Samora Machel who came here says that he is not going to join the I.M.F. even though the road may be difficult. He is prepared to take a revolutionary democratic approach and move to solve the problems of the people, not to tie the bundle with imperialism.

As regards agriculture – the President, two Vice-Presidents, that is the Development Minister and the Agriculture Minister are now singing the praise of agriculture. This will be the new salvation. The *New Nation* on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of last month said the fifth Biennial P.N.C. Congress will concentrate on agriculture. What did we read on the same page, page 1? The *New Nation* carried the headline: “While others stare US cuts back on grain production.” It goes on to give the statistics of how subsidies to farmers will be increased from \$12 billion in 1982 to about \$18 billion in 1983. President Reagan is now bringing a variation of the Soil Banks Scheme which they had a few years ago. Then they paid the farmers money to keep land idle. Now he has a new proposal to give them crops to keep land idle. I do not know how that is going to work, but it sounds crazy. That is how capitalism is – to give them crops.

Let me remind you and this House, Cde. Speaker, that when the P.N.C. first got into the Government it was in the period when the US had the Soil Banks Scheme and that is why they allowed agriculture to sink. That is why we did not put through drainage and irrigation schemes and now the US is planning a variation of the Soil Banks Scheme. When recently it sold butter at dumped prices to Egypt, virtually the whole of the E.E.C. declared war against the U.S. because of that.

Secondly, there are mountains of butter and other agricultural products in Europe today. They have such big problems of storage that they are now trying to store them underground. If the concentration is going to be mainly on agriculture, are we going to go in for a subsistence economy? This term

'self-reliance', are we going to isolate ourselves completely from the world and behave like some countries, hold the people down with military force and have them subsist at the minimal, primitive level? We are going backwards every day. All kinds of things like the coal pot and so on and so on.

Clearly this regime is bankrupt because it has no ideological, clear-out perspective about where we are and where we want to go. It is drifting. Maybe you could have drifted ten, fifteen years ago, but today you cannot drift. You cannot even stand still, you go backward. This is a fact of life.

Look at the records, look at their track records. The Vice-President for Agriculture said they are going to have a socialist transformation. Look at the track record. In rice, from 1967 to 1978 – 33,000 acres of land were abandoned. From 1965 to 1978, 16,000 or 35.5 percent of small rice farmers have been ruined. There has been under-utilisation of land. In the P.P.P. time, 266,000 acres were cultivated. In 1979 it was only 108,000 acres of land cultivated in rice.

Mr. Jack, before he went away, told us that we cannot compare prices, prices have gone up everywhere. This is not necessarily true. Prices have remained stable for essential commodities in the socialist U.S.S.R., Bulgaria and other places for 30 years. Prices, I said, of essential foodstuff.

But he went on and signed another one. If Seaga can do it why can't they do it? Because they are under pressure from imperialism. They have stopped talking about Marxism/ Leninism. The Santa Fe document. Read it and see how they are described. And so they had to give up even the rhetoric of Marxism/Leninism. You do not hear that now in their vocabulary. So I am saying that (1) we must see where we are heading and (2) change our economic and trade relations dramatically.

Secondly, don't just think that wholesale emphasis on agriculture is going to save us. Cde. Chairman, sixty-two or sixty-six industries were listed in the appendix of the 1966-1972 Development Plan, but they have not done that. I say take the offers which were given. The Prime Minister then went to the Soviet Union in 1978 and was offered unlimited credit. How is it that they have not looked into the question of industrialization of Guyana and taken credits on that score? Now we come to some of the other points made.

How much more time do I have?

All right. The Finance Minister told us about debts and debt services. He mentioned how many countries are caught up in this; Mexico, U.S.S.R., Poland, G.D.R., Brazil and so on. This is a fact. This is true but we have to see another fact and that is the Soviet Union does not stop buying grain from the capitalist world. They give the people flour. We can't say that here. They buy wheat from Argentina and the United States. They have a gold industry. Every now and then they sell their gold and get foreign exchange. They are willing to help us develop the gold industry, but you have not accepted their offer. You wanted I.M.F. money and now you are saying that it is the I.M.F.'s fault. How can you talk like that?

That fact of the matter is that the socialist economy and their payment was so good that the capitalist countries who were looking for investments were willing to invest even in the socialist countries to get loans because in the context of their own production crisis, they could sell capital goods to the socialist countries. The Fiat cars are an example of that. Another example is the Ladas. Capitalist countries are in a crisis and wanting to export their capital and their capital goods and, therefore, they saw a lucrative market in the socialist world and the socialist world could pay. The reason why they cannot pay is because of poor planning, faulty planning like Poland. You cannot put the Soviet Union in the same breath with Brazil and Mexico. They have completely different kinds of economies altogether. And consequently, the debt payments have to be looked at not only in terms of foreign exchange, but also in terms of the internal Budget deficit. You were paying over \$400 million; nearly half of it in foreign exchange but the rest has to be found within the Budget here. That is why you have no money to give school children lunches, to give them exercise books; you do not have money for drugs and now the Minister is going to charge the poor – squeeze the hell out of the poor sick people by charging them for prescriptions, charge them three dollars for dental extractions and so on.

Free medical service, you wrote in the Constitution. They ought to be ashamed of it. They ought to be ashamed, Mr. Speaker, they fooled the people in 1978 and wrote in the Constitution free medical service and now, now is the pay off. They fooled the people and now the lash. Let not the Minister of Finance simply quote from *Time Magazine* and give us a conglomeration of facts and not become analytical. The Soviet Union has not got budget deficits, big budget deficits. The I.M.F. told you to solve it. Your budget deficit is nearly half of the revenue. That is why this year you have put on \$48 million in taxes on medical services and so on. You are squeezing a few dollars - \$1 million – from medical services. Therefore, the debt payment not only has to do with foreign exchange which does not give us the money for raw materials, essential foods, spare parts, for agricultural and industrial machinery, but also has to do with the internal budget. Every year as the deficit increases because of the growing debt payments, you are squeezing the very people whom you expect to produce to give you more revenue. How are you going to do this? It is impossible, because you cannot do it.

Dealing with the sugar price, he said it has changed in the world market – everybody knows that, Cuba knows that. What happened in Cuba? Cuba has rescheduled some debts. Okay, reschedule some debts. Read how sugar is being sold in the socialist world at 35 cents, where they buy fuel at half the world's price. What do you do? What are you belly-aching about all the time of the oil prices and about the drop in the price of sugar? What are you doing about it? What new relations are you creating? Cuba's production in sugar increased in spite of all this. In fact, Cuba's economy is from the days of neo-colonialism...



I will move on quickly to two points. The bran oil factory. They invited us to go to the bran oil factory. A similar kind was ordered by the P.P.P. Government and cancelled by this Government. This factory has probably been sitting here for three years, and now that it is going to be opened there is not enough raw materials to keep it going like the textile mill. This is their problem. With their lack of proper foresight and planning they can't pay the G.D.R. You talk about Cuba trying to negotiate, have you paid them? You are paying them? We are glad to hear that. Dealing with the media, Cde. Benn said the national media must operate in the public interest. The President sometime ago said the media will be independent and will serve the people. Well, we say provide a nonpartisan board of management with guiding principles set out in the Constitution to build a socialist society. Let that be the guiding principle to see that a proper board is managing so that it doesn't become a P.N.C. organ. It is a P.N.C. organ today. Newsprint must be provided at landed cost not at 500 percent markup. Yes, ask Dr. Reid, he said I must not call him any more about this question. Provide Opposition access, in the same way as Government, to the state media. In Jamaica Workers' Parties are able to speak on the radio regularly. They can get time. Why can't we get time?

In education we are told of a three point plan to boost efficiency in the school system - that is in management of schools, in close monitoring of the education system and accountability. Cde. Speaker, we say let there be community management of each school. That is what the P.P.P. had in mind sometime ago. Let there be more money for education so as to stop the overcrowding and understaffing and let there be a school feeding programme. They say they have not retrenched anybody. They do not have to retrench anybody. They did that last year and because they know the T.U.C. and the P.S.U. will rebel they decided this year to raise taxation by \$48 million. In other words tax Peter to pay Paul and tax Paul too. That is what they decided to do this year. It is not generosity or a big heart that they have not retrenched but they know what are the political consequences of that. That is why they have avoided that. So far I close on this question of socialist democracy which Daly spoke about.

Today we heard from the Minister that the regional system is intended to bring local democracy. Well, whom are we fooling? Daly speaks about 1978, that from then on was ushered into this country socialist democracy. What are you weighing democracy with? Votes in the ballot box? Everybody knows, even you know, Cde. Speaker, that was rigged. Let us look realistically at 1964 and the 1978 Referendum, who was supporting the P.N.C. in 1964? The Chamber of Commerce, the churches, the big professional groups, the middle strata. In 1978 the churches had moved away from them, the middle strata doctors, lawyers, dentists, architects, all were opposing them. The Chamber of Commerce even opposed them. Where is the democracy? In 1964 they said the facts showed in that election they had 41 percent of the vote. How? By magic, when forces which were back-



ing them in 1964 were then opposed to them from 1978. How come they have socialist democracy? In what way? What magic? What legerdemain. Cde. Speaker, so far as local democracy is concerned we have had all this talk about the regional system going to produce results, putting Rice Boards, G.R.B.'s in each region. You had Rice Action Committees before. You had village councils before which were nearer to the people. All were rigged. How is the regional system going to do that? Let me give you one example.

Yes, the last example. Over on the West Coast a hospital was opened. Then it was closed to the people. Cde. Speaker, for the nurses hostel \$5,000 was required. They have not got that but they built an intercom system for \$15,000 so the chairman can communicate with the district office. That is their priority. That is why all the money they voted will go down the drain and people will not get anything. That is democracy for them. Help yourself. That is why this country has failed and will continue to fail until they come down to genuine democracy as we have been talking about, no corruption, no discrimination and correct planning strategies and so on. That is why we say if they want cooperation from the people they have to do what objectively is in the interest of the people of Guyana. Thank you.

## **Temporary Borrowing by Government (Amendment of Existing Laws and Validation) Bill: 21st July, 1983**

**Dr. Jagan:** Mr. Speaker, the Vice-President who is trying to get this Bill passed by this House gave us what appears to be a rational argument, largely legalistic about what exists in England, what exists in Canada and then he even added that in the period of the P.P.P. Government, size that is, that in the P.P.P.'s time, the Budget was within a limit; you got the figure he mentioned, but let us say less than \$200 million now it is \$1-1/2 billion, as he put it. That is not the question. The question is that in British time, in the P.P.P.'s time, there was proper administration of the finances of the country. Rules were set, the practice was to try to have first of all a balanced Budget and not to resort to deficit financing which has become a way of life of this Government. The big debate in Brazil as the time of Kubitschek, when he wanted to build Brasilia and make a big road right across the jungle, - was that the way to development was deficit financing, make money, create money, borrow. The Brazilian miracle has evaporated and now Brazil is very much in trouble, up to its neck in debt. There are riots in the streets now, right now and today all the unions have decided to go on a general strike because of the stringent new measures imposed by the I.M.F. which is leading to further burdens on the working people. So let us say very frankly this Government has not by and large, I am not saying in every detail, pursued any different policy except nationalization of the sugar and bauxite industries which has taken a form of state capitalism and bureaucratic parasitic capitalism, what has happened in Brazil has happened here and in so many other Third World countries. We hear about the new International Economic Order - good, we agree with that. Even the U.N. Secretary General recently said, warning Third World countries that they must not default on their debts.

I am trying to put things in a proper frame because this Government is borrowing and borrowing and borrowing and borrowing, and breaking the rules too and now trying to come and validate by this law. I am saying that is why the Secretary General of the United Nations said we must put our houses in order. We know that the I.M.F. agreement was signed by this Government since 1978. Again after they did not meet the targets, etcetera another agreement was signed. Even though conditions were relaxed, the I.M.F. gave them relaxed conditions themselves, Turkey and I believe South Korea - even those were not met. Is it because the I.M.F. is now putting mere stringent conditions which they call a "*recipe for riot*" that they are now seeking some other ways in which they can get some money. The I.M.F. conditions have to do with money areas, including how much money can be borrowed from the banking system, how much money should be circulating in the country. You have huge deficits Cde. Speaker, from 1976, which

have become chronic.

Last year, I am sorry I do not have the exact figures, but more or less the Budget deficit was \$303 million out of revenue of \$650 million. This country has reached one of the highest levels of taxation. The Government can go no more unless they want to grind the people in the dust. The expenditure last year was over \$900 million. I am talking about the current Budget. In other words, Cde. Speaker, the Budget deficit is huge and one of the things the I.M.F. tries to do in their financial management is to see that countries like these get out, to see that the Budget deficit becomes smaller. This is an important point. Mitterand, the other day, was castigating the American Government for having huge deficits thus high interest rates, which are causing an outflow of capital from all the countries to the United States. You have to deal with these questions to see it in a global perspective because Guyana is not isolated from the world. In the same way, they have high interest rates in America because of huge deficits caused by defence expenditure for the arms race. Also, there are deficits and inflation because of a big army and paramilitary and police force, and also because of squander mania. Put your house in order as the Secretary General said. Do not keep borrowing. Mr. Speaker, for many years you have been hearing me talking about infrastructure in this Parliament, long before they ever talked about this debt problem, what they now call the debt bomb. What I am saying is this is no answer. The Government wants to have production increased in the country. That is one way to solve the problem, but what is the reality. Last week I went to Berbice. In Berbice it is said that only 5 percent of the lands are prepared for this second rice crop. About 60,000 farmers mostly from the Berbice area are now planting rice in Surinam. They have left Guyana. What are you doing about those questions? What are you doing about bauxite production? They do not have their own reports. Every month millions of dollars are going down the drain. Bauxite workers are striking for food. Where is workers' control? Ask the Minister over there, where is the worker's control which he likes to talk about – a lot of theorizing but not putting it into practice.

Only this afternoon at a G.A.W.U. Secretariat meeting, we were talking about workers' control in GUYSUCO. Yes, sugar production. I am told by our Comrades in G.A.W.U., if they reach 250,000 tons this year they will be reaching plenty. When Gavin Kennard was Minister of Agriculture he said that they should have reached by now, or rather the target which he set a few years ago was 500,000 tons and now you are producing half.

[Cde. Hoyte: Why produce 500,000 tons?]

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, what are you going to produce for? Cuba produced more sugar this year than last year. Whatever they are selling at, the fact is that they are producing more. Half of their production gets a price of 35 cents per pound because they had made an agreement with the Soviet

Union when imperialism was squeezing them. Where are they? They have agreements and all of them are with the capitalist world. And then they come and tell us about external factors when they were the ones who tied this country hand and foot to the capitalist world. Cuba has been able not only to increase its sugar production despite all the low prices, but also to increase productivity. They have been able, without increasing unemployment, to reduce the labour force to one-third of what it was 10 years ago – in 1970 rather, and produce more sugar with only one-third of the labour force. Not, however, throwing the workers on the streets or scrap heap like they do here. They put them in other areas where the economy is expanding. This is reality.

We cannot get sugar in the shops, we cannot get rice, and what is sold now is like dog feed. If you go in the Caribbean, you will see rice, American rice all over the place. If you go to Barbados – I was there recently – you will see Guyana rice in a corner in a bag for the dogs. This is where you have got the country. Let us face facts. More borrowing and borrowing and borrowing, that is one of the reasons why we are in this trouble Cde. Speaker. Let us come back to the deficit. The chronic and deep deficit in the Budget; what causes it? What is it? Last year 73 percent of the current revenue went to pay debts and this year, from their own figures, it is estimated that 76 percent of the current revenue will be going to pay debts. This is an impossible situation they have got this country in to. You cannot get out of the financial mess by borrowing more and spending it in the same old way with the corruption, discrimination and the mal-administration. Every day the infrastructure for administration is breaking down. More people, skilled people even from their own ranks, are leaving.

Even if you have a capitalist economy you have to have good managers and you are not having that now. To borrow more money they want to manipulate the financial control system. It is not a question of limits, it is a question of trying to manipulate the system now – the financial control system. I repeat, it is the borrowing - \$127 million national debt in 1964 to about \$3-1/2 billion now which is the total debt of this country – and the lack of production which have got this country where it is today. And not only lack of production, but because of the falling prices in this particular period too. When prices were high, sugar prices were high at certain times, when bauxite prices were high; there was no question of markets. How is it that they lost these markets? It was the calcined field where they had a monopoly when Alcan was running the industry. Now they have lost it. Their own admission was mismanagement, etc. I hope that the Government, if they are really interested in this country, will get down to debate not only in this Parliament – nobody is here to listen – all those Comrades over there have to do is raise their hands when the time comes to vote. They have no choice unfortunately. Even if they agree with what I say they cannot signify agreement. Let us have a dialogue. Why don't we debate all these things on the radio, in the newspaper, so that the Guyanese people

will see the mess that this country is in? I do not know about these Comrades, but I hope they do. If not, I am prepared to give a lecture here any time and then invite them to listen. I am serious on this question. The crisis is too deep, there is now a vicious circle and you can't get out of it simply by borrowing. This only deepens the crisis. What is needed is basic democracy beginning from the grass roots and putting a lot of other things right. I repeat, this manipulation is not going to help, as so many other things are manipulated in this country. We asked the Government not to push through this thing but to reconsider. Let the Government agree that we put the issues to the people of this country not only from the floor of this Parliament, but in the street corners, the radio and the newspapers so that we can have a national dialogue. Let the people also indicate the direction in which this country should go.

## Importation of Food Items: 31<sup>st</sup> August, 1983

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, we heard a lot of irrelevancies a little while ago and no serious analysis and attempt was made to see where this Government has taken this country in a wrong direction and where and how to bring it out. The old platitudes, the old statements are regurgitated - an eight dollars increase to forty-three dollars for oil. What about the failure to implement hydroelectricity - the Tiger Hill project? What about scrapping the railway contrary to expert advice from United Nations Consultants - Smultaca. Independence he talks about. He wants to achieve Independence. Is it that the Americans will put them in power with the help of C.I.A. disturbances here? They told them to break off relations with Cuba and scrap the Tiger Hill project. Why is it that we do not have one project now? Do not belly ache all the time about how much we have to pay for oil. It is your doing. If there was an hydro electric scheme in this country, and if the railway was not removed we would not have been importing so much fuel into this country. That is a simple fact no matter how the price has gone up. No way, just listen to that. Your experts, when we nationalized the electricity company in 1960 recommended...

They keep regurgitating the same stupidity about oil. We all know the oil price has increased, but does Jamaica have a hydro scheme to develop it? Does Trinidad have it? At least Trinidad has oil. Does Barbados have it? They have a little bit of oil. If they have a foreign exchange problem it is because they were not so daft as this Government is to take orders from Uncle Sam and break off trade and aid deals including rice. They could have sold rice to Cuba and bought cement in exchange. Cuba's cement is the cheapest in the world. They have no cement here for building and construction.

I was in two quarries a few weeks ago. One of them has no dynamite to break up the stones. Instead of employing over 100 people, they now employ only 25. They have no material for the factory. They have no spare parts. Another quarry over the river has stone, but no market to sell it to. There is no building and construction because there is no cement. This is the reality where you have blundered and you keep telling us about the world and the oil and all that nonsense.

The other point I want to deal with is unfair terms of trade. Cde. Speaker, this has always been so, since history began and the history of colonialism was written. The fact is that here has been unequalled international trade where the industrialized imperialist countries produced manufactured goods, sold them at high prices, and bought agricultural and other raw materials at cheap prices. I could send them a book that I wrote on this question many many years ago. We were talking about unequalled international trade. What have they done to industrialize this country? How

many industries have we got? The global picture – Third World countries only have 7 percent of their total economy in industry and they are fighting by the end of the century to get 28 percent industrialization so they can have a balanced economy and not suffer from unequal industrialized industry. So why tell us about that? That is an old horse you are riding. The fact of the matter is what have you done to balance your economy? Where are the industries? 62 were listed at the back of the page of their Development Plan in 1966-1972. Let them look at and tell us how many you have built in this country, whether in the private or the public sector.

Unequal terms of trade. That has always been so. The Soviet Union is still buying wheat. President Carter applied a weapon, political reason, blockade them, don't sell them wheat. But they got the grain from Argentina. The same Ronald Reagan, who was telling the Europeans not to sell pipes for gas, he was forced to sell grain to the Soviet Union because the farmers were raising hell. That is not the main question. The main question that I want to make to him is that the Soviet got the gold and dollars to buy it. What dollars did they get? That is the main part. Why you do not have wheat?

Cde. Speaker, they are telling us of national ethos and we must eat what we produce and all that rationalization. Didn't they know about that when they built the flour mill here? Who built the flour mill? What has it come out of, rice flour? Rice you are milling there. Who bought it? For what purpose? For milling wheat into flour. Where was your ethos then? You did not know about that then? It is because they are bankrupting the country in terms of foreign exchange that they do not have money, unlike the Soviet union which has dollars in gold, in oil, which they export. A healthy economy. They can buy all the wheat they want. The imperialists, no matter how they try to use political blackmail, they cannot blackmail them. They have to go and beg them to buy the wheat. That is a reality of life. That is when you have real socialism, not like air sacks. Pseudo-socialists masquerading as socialism. Let us not hear that point again.

Self sufficiency. Eat what we produce. Cde. Speaker, all Third World countries are being forced to do that. It was the planning strategy of imperialism to force them to concentrate on agriculture. Industrialised countries have a 75-25 ratio. 75 in favour of industry and out of industry they have been able to subsidise agriculture from taxation, like the double pricing system, and to mechanise it because of the highly industrialized industry, taking advantage of science and technology. But what we do here? The man can't even find a cutlass. They can't even find a file. This is how we are going to arrive at self sufficiency. Self sufficiency and real independence don't only come from thinking of agriculture. That is what many Third World countries are trying to get out from.

Why are we in all this trouble. Let them try to admit. Let us have a real debate. We have a shortage of foreign exchange. Why? The fact is clear, how can they deny it? The points my colleague made are simple:

(i) There is not enough imported food. They have adopted the policy years ago, not now, even before the banning of wheat, of so called import substitution. Call it what name you want. It is the same policy but they have not succeeded. When they were talking some years ago of producing blackeye, of eating blackeye instead of split peas the same point came up. You could have sold the blackeye at a higher price in the world market and buy the peas at a lower market. What is wrong with that? The same point you were making, Cde. Speaker, about the rice, exporting the rice. You know why you can't export the rice because for one they are not producing enough. There are rice shortages right here. Rice production is going down steadily. One big man from outside who is looking at agriculture told me that if the present trend continues in five years time this country will be importing rice. I was in Bartica two weeks ago. In front of the G.N.T.C. store what did they have? A little sign: no sugar, no rice, no oil, no salt, etc. Going in the store what do you find? Little packets of curry powder and little packets of coffee, that is about all you get. Not distribution. Ask Cde. Corrica how many times I went to him. He will tell you.

We have the foreign exchange shortage. Lack of production. Falling production. Let them answer whether the figures given by my colleague are correct. As I told you they are likely to import rice in five years time.

Sugar production according to a statement made by their previous Minister and now consultant to the President, Gavin Kennard, we should be producing 500,00 tons of sugar. They will probably be producing half this year. Similarly we can talk about the bauxite production going down and down. That is point one.

(ii) Payments for oil and debts take up about 60 percent of our foreign exchange earnings. Around 40 for oil and 20 for debt and compensation payments. You will recall how many times we said in this House that they overpaid the imperialists. It was not Jagan who offered or the P.P.P. who went and told Bookers one dollar for compensation. It was Kennard and Sukdeo, the then blue-eyed boy. When they got a little pressure from imperialism they raised it to 102 million at 6 percent interest to be paid in 20 years, roughly 180 million dollars. When you changed the bauxite terms you did not consult us. You raised it when you got pressure from imperialism. Now that is why you don't have foreign exchange. That is why. That is another reason. I mentioned already the abandonment of the hydro scheme and the scrapping of the railway. We are importing more oil. That is what is eating up the foreign exchange. Mismanagement of foreign exchange. Squandermania, when they took away three hundred and something million from the sugar levy. They squandered it. Cars going like peas all over the place, roads to nonexistent places. About 600 million of heavy equipment. Foreign exchange. Read the Report. Read their Reports. Their own Report said it was better to use our foreign exchange instead of borrowing for development. They used foreign exchange that



they had in reserve. They said that here. Lack of brains, lack of foresight. They thought the sugar price and everything would continue forever. Foreign exchange – foreign service from \$4 million in 1972 to \$16½ million now. Cut it by half, we say, and buy some flour and some split peas. What are they doing outside, living like little Burnhams over there? That is all. I suppose they are practising self-sufficiency over there, growing pigeon peas.

Let me put it this way. We have a vicious circle now. They cannot get this country out of this mud they have sunk it in. Every year it is going down. You know the old story of the chicken and the egg, which one comes first. Similarly on the question of foreign exchange and production – lack of production means we do not export enough. If we do not export enough we do not get foreign exchange. If we do not get foreign exchange we would not have the raw materials. Forget the food at the moment. We cannot get the foreign exchange for raw materials for factories and spare parts, I am told. The match factory will close this month. Go in all the factories and ask them how many of them are working and at what capacity they are producing. Go around and make a survey. There is the lack of foreign exchange. If you do not have foreign exchange to buy spare parts, to buy machinery and what not, you are going to affect production and you will have a vicious circle. When that vicious circle gets going it will affect even local production as I told you at Bartica.

I just came from Wakenaam, Leguan. Go and see the road. I would like the Minister of Agriculture, you, Cde. Speaker, and myself to go and take a look at that road. Even tractors have a hard time passing through that road. There are not enough tractors, they are fifteen years old in this country. The combines are not enough. Right now in Wakenaam there is no bag in which to put the paddy after the man reaps it. If he manages to reap it, try to pass the road. That is how agriculture is going to develop according to these people. This is a lot of talk. That is the vicious circle we are in.

Let us face facts. People are alienated. I know they know that term. Some of them are Marxists over there. They claim to be anyway. Alienation is developing daily because the ordinary man cannot live. The T.U.C. Reports have given these figures over and over, especially last year. In February last year the T.U.C. said the working man was earning \$270 a month and spending \$654. In July they put out another Report and said the standard of living in one year and a half from January 1981 to the middle of last year, declined 24 percent. They recommended then a wage of \$29.70. It was then \$12.71. It remains at \$12.71 in spite of the increase in cost of living. We have reached the stage not where the worker cannot even get the split peas and the flour, but where he cannot even afford to buy the local things. What is the Vice-President talking about, that if we stop importing wheat then production will go up?

Do you know what the cost of production is? One man told me he had to hustle all over the place to get a cutlass and when he got it it was \$25.00. If devaluation comes, how much will the cassava and the plantain be sell-

ing for in the market? Their newspaper, the *New Nation* said the I.M.F. terms are a recipe to riot. They should be happy to see some flour and some split peas coming in to solve the problems. It does not mean that if flour comes in and split peas come in we would not have any markets in the Caribbean. In the P.P.P. time we used to sell rice to Cuba and we produced surplus to the West Indian requirements. We used to export beef. One time Trinidad stopped it because of the hoof and mouth disease. We got that settled. We used to export plantains and pumpkins to the Caribbean. You have an open market there but they cannot produce the stuff.

Why tell us to eat what we produce. I mean it is nonsensical. It is not only nonsensical, but no country in the world is completely self-sufficient. Even developed socialist countries buy and have foreign trade with the capitalist world. No country – except you are going to live like Haiti, a simple backward subsistence economy where you are just tilling the soil a little and growing a few things. That is what it is going to come to here because there are no machines, no fertilizers, no bags. So the man will grow a few acres, by hand he will cut and just eat. That is what they are calling self-sufficient, a subsistence economy. That is what he is talking about. Why doesn't the Government be honest and admit that this country is sinking daily. Do not come with a lot of irrelevancies. That one speaking over there is now made the Chairman of the Rice Marketing Board. You know what the I.F.A.D. Report said? It said the farmer is getting less than half of the price they get in the West Indies. It is because of people like him, drawing big salaries and allowances and so on in that over-bloated bureaucracy. That is why the rice farmers are leaving the country. Soon we are going to import rice. Correct those things. They are going to import farmers soon, they tried that once.

Let me just clearly enumerate because they keep talking of foreign influences, buying dear and selling cheap and so on.

(1) Wrong planning strategy.

You know how many times I talked about planning strategy in this Assembly, since 1966.

(2) Lack of emphasis on industry and agriculture.

The same thing they are belly-aching about now, the Mahaica-Mahaicony-Abary Project, the first phase was to start in 1965. Ask Steve Naraine. He drafted the plan for \$32 million. How many millions now? Whether it will be economical now is a second question. Then it was economical. He gave the figures when he brought the plan to me. I asked him to tell me how soon we can pay back this money if we got somebody to finance it. He worked out the feasibility and said 17 years. I said yes, we can go to somebody and sell them the project because if it is 20 years they

will see the project will pay for itself out of profits. What happened? The C.I.A. put them in power and at that time Uncle Sam had the Soil Bank Scheme. Uncle Sam was not interested in agriculture developing Guyana, plus their own propaganda. The P.P.P. Government was the rice Government and the drainage and irrigation Government. So they abandoned all of that. That is what you are reaping now, the harvest. These are the realities, where you are in the mud not only because of external factors. No hydroelectric scheme, the scrapping of the railway, right now discrimination in food production and spare parts. This is well known. They cannot manage anything and they have not instituted workers' control and farmers' control in the Rice Board, for instance, where you have the farmers running the Board. Bauxite industry, sugar industry. Where is the workers' control? The same type of bureaucratic management under private free enterprise capitalism we have now under state capitalism and bureaucratic capitalism, parasitic capitalism, that is what we have now. Then squandermania, I mentioned that already. Now Cde. Chairman, the Vice-President said why are we not offering constructive proposals. May I remind him that in 1975, when we offered critical support, when we showed our patriotic duty to this country, when they were faced with imperialist and fascist destabilization we told them: one – do not build a big army, build a big People's Militia. The army, the police and everything now, in 1970 it was costing 15 million, now it costs 130 million including a lot of guns to keep them in power. Guns and ammunition which should be buying food they are buying it to keep themselves in power.

Cde. Chairman, we made other constructive proposals – President Burnham and I was standing together at Enmore Martyr's Day in 1976 – one of the few opportunities I can get on the radio, so I took the opportunity and I said good for you and I to reappear on the May Day and tell the imperialists and fascists that if they come to Guyana they will meet a united people, but if the economy goes down you will have pressure from imperialism and the little independence you have, by nationalization will be bartered away as we see now.

I proposed seventeen points – how many times haven't I referred to that, they say we do not make proposals, I made it then, seventeen points. I said if those seventeen points are not implemented this country will get into serious problems and here it is. It is not that we are not making proposals, that was in 1976, then in the talks we had with them, we talked about a political solution because we knew from the 1971 experience when we gave support in this House, parliamentary support to nationalize the bauxite so they can buy on credit.

Just five minutes more Cde. Chairman. This is serious because we are making proposals now. He said we do not make proposals. I have to remind them. We put those proposals and then we had talks with them and the talks were aimed at a political solution in the country. We made the point that the economic and social crisis cannot be solved without a politi-

cal solution. They were not interested in that because having agreed to pay Bookers 102 million dollars when the heat was off, they were not interested and that time they had the sugar levy, plenty money. They were not interested any more in any kind of solution to this country's problems and so eventually talks were abandoned when in 1976 in December they started removing subsidies. The first one was on stock feed, that is why chicken and eggs are where they are today. That is why Cde. Speaker, so what do we do now? Yes, we are concerned; they signed the I.M.F. Agreement in 1978. They had a Soviet offer; Burnham went to Soviet Union in April before he signed the agreement. He had unlimited credits at low interests – six percent. He had a deal to put the bauxite industry straight and to buy bauxite. He had an offer to develop the Gold Mining Industry. They have a lot of experience that is how they are buying wheat. When I was Premier they told us there is oil here, they could have helped us find it by now if they had not taken orders from Uncle Sam and kept the socialist countries away and bring them private oil companies here – imperialist companies and whether they find oil or not you will never know. Today they find it, tomorrow they close it down. Anyway they did not accept our call for a National Patriotic Front, they abandoned the generous offer from the socialist countries to sign the I.M.F. Agreement. That was going to be the solution. They defended in 1978 the I.M.F., now even they have come around to saying it is the I.M.F.'s fault.

The solution is to stop the discrimination, to stop the squandermania.

In our Central Committee Report at the last congress, we have listed all the cuts which can be made judiciously without affecting the efficiency of the service, where you can save fifty to sixty million dollars.

We have dealt with the question of the foreign debt. Above all we have said you have to sit down and decide on the question of democracy and a political solution in this country. Lenin always said you cannot build socialism with democracy. The foundation has not been laid here for socialism and this is one of the reasons why we are going down. Right now they are beating their breast at this congress to no doubt influence all the foreign delegates – beating their breast.

Imperialism – Reagan is destabilizing us because we are socialist, we are building socialism. They do not want a socialist course. Let us put the records straight. What does imperialism want and what is it doing? Yes, some pressure – for what – to move from state capitalism, bureaucratic capitalism, cooperative capitalism and parasitic capitalism, that last one is even worse than all.

## Invasion of Grenada: 28<sup>th</sup> October, 1983

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, as one who represents a Party which was subject to imperialist aggression both directly in the 1950s and indirectly in the 1960s I wish to register our strongest condemnation for the brutal, dastardly, despicable act of intervention by US imperialism and its lackeys in the Caribbean. This is a case of a vulture-eagle descending on a peaceful dove in a calculated move to snuff out its life. It is a case of a bully using superior force to crush a small heroic people. What is even more distasteful is the connivance and complicity of the regional hawks with the fiendish eagle. It is a dark and shameful day in the history of the Caribbean people. The treacherous position taken by Jamaica, Barbados, St. Vincent, St. Lucia, Dominica, and Antigua, is reminiscent of the sordid role played by the Caribbean political leadership in 1953 when British imperialism, acting through the Churchill Government, landed troops, suspended the constitution and forcibly removed the P.P.P. from the Government. The sordid role of the Caribbean Leaders gave the hawks in Washington the pretext for their criminal gunboat action. These puppets in the Caribbean are looking for crumbs from Reagan's Caribbean Basin Initiative. Right now Washington is going through the Caribbean carrying out bilateral discussions, hoping to get these puppets one by one to sell their souls for a mess of pottage. This is what is happening right now. They want to be designated as the Uncle Toms of the Caribbean – Uncle Toms – tied to Uncle Sam. What a disgrace!

The fascist-minded in the Pentagon and their minions in the Caribbean prattle on about democracy and the rule of law while they flagrantly violate international law and the Charter of the United Nations, and President Reagan has used the threadbare excuse of moving in to protect the lives of Americans in Grenada.

Crocodile tears are also shed about Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and some of his colleagues. What utter hypocrisy! We all remember it was not too long ago when Reagan and his warriors in Washington were aiming missiles at Maurice Bishop and his colleagues. They insulted him. When Maurice Bishop went recently to Washington, Reagan refused to have talks with him and now he is shedding crocodile tears. Since when are the hawks in Washington concerned with human lives? Since when? From the days of the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, and more particularly from the Roosevelt Corollary of 1904, the US ruling class has resorted to plunder, destruction, rape and murder all around the globe. What we are seeing is nothing new. Have we forgotten the Mai Lais and napalm and the saturation bombing of Vietnam and Cambodia? And who it was but the C.I.A. and its minion Pinochet who slaughtered the great Chilean patriot, Salvador Allende?

When President Ford was asked, "*Under what international law do we have*

a right to attempt to destabilize a constitutionally elected Government of another county?" he replied, "I am not going to pass judgment on whether it is permitted or authorised under international law. It is a recognised fact that historically as well as presently such actions are taken in the best interest of the countries involved." Sheer hypocrisy then to talk about democracy and freedom, and that they are moving to Grenada to protect lives and the rule of law. These criminals! "Best interest" under the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 meant "*securing America for Americans.*" That was the quotation used then. The Americans posing as defenders of the countries of the South against armed intervention from the outside, Europe particularly, and preparing the way for future US expansionism. That was declaration of intent to keep our hemisphere as their preserve, as their backyard, as their lakes.

More recently the Truman doctrine of 1947 and the Caracas Declaration of 1954 gave the Monroe Doctrine a new content, from an extra-hemispheric power in Europe, threatening our hemisphere to a foreign ideology of Marxism/Leninism. In his crusade against communism and national and social liberation, President Truman stated that Governments which conducted planned economies and controlled foreign trade were dangers to freedom; that freedom of speech and worship were dependent on the free enterprise system; that controlled economies were both not the American way and not the way to peace. He argued that the whole world should adopt the American system and that the American system could survive in America only if it became a world system.

And so the Americans set about on a warpath to sell their criminal imperialist system to make it a world system, and anybody who did not go along must come under their "*big stick.*" The Monroe Doctrine and the Roosevelt "*big stick*" were resurrected all over again. The Caracas Declaration of 1954 provided the political justification for the US sharks swallowing the Central American sardine, Guatemala, for the C.I.A. overthrowing the democratically-elected Arbenz Government.

They are talking about elections and democracy. They threw it out – the Arbenz Government with C.I.A. intervention and the training of Guatemalan "*worms*" in the jungles of Nicaragua under the butcher Somoza, and then getting them to invade Guatemala. Just before the invasion, the imperialist gathered their lackeys in Caracas, then in the O.A.S. and got them to pass a declaration and this is what it stated:

*"The domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by an international communist movement extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extra-continental power would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties."*

By "*existing treaties,*" they meant bilateral treaties under the Rio Treaty

in the case of our hemisphere, which together with N.A.T.O., the Baghdad Pact later called C.E.N.T.O., and S.E.A.T.O. were intended to create an iron ring of military bases all over the world to contain not only communism but national and social liberation. That was the mission. All the puppets decreed to brand the Arbenz Government as communist, as the British Churchill Government had branded the P.P.P. Government in 1953, and therefore to justify intervention, whether direct or indirect. Yes, "*best interest*" meant direct and indirect attacks to protect the interest of Bookers and the ALCAN/ALCOA monopolies in Guyana and the United Fruit monopoly in Guatemala.

The Prime Minister told us about US interests in South Africa, but they are also very big in this hemisphere. "*Best interest*" also meant the C.I.A. engineered invasion of Cuba in 1961 to protect US investments. Cuba was the pearl of the Antilles so far as the US imperialists were concerned.

In 1965, like Reagan, President Johnson had sent troops to the Dominican Republic ostensibly, to quote from what he told the Congress, "*to save the lives of our citizens and to save the lives of all people.*" But, again, imperialist interests were at the root of a massive invasion with 42,000 troops. The doctrine of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Oliver Lyttleton, in the case of the 1953 use of force in Guyana, which stated that Her Majesty's Government "*is not willing to allow a communist state to be organised within the British Commonwealth*" became the basis of the Johnson doctrine which stated:

*"The American nations cannot, must not and will not permit the establishment of another communist Government in the Western hemisphere."*

This was the basis, too, for the C.I.A. intervention in Guyana in the 1960s. There should be no more Cubas in this hemisphere.

We are glad to see that the Guyana Government has taken a very firm position on this issue. Let us hope they will remain consistent. Had they spoken in the same strong way that they are speaking today perhaps we would not have had a Grenada. They were a little silent when the C.I.A. invaded Cuba, and they justified the massive intervention of the Dominican Republic. When the President, the then Prime Minister, visited President Johnson in the USA in 1968 and went horse-riding with him in Texas, he declared that he now understood why the Americans had intervened in Dominica. Anyway, let us hope that those days are gone. But we will just put that in for the record.

The "*best interest*" of the United States under President Ford became the "*vital interest*" under President Carter. These vital interests were spelt out by Abelardo Valdez, the then U.S.A.I.D. Assistant Administrator. In a speech in 1979 to the United States House Foreign Affairs Committee, he said that Caribbean and Latin American countries were purchasing \$20 billion (US) worth of exports, that United States investment in this area exceeded \$27



billion or represented 82 percent of all their investment worldwide, and they were making a profit of \$4 billion per year on those investments. This does not include many other things which come up to nearly \$20 billion per year. That is their stake. And President Reagan, when he addressed the O.A.S. last year, said the Caribbean Region is a vital, strategic and commercial artery for the United States. Nearly half the US trade, two-thirds of her imported oil and over half of her imported strategic mineral pass through the Panama Canal and the Gulf of Mexico.

Then there is bauxite. Caribbean bauxite provides nearly three-quarters of the raw material for the American aluminium industry, but the region gets only a fraction of the total income of this integrated industry. Yes, this is how they plunder our resources and they hypocritically talk about freedom and democracy. I had to tell somebody the other day these facts when they were saying: let the "*white man*" come back, let the imperialists come back.

I told them that when I was Minister of Trade, I had summoned Reynolds Bauxite Mines and asked them (they held 1/4 million acres of land which they were getting for exploration through annual Exploration Licences) to better talk "*turkey*" or they were not going to get any more licences. For ten years they had operated in Guyana without paying one cent in tax. I said: which company in the world would operate in a country for ten years, consistently losing money and still staying there? They were cooking the books. They were selling to themselves cheap and buying from themselves as the imperialist always do. They bought four tons of bauxite from us for \$60 to make one ton of aluminium and we bought it back from them for \$1,500. This is imperialism and I hope that those on the other side, the Government, will take heed of all these facts and take a firm position along with this side of the Assembly. I do not mean the little side at the back (The United Force). They are not here and I can understand why they are not here conveniently. The Government must take a firm position because this is a time for decisions; this is a time to say which side you are on.

With the fall of the butcher Somoza of Nicaragua, the lunatic dictator, Gary of Grenada and the Shah of Iran, then the second largest exporter of oil, along with Afghanistan, the Kampuchean Pol Pot regime and the African Portuguese colonies, there was a decisive shift of the balance of forces against imperialism. And in their own backyard, with the liberation of Grenada and Nicaragua, they became hysterical and began to move.

President Carter in the last period of his four-year rule reactivated the cold war and created the Rapid Deployment Forces. A Caribbean Joint Task Force was stationed at Key West, Florida in the United States, and military exercises, surveillance and intelligence activities were stepped up to cope with the volatile Caribbean, deemed by the United States Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, as the world's fourth trouble spot. The attentive "*big brother*" policies with smiles, tri-lateralist aid, reformism had more subtle methods of control, and gave way to "*gunboat diplomacy*."



The People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada was subjected to pressure even by Carter. Former U.S. Secretary Frank Ortiz told Prime Minister Maurice Bishop that the United States would view with displeasure any tendency on the part of Grenada to develop closer ties with Cuba.

The USA was daring to dictate to a sovereign Government, a sovereign territory, what their foreign policy must be, who must be their friends and who must not be their friends. Various attempts were then made to intimidate, isolate and harass Grenada, and even to assassinate the principal leader of the People's Revolutionary Government. We remember the explosion which nearly killed Maurice Bishop and others. At one point President Carter said:

*"We were seriously considered blockading Grenada after the Government of Maurice Bishop began moving conspicuously closer to Cuba."*

That quotation is from a Magazine called *South*, an English magazine dealing with the "Third World." It was written by a West Indian named George Manning. Dr. Richard Feinberg, State Department specialist on Latin American Affairs, visited Barbados in 1979 and declared that if United States vital interests were threatened, the use of military force would become an option. Why is it now threatened? Why has it become an option now? It has become an option now because of internal division. Whenever there are internal divisions, as in 1953 in Guyana and now in 1983 in Grenada, Imperialism uses that as a stepping stone.

More than that. The Caribbean is in a state of turmoil. The group of "wise men," whom they appointed recently to look into the economy, said something has got to be done. Unemployment is around 30 percent and more in some places, and if nothing is done, we will soon find 40 and more percent of the young people roaming the streets without having anything to do. Why are these states in turmoil? Because of the neo-colonialist and colonialist policies they are pursuing, and the economic planning strategies dictated by imperialism – the Puerto Rican model, the partnership model, etc. Because of that, their countries can't solve the problems of the people. Meanwhile, Grenada under the P.R.G. was solving problems and becoming an inspiration to the people of the Caribbean. Therefore, snuff out that revolutionary outpost in the Caribbean so it will not be an inspiration, a guide, a hope for the long-suffering Caribbean peoples who have been betrayed by the puppet leaders for so long. This is why they have to move in, not to allow Grenada to become stabilized, not to allow it to become an example as Cuba has become to Latin America.

Cde. Deputy Speaker, the Reagan Administration deemed President Carter's policy soft, although Carter reactivated the cold war. It was said that he was too soft that he allowed the Panama Canal to go out of America's hands by the end of this century through the signing of the Carter Torrijos treaty; that he allowed Khomeini to get away with the Iran revolu-

tion and to humiliate America by taking American hostages. So Reagan said no more of this. Stop. We must now show our friends that we intend to stand by them and we intend to move to stamp out any more Cubas, any more Nicaraguas, any more Irans. So the bloody battle has started. They flex their muscles, build more weapons, MX missiles, neutron bombs, Cruise and Pershing missiles in Europe. Now they threaten the whole world with another war, use Lebanon and Israel as a base to attack Middle East Arab countries, progressive revolutionary countries in the Middle East; use South Africa and some of their puppets in that region to hit at front-line states and other revolutionary democratic countries in Africa; and do the same thing in the Caribbean.

Well, this has now come to the point where it is quite clear what was the intention, a rightist offensive (military, economic, ideological, cultural and political), the main objective of which is to halt, if not reverse, as now in Grenada, the revolutionary process; to re-colonise the region with the Puerto Rican model and maintain the economies of the countries in a dependent status to the USA; to create a more congenial climate for the US transnational corporations; and to propagate the American way of life. This is Reaganism. As I said, it is a sad day for the Caribbean, not only because of the fascist like methods used by the Reagan administration but also because those who claim to stand and speak for the Caribbean peoples are selling out their birthright. They attacked Grenada. They attacked Surinam. The C.I.A. is moving in there. They are now threatening Nicaragua and butchering people in El Salvador and Guatemala. Over a hundred get killed every week by the right wing death squads. This is how they are teaching the people democracy in the Caribbean. But the American people, fortunately, American senators like Christopher Dodd and others are resisting the policy. The American people do not want any more Vietnams.

What are the hawks therefore thinking? That they have to reverse the so-called Vietnam Syndrome. People say they do not want to go and die, get maimed and get killed in other countries. For what? Therefore, they are opposed to going, whether in El Salvador or Grenada. Anywhere. Consequently, the hawks in Washington want to give the American people another message. We do not have to die. We do not have to lose. We will win. Therefore, go in quickly with massive force, score a victory. Then the American people will have the message – we do not have to lose like Vietnam, we can win. Thus the prelude for intervention in Nicaragua, intervention in Surinam, intervention in Cuba. This is what is behind the mentality of the Reaganites. Change the Vietnam Syndrome, change the mentality of the American people. It is in this context we have to see the tragedy in Grenada, a tragedy compounded by the so called leaders of the people. What then are our tasks? We have, first of all, to see that the gains which have been made by mankind from the very beginning when the Russian revolution was started in 1917 are preserved, and that we do not have a thermonuclear war which will mean annihilation of mankind and of civilization

as we know it. Therefore, we must make in Guyana the cause of world peace and disarmament our cause.

We must come out and shout as millions of people in Europe and North America are shouting against the stationing of missiles in Europe. They are not being put there for defensive purposes. Grenada is small fry. Their main enemy is the Soviet Union, the bastion of socialism and they would like to have a first strike, first strike with Cruise and Pershing missiles stationed in Europe, which can hit and knock out the Soviet Union in six minutes, with the Soviet Union not being able to hit back at the USA with their inter-continental missiles which will take at least twenty minutes. This is the strategy of the hawks in Washington and their puppets in Europe, Thatcher and all of them who want to site the missiles in Europe. Therefore, let us remember that the battle in Europe, the battle to save world socialism is integrally related to the battle to save Grenada. World peace must be something we must be shouting about right here in Guyana.

On that we have no difference. Let us have a chance to go on the radio, so far refused, and talk about it.

We must call for the withdrawal of all troops from Grenada. We are glad to see the vote in the United Nations where US imperialism was isolated. Even their friends did not vote for them. This is a good sign. When Britain, Israel and France invaded Egypt in 1956, 62 nations in the United Nations got together and opposed the intervention. The Soviets came to the side of Egypt and the British had to withdraw and Anthony Eden was forced to resign as Prime Minister. Let us hope that world public opinion will be so aroused that that man in the White House will be removed because he is endangering not only the lives of the American people but the peoples all over the world.

[Applause]

**Dr. Jagan:** Those troops must be withdrawn and let us get the West Indian people to march as we are marching in this country, not only against the Americans but also against their own puppets so that we can have a new deal in the Caribbean. We must give every possible help not only to Grenada but to Nicaragua, El Salvador and Surinam, these are in the front line. We know what is happening in those countries. We must struggle for the transformation of the puppet O.E.C.S. and CARICOM into a genuine integration movement, at least as anti-imperialist as the Andean Pact which was started on the initiative of Salvador Allende and the revolutionary democratic Government of Peru under President Velasco Alvarado, and for the adoption of an independent position like the Contadora group made up of Venezuela, Columbia, Panama and Mexico. These people, so-called leaders in the Caribbean, have disgraced us. Imagine Venezuela, Columbia, Mexico and Panama, standing up against US imperialism in Central America and our puppets welcoming imperialism to attack Grenada.

I am ashamed of these yard fowls. Why can't they behave like men, like the Contadora group? Those countries are not flaming radicals, they are not flaming revolutionaries. Yet, they are taking a sensible position, no to intervention. We cannot go about the world. Our head is low at the moment because of that behaviour, we have to bring that to an end. Here, at home, we must break with the imperialist I.M.F. We warned about the I.M.F. in 1978. They are still hovering around the corners. It is no use talking only of intervention with arms against Grenada.

Equally dangerous, and perhaps more dangerous, are the more subtle methods of penetration through the I.M.F., which wants the country to change course for the grant of a few dollars. We must break with the pro-imperialist I.M.F. We know that parallels are being drawn now in Guyana with Grenada. Imperialism is hitting Grenada because it was socialist – oriented and Guyana because it is socialist: this is the claim of the P.N.C. But let us call a spade a spade. Let us deal with things scientifically, not in rhetoric. Reagan is applying pressure to Guyana but not for the same reason that pressure and military intervention took place in Grenada. Nobody could doubt where the Bishop Government, the P.R.G., stood in domestic and foreign policy. There was no inconsistency about it. What was said and what was practised was the same. Here we have rhetoric. What is said is not, however, what is put in practice, and so we would like to put the thing how we see it, how the Guyanese can see it, too, and judge. What is existing here and against which pressure is exerted is not socialism.

It is state, bureaucratic, cooperative and parasitic capitalism, a form of capitalism which US imperialism is opposed to. Why, because one-time strong friends of US imperialism in every possible way have been displaced. I mean the United Force (U.F.) and all the business elements who were backing them. They were displaced politically, and were taken out of Government in 1968. But they were taken also out of their business positions, especially in trading in favour of the state-operated import/export trade, and state and P.N.C. dominated wholesale and retail trade under the highfalutin name of K.S.I., Knowledge Sharing Institute and some private new friends of the P.N.C. after those. So imperialism is angry. The P.N.C. was their second friend; the U.F. was their first friend. They are angry because firstly you displaced the U.F. politically, economically. Secondly, your special brand of capitalism cannot provide them with the political stability that they need. You revised the Sophia Declaration under pressure and brought in the New Investment Code to allow the imperialists to come in. But the imperialists do not want to come into any country which is faced with political instability and riots around the corner as you yourself said when you pointed out that the new I.M.F. proposals were a recipe to riot. They do not want that. Therefore, they are pressuring you not because you are socialist but because your type of capitalism cannot "*produce the goods.*" They are pressuring you to go to free enterprise, dependent capitalism, which is tied to the advanced capitalism of North America, which has a

distorted underdeveloped base like Venezuela, as an example, with 85 per cent of its income based on one product, oil and with oil employing only one percent of the total population – Venezuela which used to be a producer of its own food now having to import practically all its food, a classic example of dependency. Now in Venezuela, with the drop in the price of oil, they are in as much trouble as Guyana.

Not only Venezuela but also Mexico, Argentina, Chile, Brazil, the most “developed” of these dependent, capitalist Latin American countries, are in the most trouble. That is where the Reagan administration wants to push the P.N.C. Government. We are against that, the P.P.P. is against that because that road has no future. Look around in Latin America, look around in the Caribbean. It is that which caused guerilla warfare in Cuba under Batista, which caused guerilla warfare under Somoza, and which is now causing guerilla warfare in El Salvador and Guatemala.

That dependant capitalism is not the answer for Guyana. The answer for Guyana is socialist orientation, a socialist oriented path which Maurice Bishop and his Government was pursuing, for which they were attacked, for which they were slaughtered recently with the invasion. Therefore, we repeat, break with the I.M.F. Grapple seriously with the internal situation because if this continues to slide as it is sliding downwards, no matter what you say Guyana will drop into the lap of imperialism.

Therefore, find a political solution to the grave economic social and political crisis.

We are not faced with a crisis only because of the world capitalist crisis, there is also the internal political situation with lack of democracy and so many other things. And at the same time, we must strengthen our relations – economic, political, cultural – with the socialist community, with the revolutionary democratic states.

This is the only way forward. Of course, there are risk in these things. But what is the other way? Submit on the basis of geographical fatalism that Uncle Sam is too strong; therefore, all of us have to bow. If we do that it is a dead end road. Latin American countries are facing us squarely in the face. There is no future in their dependency model.

Political differences, as I said in 1953 in British Guiana and similar differences in Grenada in 1983, opened the way for intervention by imperialism. Imperialism must not be allowed to meddle in our affairs. Down with US imperialism, down with the puppets of imperialism.

Forward ever, backward never!

## Sympathy on Death of Cde. W.O.R. Kendall, C.C.H.: 8<sup>th</sup> December, 1983

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, I wish on behalf of the P.P.P. to join with the Vice-President in expressing our sorrow at the death of Rudy Kendall. As the Vice-President pointed out, he had a long record of service especially in this Parliament. I remember him from the early days of my political career when we sat in his Chamber. We did not agree, generally speaking, because we were on opposite sides of the ideological national spectrum.

However, one thing that can be said about him is that he was a man who had close links with the people. One must not confuse this, however, in my view, with fighting for these people, but he did have that kind of nature that his links with the people were very close, so much so that when he won the New Amsterdam seat, one could ascribe this not to victory of the party to which he belonged but victory on the basis of his own personality, his own way of going about things. I think we used to call him sometimes "*The Tzar of New Amsterdam.*"

However, I would like to say, as I pointed out already, that although we did not share the same views and on many occasions we sharply criticized each other, nevertheless I can say that Rudy Kendall had an affable personality and did not get angry. He always displayed a friendly spirit. I think that was a good side which we all respected, and consequently I am sure we all will miss him because of that. We wish to take this opportunity to express our sympathy and to convey that sympathy to members of his family.

## Municipal and District Councils (Amendment) Bill: 12<sup>th</sup> December, 1983

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, it is a truism that democracy is synonymous with development. What we are dealing with here is not just a quantitative question. How long must a person serve, whether it is three years or five years? What we have to deal with is a question of quality, content. We did not hear anything about that.

Only a few days ago we had a talk with the Prime Minister and this matter came up. People are fundamental. We can talk about plans; we can talk about inputs; we can talk about a lot of factors. I reminded the Prime Minister that when Professor Arthur Lewis was brought here as Economic Adviser he put forward a thesis that what Third World countries needed was good managers and if you have good managers, coupled with money, then the problem is solved. Well, we had good managers. Unfortunately many with skills are leaving the country. We had plenty of money, so much so that the money has become a burden. 76 percent of the moneys collected from the people of the country has to be allocated to pay debts. The money has become a burden. So it is not for want of money, for want of expertise. Go back and see how many experts have come to this country, how many reports have been written and yet the country keeps going on a downward spiral. Look at our production figures, be it rice, be it sugar, be it anything. This has to do not only with the question of external factors, the general world crisis of capitalism. It has to do with human beings and how you deal with them. That is why Lenin said that you cannot build socialism without democracy.

This Government gives the impression here and abroad that we have a democratic structure. I remember going to the Kuru Kuru College some time ago and I heard the principal extolling the virtues of the Constitution how it was set up as a democratic structure in the country. I was reading the *New Nation* today and I saw an article dealing with the People's Power in Cuba. The article claimed that for the second time this year the People's Power has gone before the electorate in Cuba to render account for their actions. This procedure allows the people to closely question the delegates on the progress of work done and not done by them. The national ceremony to mark the year's second session was attended by 14,025 voters representing some 92 percent of the local electorate. This article was in *New Nation* 11<sup>th</sup> December. When I was at Kuru Kuru College, as the principal was speaking, I reminded him of Cuba. I told him that our structure was the same as Cuba and I reminded him of the fundamental differences, that is, at the grass root level and the district and municipal level. Not only Communist Party Members can stand, but any person can stand and his whole history has to be put. Not just emotionalism and who can promise more and who can give something, like we saw in the high powered elec-



tion campaign which the Americans mounted in Jamaica for Seaga and for Hudson Phillips in Trinidad and Tobago, but a biography of the candidate so people can intelligently see what the man's qualifications are for the post, what he has done, how he has served and the, his experience with the person at the grass roots, elect him. He is elected, Cde. Chairman. He has to report back to the people. That is what we are talking about here. The people have a right to recall him.

I remember one of the first things I talked about in this Parliament when I was elected in 1947 was the democratic provision of the recalled. What have we got? Recalled! No, extend. Cde. Speaker, this matter of Local Government – my Comrade who spoke mentioned the fact that elections were last held in June 1970 for six Municipal and district Council areas. Because of manipulation and other things even where the P.P.P. had traditionally won General elections, the P.P.P. lost. Leguan is an example, and so that the P.P.P. decided to boycott the election – the remaining elections which were held in December. So the P.N.C. controls every single Authority and District Municipality in this country. Let me say that when we had talks with the P.N.C. in 1976, the matter of Local Government elections came up. That was one of the issues. Because then we were concerned as we are concerned today, with economy, with production. Who can deny that the position today is a thousand times worse than it was then. But then we saw the handwriting on the wall and we said one of the questions you must solve is the question of democracy, the question of the people's involvement. That was in 1976. We were told to defer the elections of 1978 so we can have a new Constitution to give the people jobs, medicine, food and everything and where are we now? Tell us. Okay, we are not saying do not eat rice flour, but the nutritionists say we must have a balanced diet. I attended a meeting over the weekend. For two days rice and fish, rice and fish, fish and rice. You could not even get chicken to buy even if you wanted to.

Cde. Speaker, let the comrades on the Government side realize that we are in a serious situation. You are not starving, but the people are starving. Read the nutritional report from the group of doctors. He would not read them because he cannot do anything about them. They said that the administration do not care and the Minister least of all. They cannot do anything about it, so he keeps mouthing the same old thing, there is no real malnutrition in this country. Well this is contrary to all facts. Cde. Chairman, I do not want to hold a debate with him on this point. Let us face the facts; the country is in a serious position.

I understand that the International Monetary Fund is not willing to sign even at this stage what they were prepared to sign last year. The terms they gave you which they said were a recipe to riot. Even the I.M.F. is now saying as I understand it that they have no money. That is true to a certain degree. They have no money despite the fact that more money was voted for them by Reagan. \$8.7 billion, they have been looking around for some



money elsewhere. But the demands are so great that they now tell the...so I understand, they have not told me this. That is Guyana for us. So if you cannot get it even from the traditional sources where are you going to get it from?

I did it from a principled position. When they go to the International Monetary Fund it is not for a solution. They had an alternative but they rejected it. This country is only looking for help from outside. You either go to one side or the other side. The answer is to solve the problem internally then mobilize people. The Chairman, of Guymine, Pat Thompson said that the morale of the people of this country is very low. He was one of your blue-eyed boys. You had him a while ago at the United Nations but he left you and disappeared.

There are many things to be corrected. The comrades must not only think of just staying in power because if that is the only consideration clearly then we are not going to get out of this mess. It is going to plunge deeper and deeper, more and more people will be going away. That is not the answer, that is not what we want for our Guyanese citizens. This is a rich country. Unfortunately, it is not possible to mobilize the actual wealth of this country. The *New Nation* says we must own and control the natural resources. Yes, you can own and control but as Lenin pointed out if you want to do what you claim you want to build a socialist society you must have democracy. This Bill is not intended to do that, it is not going to contribute to the well being of the people of this country and solve the very grave and serious problems that we now face. All of us face it. It is no use digging our heads in the sand and saying there are no shortages when there are wounds of people in the hospital in a state of degradation. Wounds of people are deteriorating because they do not have dressings, they do not have whatever drugs are necessary and they do not have the staff. This is a disgrace and a shame and all of that has to do with the existing order of lack of democracy and people's interest. I am sorry if I have to speak in strong terms but the time has come for it and not merely to push around, extending the time of Mayors and Deputy Mayors. What for? Where is the democracy here? Why don't they implement it like Cuba? Why they do not go back and report to the people? I hope they are going to withdraw this Bill and make provision for the democracy we are talking about.

## Budget Debate: 7th February, 1984

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, the Budget presented by the Minister of Finance and Economic Planning in our view does not get down to the root of the problem and, like others before it in the recent past, will not produce the desired results. True, the Minister being an economist has presented us with a very technical and what appears to be a theoretical rational presentation, but his approach is basically technocratic monetarist. It is little different from that of Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan who are busy dismantling the capitalist welfare state. Here, as in the USA and the UK, what was inherited and initiated is being dismantled step by step. The quality of life, no one will deny, has seriously deteriorated from the days of the P.P.P. Government and every day it is plunging downwards.

The Minister's dilemma is real and being unable to take the dialectical, political, economic and revolutionary, as distinct from the static, economic approach he is incapable of finding real solutions. For instance, he stresses that he views the deteriorating effects of the parallel market as the main problem, but he failed to point out that the parallel market came into being precisely because of the Government's inability to provide the basic needs of the people. This is how it came about. Basic needs have to do with money, local money, Guyana dollars and foreign exchange, foreign currency. We have neither. Why? If we look at the Budget structure, we will see that it is because of fantastic debt payments and huge and costly bureaucratic and military apparatus. These are responsible for our chronic and growing Budget and Balance of Payments deficits. Without a revolutionary approach it is impossible for this Government to take this country out of this crisis. All that is being offered is a tinkering here and there, a little change in this Ministry, a little change in that Ministry.

The Minister did not indulge in a lot of political rhetoric in this speech, but this was provided from the floor by our friend the Minister of Manpower and Cooperatives and this afternoon by the Minister of Foreign Affairs. We heard the usual jargon about building a socialist society, about socialist democracy and about anti-imperialism, but slowly and surely the road is being prepared for a course which the imperialist masters who brought the P.N.C. to power want for this country. Look at the Budget. I have taken out these quotations which indicate that the Government is changing from its present position of state bureaucratic, cooperative and parasitic capitalism to free enterprise, dependent, distorted capitalism which Reagan and the American administration want. Here are some of these, thrown in at different points but indicating a direction.

First, reliance on market mechanisms, the whole price control system has gone one after another. All gone. President Reagan talks about the freedom of the market place. That is the road to democracy and progress

that is to be found on page 19. Then on page 40 there is a suggestion of denationalization:

*“Non-strategic companies will be divested or brought into joint ventures with private firms.”*

Go to London now and you will see Margaret Thatcher is doing the same thing. But this is called socialism here. Margaret Thatcher does not hide her monetary policies and her blatant outright conservative capitalist policies. Even some of her colleagues in the Conservative Party do not agree with her.

Last but not least on pages 51 – 52 he talks about “*Management Contracts*” and I quote:

*“The issue of strengthening day-to-day management requires us to choose an appropriate model of expatriate management involvement.*

*The willingness of some customers and prospective leaders is linked to the preference of these sources in relation to both the management and marketing solutions.”*

We were hearing this afternoon about political and economic independence. You can nationalize, certainly, the imperialists are not too worried about that. A new form of neocolonialism is to take over the lucrative sections: management contracts, marketing contracts, and other consultancy services. We see them all over the place, crawling in the economy of Guyana today. Yet we hear we are dead on. And in dealing with the socialist world, Cde. Speaker let us call a spade a spade. This country reached the situation of chronic crisis beginning in the end of 1976 and every year it is getting deeper and deeper. In 1977 we made a tour of the socialist countries. We were busy all over the place. In 1977 we joined the Comicon. In April 1978 they were given a lucrative deal by the Soviet Union and the then Prime Minister, now President, visited the Soviet Union and limited credits helped to rehabilitate the bauxite industry to buy bauxite, to help to develop the gold industry. But socialist countries do not give cash. It is not in keeping with their policy. They want dollars. So they went in June and signed the I.M.F. Agreement. They had a lot of foreign exchange. First with the sugar levy, that was squandered, and then from the I.M.F. deal – we had I.M.F. credits, plenty of it.

There were credits from the World Bank, I.D.B. and U.S.A.I.D. Thirty seven percent of all United States aid in 25 years was given in that period, 1978–1980. Of course, they had to pay a price for all that – a retreat in foreign policy and they had to open the door with the New Investment Code to foreign capital. But that did not save them. Now despite all that help we are back to square one. The crises are deeper. Mr. Speaker, I have a budget speech here of 1977. The Minister then said: “*External Debt Service*

*Ratio is estimated to be no more than 10 percent of export earnings in 1976.*" Today they are telling us it is 42 percent in spite of all the insistence and foreign dollars that came here. Has it helped the economy? Why are we now not only in this mire of having to spend 42 percent in servicing foreign debts, but the total debts – foreign and local – is equivalent to 92 percent of current revenues. Can you believe that? The debt that this country is paying is 92 percent of the revenue. This is an impossible situation. I do not know if Comrades on the other side of the Assembly recognize where this country is.

Perhaps if they were, they would not be sitting and chatting when all those rhetorical utterances from the other side were being made. Now, does the public know this? Cde. Speaker, the situation is serious. We have been saying over and over again what is the answer? The answer should not be only loans from outside if you can get them. There must be democracy; there must be an end to discrimination, politically and racially; there must be an end to extravagance; an end to corruption; a redistribution of income in favour of the people; a raising of morale so that the people can get down to producing. We are saying this over and over. We are not the only ones shouting now, others are also shouting. Mr. Feilden Singh today read a statement on Carl Blackman where he said we must call a spade a spade. Why tell us about re-evaluating in relation to a basket of currency? That is called devaluation and this is going to affect our people. Already the cost of living has gone up. He said let us be serious, let us start setting the example. Cut out the extravagance. Cut the big spending. The General Secretary, Daniels, P.S.U. President, recently headed a Committee, what did he say? In this report of the T.U.C. Committee, it says one of the aims should be to reduce spending on Military, National Service and Foreign Embassies thus redirecting funds to other sectors. The People's Progressive Party has said this since 1981 or 1982. At our last Congress we outlined how we should reduce spending. I read it out here.

Cde. Speaker, apparently the only thing that will shake these people up is a good riot. They are heading for it. They are paving the ground for it. The President said last May that the conditions set by the I.M.F. is a recipe to riot. They had it in Brazil and he knows it for he is smart enough to understand. What are they doing again? They are going along the same road once again. They are sending their men to all the socialist countries looking for cash. But they got no cash. If you want to develop your economy are you are going to get help? If you want to develop industries, yes. If you want to put agriculture and education on a sound footing, if you want to do it with the help of the people, yes. If you want to do it that way you will get help. But if you want dollars only, go to the I.M.F. and throw it down the drain.

That is what they are starting on again. The I.M.F. told them 66 to 100 percent devaluation. The President said that is a recipe to riot. When I say you are preparing the ground you start with 25 percent. You are on the

road. What is the justification except a lot of rhetoric? What is the justification for that? Add it up in economic terms, get all the Guyanese, Guymines and the Treasury, and you will see there is no reason for it. The traditional reason for devaluation is not applicable to Guyana.

Cde. Speaker, the Government is asking for cooperation from us, from the working class, from the T.U.C. Cooperation will come not only by statements but by doing what is in the interest of the people and showing the people that you mean business. The Vice-President gave us a lecture yesterday supported by a school teacher, another Minister, Mr. Denny, about what are production and productivity and call on us to get improved production. Obviously every school child knows that is the answer to the problems of the country. We are not producing. Production today is the three main sectors of the economy; sugar, rice and bauxite are lower than in 1964, the last year of the P.P.P. Government. Why? Let us sit down in this Assembly and have one debate only on this question and say what must be done. Step by step, what are the factors, external and internal?

First, foreign exchange. The Government's focus in this Budget is the leakage of foreign exchange through the parallel market. I have already said that the parallel market is a creature of the Government; it is the effect of the Government's failures. I have already pointed out that foreign exchange service was on 10 percent in 1976. Every year it is increasing. Last year it was 42 percent of foreign earnings. Oil is taking another 40 percent. Where are we? What is left? 20 percent, even if some is leaking. So the parallel market does not help us. It does not help. The little that there is, is not adequate for raw materials, for food, consumption goods, for spare parts, for new equipment. It does not matter what amount of Burnham magic you can find, take out 80 percent, 20 percent cannot be enough and it is no use blaming and finding another scapegoat.

You have found so many in the past, you are finding one now in the parallel market. You cannot solve that problem. What is needed is a revolutionary answer to this problem.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs gave us a lengthy circle around the Non-Aligned Movement, the Committee of 77, north/south dialogue and how the north is not cooperating etc. What he fails to realize is the imperialist north exists on the plundering and the suffering of the south and they are not going to give it up without a struggle. They are not going to give it up by pleas from capitalist-oriented Third World countries that want to beg but not to fight. Those who are in the Third World who want to take a socialist oriented course are getting pressure like Grenada which was recently thrown out. Those others do not want to fight because they want to go on the same course, so they are begging. Do we expect imperialism to give up its plunder simply by imploring it to do so? This is wishful thinking, it is not realistic. Unfortunately many Third World countries are becoming foot-lickers, faced with financial problems like this one and instead of trying to find a real solution they are going back again, preparing the

ground again for the I.M.F.

At the last special May Day Conference when the G.A.W.U. said experience has taught us that the I.M.F. is no solution, reject it, four Ministers were there and trade union leaders were all saying no, we cannot take that line; all we have to do is argue for better terms. So they go to the socialist countries and want to use, no doubt, the socialist countries to see if they can blackmail the I.M.F. and Uncle Sam.

The answer, Cde. Speaker is not to go back begging to the I.M.F.. The I.M.F. has not solved anybody's problem in the Third World. Experience has shown that it will make it worse. The time has come for boldness and no vacillations. The time has come also for looking at the internal factors. We were told by the Foreign Minister today how the external situation is complicating our situation. Of course everybody knows what imperialism is doing to the Third World.

Here is a report which is signed by Mr. Leslie Melville for the T.U.C., another third Committee report. Let me just read you a few sentences. It is talking about this business. Page 2 states:

*"It has been argued by some that our falling living standards are due entirely to the world economic crisis but it is the view of the Committee that while the world economic crisis has contributed to the problem there are other factors that are also contributing."*

We have been saying so all along. The T.U.C. is now saying so. It continues to show that the investment ratio, that is the investment as a percentage of gross national product was 32.2 percent in 1980 average, 28.8 percent for 1979 as a percentage of G.D.P., investment average, 27.2 percent in 1970 and 31 percent and 26.2 percent for 1981 and 1982.

But it goes on to compare other Third World countries and the developed capitalist countries saying that they have far greater investment ratios to G.N.P. and G.D.P. What have we done with it? What have we achieved? Then it goes on here to talk about consumption – private consumption. They are saying we must hold private consumption and use the money for investment for production. Here what the T.U.C. says: *"A look at the figures reveal that in 1969 private consumption as a percentage of domestic expenditure was 62%, while by 1979 this figure has fallen to 53% and as estimated at 1980 it would be 5%."* It goes on to say that this figure is also lower in other countries. In other worlds although this is the T.U.C., it is not the P.P.P.. The T.U.C. which is dominated by the P.N.C. Government, controlled by the P.N.C. Government – so Cde. Speaker, we have and I repeat to deal with those internal factors. I mentioned already the question of for instance democracy, racial and political discrimination and so on. My colleague talked about a comprehensive Development Plan. Why is it we do not have a comprehensive Development Plan? After twenty years, after planning commissions and everything else, so much noise was made about

this; we have not got one yet.

Cde. Chairman, it is necessary, we cannot just move ad hoc – every now and then we move off to something else. We have to see how this operates, lets face it. What did the Vice-President say about milk yesterday – milk by 1988. Our Comrade told you this afternoon how we were already becoming self sufficient in milk in the 1960s – but we were told that so many milk cows, so many heifers are being slaughtered. All of a sudden we will stop slaughtering them. Okay what happens to beef consumption? In the P.P.P.'s time we used to export beef to the Caribbean, to Trinidad, to Surinam, to Barbados – now we do not. We had to fight the West Indian Government once about the foot and mouth disease, now we do not have beef, we do not have milk, so we will concentrate on stopping some of the slaughter. Okay, I agree with that – it is quite sound, but what will happen to the beef – now it is \$9.00 a pound. Planning involves taking care of all of that – not just simply to look at milk. You have to look at people, you have to look at beef, and you have to look at the price of beef because peoples' everyday lives have to do with production too. If they are sick, malnourished – protein is an essential part of the diet – they will not produce.

I am saying that this country needs a Plan – coordinated and integrated. Everything has to be sorted out, not as this Government is doing as we find now. Factories set up at great costs like the textile mill and we have not got the raw materials, like the oil mill and we have not got the raw material. We have a cassava mill without cassava. Where is the integrated planning that is necessary? Administrative democracy is an essential part of administration, not bureaucratic management only.

We are told that a lot will happen to the Rice Marketing Board which has of course pressure from the United States to dismantle that Guyana Rice Board setup – well now we have some cosmetic changes. My colleague told us today that at one time they came in this House and argued how you must merge the Rice Board. All kinds of arguments were given. Now, no doubt under pressure some of the rice mills have been shelved out. A separation will take place between milling and marketing and some private millers and so on will be allowed to sell rice abroad. Also Cde. Speaker I am not arguing for the Americans but I think they are concerned with their friends' political stability and therefore they see the rice industry going down and down and soon if this rigmarole does not stop you will have riots for rice too. We hear about rice flour so much. Were all the great qualities of rice being thought about in the days when Mr. Burnham said we will grow wheat in the Rupununi? The fact of the matter is this rationalization, because they had no foreign currency to keep buying the wheat. They are rationalizing now, but Cde. Speaker, soon we will find because of increased consumption of rice to replace the falling of the imported wheat that we cannot supply the markets – even the traditional ones that we had, much less where we are trying to engage in what you call barter trade. We have the example which was told to us today of a Soviet ship here for more



than two weeks – which cannot get enough rice to load it – it had to load from one which was taking rice to Jamaica because the people I believe are making a hell of a lot of noise. So where are you gaining? You are denying the people flour and now you are finding you cannot have rice to sell and soon you will have the problem of finding rice to feed the people inside the country.

Cde. Speaker, maybe the Government is not worried about all these changes in the structure of the G.R.B. and so on, allowing private millers – they say private millers will be allowed to export if and when the Government has fulfilled its Government to Government contracts anywhere in the world, plus the CARICOM market. Tell me what is left of them? This is a cosmetic change to satisfy the imperialists that you are doing something, like hiving off some of the rice mills to the Regional Committees which is nothing more than the same administration.

I can go on and talk about this. Cde. Denny talks about workers' participation. Well, the T.U.C., of which he is a big member, has advocated at least a 50-50 arrangement in the Board of Management where the trade union will have half of the members, as happened in colonial times in the G.R.B. when the R.P.A. was playing a role. Nothing was said about the restructuring of the G.R.B., about the role of the R.P.A., nothing except that cosmetic changes will take place to see if the Americans and U.S.A.I.D. can be fooled to give them some more dollars.

Today we heard another example of lack of democracy when the Minister said that they believe in consultation. This is a democracy and therefore Harry Persaud Nokta cannot go to an Amerindian area. He is not only a parliamentarian; he is Organising Secretary for the P.P.P. He cannot go because the Amerindian captain has to approve. The captains are puppets in most places. They are paid and elections are rigged. That is the democracy they want to foster, to deny Guyanese, including parliamentarians and the P.P.P. Organising Secretary, a right, a constitutional right, to go anywhere in the country. That is democracy for them.

I have already referred to Mr. Blackman and the question of extravagance. I have referred to Mr. Daniels talking about controlling expenditure and military and national service and so on. If you do not distribute income...Mr. Denny told us yesterday that you cannot get what you do not produce. The fact of the matter is people are producing. They are not producing as much as you want them to produce because you are penalizing them all the time but whatever they are producing is not going to them. The figures are here in the Budget. It is going toward debt payment. Out of the revenues the Government collected last year, \$565 million, it was going to spend \$990 million. \$521 million is going to pay debts and salaries; \$253 million for civilians and military apparatus. How much is left for the people? Social services were to have \$216 million, a fall in this sector of the current Budget from 45.5 percent in 1964 to 21.8 percent this year. And we expect the people to produce! Clearly one has to heed the



advice of the working class, the T.U.C. Mr. Denny knows this.

In the same Report I was reading from are some figures based on the cost-of-living index figures and a budget for families. This is what the T.U.C. said: That the monthly wages in 1980 should be \$654.23, \$25 per day. I am giving you the round figures now. For 1981 it was \$772 a month, \$29.68 per day; 1982, \$918.81 per month, and \$35.34 per day: 1983 was \$38 per day. Today it is \$12.71 whereas in 1979, according to this Government, it should have been \$14 a day.

How can we expect starving people to produce? How do we expect people who are malnourished, whose children are going to school with tea in the morning, who are suffering, to produce? How do we expect the children to learn? How do we expect, if we produce a nation of dunces, to bring development? People are involved in development. Education is a vehicle for development. How do we expect development to take place under these conditions? There cannot be improved production without seeing to the needs of the people. There is an interlinked interaction between economic development and social development. You cannot penalize the people and expect economic development. This is a truism. It is a fact of life and you have to face up to this, but the Government's dilemma is real. I understand. It is being pressed by "*Reaganism*" to go backwards to free enterprise, dependent, distorted capitalism. The Members of the Government do not want to do this because they do not want to dismantle the system of privileges and corruption and bureaucratic, cooperative, parasitic capitalism. They do not want that. That is understandable.

For the same reason they do not want to go forward to socialist orientation, which the new situation demands, which the T.U.C. called for in 1978 – a political solution. Mr. Pollydore recently called for it again. He said the time has come when perhaps we should think of this again because in 1978 when the call was made, the Government rejected it. As Pollydore said after he went to the Constituent Assembly meetings: "*Not one of our recommendations in this regard was accepted.*" This is their dilemma.

The only way I see that the dilemma is to be solved is from the growing contradiction within the P.N.C. now from the bottom and the top. The bottom cannot live and the top is getting richer. The top has two steams characteristic of the petty bourgeoisie class, one class which is climbing to the upper section of the petty bourgeoisie class and becoming the bourgeoisie and the other, having gone to socialist countries, having studied in socialist countries, understanding political economy, understanding theory but with no face. They know that what we have now cannot take this country out of the mess. They will tell us in parlours and in private, but their voices are weak. They are creatures of the leader. They have been made by the leader. They have no votes; they have no face. Therefore they cannot influence the process. One thing will strengthen them, but the class struggle sharpens at the bottom and fortunately not everybody is running away. Those who remain have to fight. The bauxite workers in 1979 had a five

weeks' strike. Last year there was a one day a week strike for food, and there was a six weeks' strike when they tried to up them on a three-day work week. In December, 1972 the same T.U.C. which brought them to power took to the streets. They manoeuvred to wreck the last T.U.C. Congress. Ask Cde. Denny, the chief bottle-washer, how they manoeuvred. They told five delegates from the P.S.U. that they were not accredited, their accreditation was withdrawn. This was a manoeuvre which helped to wreck the Conference. Up to now Denny with all his bureaucracy and trade union democracy and social democracy cannot get the T.U.C. to meet again. They are now afraid even of their own creature. Herein lays the hope for Guyana – a sharpening class struggle. The P.P.P. will be with that struggle to see that we get the dawn of a new day in Guyana.

## Speech on the deferment of the Labour (Amendment) Bill: 16th March, 1984

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, I wonder if I could crave your indulgence to raise a matter at this moment concerning the matter before the House, which not only this Party on this side but the country as a whole consider to have far reaching implications.

Cde. Speaker, this last week I wrote the Minister asking that this Labour Bill be deferred to allow more time not only for this House to have to go into the rectifications of this Bill but also for the Labour Movement as a whole. I informed him that I spoke to the Secretary of the Trade Union Congress last Tuesday and at that time 2.15 p.m., or 2.30 p.m., in the afternoon the T.U.C.'s General Secretary had not yet seen the Bill and they had not as far as I am aware discussed this matter yet, and now I have in front of me the letter by the Secretary of the T.U.C. Mr. Pollydore to Mr. Denny and it reads as follows:

*“Three copies of Bill No. 5 of 1984, Labour Movement Bill, 1984 as published in the Official Gazette of 8<sup>th</sup> March, 1984 have been received by the Trade Union Congress. One copy was received late on the afternoon of Tuesday, 13<sup>th</sup> and two copies were received about 10.00 a.m., on Wednesday, 14<sup>th</sup>. I am writing to inform you that because of insufficient time between the receipt of copies of the Bill and the debate on the Bill which begins in Parliament today, the T.U.C. is not now in a position to offer any comments or recommendations on the proposed legislation. This is considered regrettable because of the apparently far reaching implications of the proposed legislation as it relates to the T.U.C., and its affiliates to the Trade Union Movement generally”.*

Cde. Speaker, you will remember that following on the 1963 strike which lasted for eighty days when the Labour Bill was before this House, the T.U.C. as supported then by the P.N.C. and other forces argued that there was not sufficient time, sufficient consultation, although he now Minister of Education, the then Minister of Labour argued that there has been not only publication by sufficient consultation and time and it was agreed out of that in future when the settlement was made on that strike, when the Bill was withdrawn, that in future on all occasions before any labour matter comes to this Parliament, the Employers Association and the Labour Movement as represented by the T.U.C. will first have a say on these matters.

I am therefore requesting in keeping with what I have just said that this Bill be adjourned for another two weeks so that all and sundry in this country will have an opportunity to have far reaching – not only in relation to labour, this is to do with judiciary and all kinds of things and therefore I am making a request to the Government, not to rush through today with

this Bill, to defer it for two weeks when the T.U.C. and others would have had an opportunity to discuss it and then we can discuss it in this Parliament.

## Labour (Amendment) Bill No. 5/1984

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, the historical development of this society is advancing both in terms of material wellbeing and in terms of spiritual values. Society is moving from a lower to a higher level and in the process where people are becoming more and more involved at a higher stage of democracy. This is what is happening for instance in the socialist countries. In this country it is written in the Constitution that we are in a transition stage between capitalism and socialism. But let us examine the reality, instead of going forward – forget the rhetoric of the Minister of Labour and the sophistry of the Hon. Attorney General – this country is moving backward with anti-labour slave legislation moving more and more, step by step in the direction of an anti-working class slave stage. My colleague, the last speaker, referred to the fact that the T.U.C. said the present wage structure is such for the working man that when it is measured money related to goods, the working man's position is worse than in the days of slavery. Is this what Guyana is involved in through the struggles of Critchlow, through Cuffy and all of them? With all our resources we are now hearing about the price of sugar. What happened when the sugar price was high? We hear a little voice in the back. What happened to the sugar levy? What did you do with the sugar levy, \$111 million, earned in previous years? Minister Denny told us about the sugar strike in 1977 and how magnanimous the Government was to hold a poll to give G.A.W.U. recognition and G.A.W.U. in turn went ahead to sabotage the Government. What falsehoods? Half-truths are more dangerous than lies. It is true that the Government made arrangements for a poll and the one consequence of that poll was the Minister's head was rolled. He is no longer with us. That made place for this Minister.

The fact of the matter is that in 1971 the then Prime Minister said in this Parliament that the poll would be taken in the sugar industry to determine union recognition and that promise was never kept. As a result of that, in 1975 there was a strike which lasted seven weeks in the spring crop, for the first time in this country. It was adjourned – even the President, then Prime Minister, said that he never heard of adjourning a strike. It was then called back in the second crop for six weeks and that is how they were forced to agree to a poll. Those are the facts. So tell the truth here, do not come and tell half-truths.

Why did the workers go on strike in 1977? It was not to sabotage but because you robbed them of their profit-sharing scheme. There was an agreement from the days of Bookers for profit sharing. They imposed a levy which gave them this \$300 million which I told you about. They took away all of it. As a result the company said they have no profits to share with the workers. We told them take it from Bookers, let the workers get at

least something when the price of sugar was high. When the price of sugar was highest in the history of this country workers got nothing. Ask them what they did with the \$300 million. They squandered it, wasted it, and misspent it. All who helped themselves admitted that they made miscalculations and as a result all went down the drain. Now the sugar workers are being blamed. When they robbed them and when the workers struggled for their rights they used big stick methods, 6,000 scabs to break the strike. You did not hurt me, you hurt the economy. That is like the contract labour. They are employing contractors to do the work now.

Let us look at the history. For nearly 25 years G.A.W.U. fought for recognition. When they got it and they were forced to recognize it they bypassed that and made an agreement with the T.U.C. Now they are telling us this agreement must become law, that agreements between Trade Unions and employers do not have the validity of law and they want to make it that way. What the Minister did not tell us was that agreement was made by the T.U.C. They are saying now that there was an agreement, implied, an act of faith that the workers will produce. Expressed! Implied! Do they know that the T.U.C. at that time was saying the minimum wage should be \$23 a day? I am talking about the technical people who are measuring the wages, like Clive Thomas and all of them. I am talking about people who are measuring statistics and cost of living. They were saying at that time \$23. Go in the records and you will see that. So they got the T.U.C. under their control to make a three year agreement so as to bypass collective bargaining by unions such as G.A.W.U. which had fought for many years and which got recognition and which was at the point of making their own agreement. On the one hand, you frustrate collective agreement by separating unions; you deal with your company union, the T.U.C. at that time. What was the negotiated wage? It was \$8.40, \$11.00 and \$14.00. When the \$14.00 was to be paid in 1979 they said they did not have money, the workers did not perform. When they mismanage everything they then put the blame on the workers.

Cde. Speaker, there are three parts of the national cake; what goes to the workers, the people who work in the state – and you must make a distinction between the bottom and the top, those who cannot get slave rations and those who get Datsun cars after being in power for so many years. They must tell us why it is necessary to enlarge the police and the military which cost \$15 million in 1970 and which today progressively has been increasing, costing today nearly \$140 million. Put all of that in the equation gentlemen, if you want to tell us who is producing and how the cake must be shared and who must get what. The fact of the matter is that they refused to honour an agreement which they made. The \$14 a day, as the Minister pointed out was even below \$15 a day when the agreement was reached. Even if there was indexation in Guyana – Brazil has it, Israel has it. They do not claim to be building socialism. The fascist's dictatorship in Brazil, one of the most reactionary Governments, has it. The bourgeois

Government in Italy has indexation.

The socialist countries do not have indexation but every year their real wages are going up. I am talking about bourgeois states like you have set up in this country – bourgeois states and which you call socialist countries, practically all of them that deserve the name every year imperceptibly the standard of living is going up by 2 to 3 percent. Real wages are going up. That is state planning – not the kind of planning you have set up here.

Cde. Speaker, what did they do about this \$14.00 a day which was below Minister's Denny figure of \$15.00? In the last year of the agreement it was below and still it was not paid. They not only did not pay the \$14.00 a day, they did not pay increments – it was paid automatically in February and then an order was issued to the corporations and elsewhere - do not pay. In June it was withdrawn – that led to the bauxite strike of 1979 which lasted for five weeks and how did they deal with that? When here was a solidarity strike of four unions, they deemed it political and used police methods to solve the problem. Two bus loads of a cabs were put at Guyana Stores the first day – the Friday, the second day, they arrested Gordon Todd the Leader and dumped him in Berbice. The President of the C.C.W.U., they beat up the workers who were assembled right outside Guyana Stores and they threatened the workers that Saturday that unless they returned to work on Monday all of them will be dismissed. That is democracy. We hear the Minister telling us how they love trade unionism and they recognize trade unions – that was using force, police methods in a so-called democratic society. What is happening in Poland is what you were doing with the C.I.A. in Guyana in the '60s.

Cde. Speaker, in 1979 on the same question of increments, they used police methods, intimidated the workers, harassed them, beat them up and then when the strike was crushed they went ahead – these lovers of trade unionism and workers, and dismissed eighty-two workers – key workers, shop stewards and others of the C.C.W.U. and they are telling us they respect trade unionism. So what is left for the people – they resort to the courts. In this case merit increments – not the usual increments, but the merit increments. This was the agreement with N.A.A.C.I.E. – the people merited it and the courts upheld it. Now they are going ahead to amend the Constitution in order not to pay, or to stop further payments if they have paid anything at all. I do not think they have paid and this so called amendment that was put, that if anybody was paid they will be so generous that they would not demand it back is a lot of eye wash. How they have compromised with the lawyers, with the Bar Association because they have not paid and because they have not paid the union representing Teemal, one of the members has gone on strike because they refuse to pay.

Cde. Speaker, where are we going? What is the practice in this so called socialist state? One of the foundations of a socialist state is democracy. You are undermining, you are using police methods to solve industrial disputes, and then you are now interfering with the judiciary. At one time in

this country a lot of the people in the judiciary and the magistrates and so on left the country because of the partisan nature of how they selected hand-picked people and so on to put them in the judiciary. Cde. Speaker, what has happened now? The same judiciary that they nurtured and built up now has given a decision against them, and then we hear the Honourable Attorney General giving us a big explanation to justify this. He quoted Burma, India, Canada, etc., the case in Burma or wherever it was involving the Burma Oil Company's properties – I presume it was the Far East that he was talking about because that is where the Japanese moved in and took away the properties and the British and the Dutch when they ran away – they employed...policies and it may be in that context that they argued that this was in the fight against fascism and therefore they had to destroy it and therefore they are not liable. That is the particular context as I understand it – that argument was put forward justifying retrospective legislation and that are we to do? We know that this is a policy of the Soviet Union when they were retreating in front of the fascist hoards – they had to themselves destroy their own property in order to stop the onslaught.

So we can go on and talk. He can quote India, Canada and so on, we have to take the particular situation, and we have to take the nature of the state. What kind of Government, which class and if we want to talk about a so called perfect democracy in America constitutionally. Do you think in America any President can pass a law like this? Sure they can pass a law; they can change the law if the Supreme Court judges something unconstitutional – they have that right, a written constitution like we have. The legislature has the power to remake another law, change the Constitution, amend the Constitution, but not dating it back because by dating it back as they have done now, they are virtually telling the Supreme Court – that is why my friend said intimidation, the Honourable Attorney General says no, we do not intend to intimidate, but if any time there is an interest between the State and the people and there is a conflict of interest – what this decision is saying to the judiciary is if in future you do not decide in our favour we have the right to change it retrospectively. Isn't that intimidation Cde. Speaker? What else is it?

No amount of sophistry can change this. In other words, the foundation of the state is that the Executive must not be supreme and rule by decrees...if you tell us no, we are coming to Parliament and Parliament is making a law. Parliament is supreme in all countries. The people are sovereign but the people did not elect you. Fraud elected you. Fraud gave you a majority in this Parliament. Fraud gave you a two-thirds majority by which you brought a Constitution and now you are seeking to amend that Constitution with that same fraud.

Let us deal with the thesis that Parliament is supreme. Sovereignty here rests with the people. That is why the people rolled the head of King Charles and made the Rump Parliament. The House of Lords became the Second Chamber without any power virtually and the House of Commons, the



elected body, become the supreme lawmaking body. That is history, it is historical development. Do we have that here? Can anybody – not just the P.P.P. – say that we have free and fair elections in Guyana? That we have an elected Government of Guyana? That we have a Parliament which represents and speaks for the people? What we are doing here? We are here to expose you and to sue this platform to work for your downfall, which is inevitable. In the same way the people rolled the head of King Charles, in the same way the American revolutionaries fought to bring an end to British colonialism and British authoritarian rule in the thirteen colonies, in the same way the people are going to do that here.

I want now to deal with the section about the T.U.C. They used the T.U.C. to come to power. That is well established, but even in the T.U.C. there has been evolution. The T.U.C. in 1976 called for a general strike. The Government was able to coerce the T.U.C. to stop that. In 1982 the T.U.C. took to the streets. In 1983 the balance in the T.U.C. shifted further, so much so that the very executive that they control – they kept out the two major unions in the country, the bauxite and sugar industry unions; the unions of the two major industries of the country, with the largest work forces, were kept out of the T.U.C. by manipulation – was seriously divided when it came to last year's strike in the bauxite industry when the Government wanted to take away the rights of the workers and put them on a three-day work week. There was division. Even within the ranks of the body that they nurtured, controlled and manipulated that has come about, because the working people no longer, as my colleagues pointed out, can live. Therefore, that pressure is being exerted at the General Council level and even at the executive level of the T.U.C.

That is why they manipulated last year's T.U.C.'s Annual Conference so that it broke up in disorder. They refuse now to exert their control over it to summon another meeting of the General Council or another meeting of the T.U.C. Annual Conference. They are refusing that because they are afraid that the T.U.C. might move against them and so what are we going to find now? In the same way that the M.P.C.A. was a company union for 25 years...we tried to make legislation in 1953. We failed because the troops came in. In 1963 we failed again because by that time Mr. Burnham had changed sides and he was using the Bill to bring down the Government. We failed again to make it into law. Until today the Bill has not seen the light of day. Mr. Minister Denny is telling us that they are consulting; they are waiting on the T.U.C. But, on a matter like this, where the T.U.C. is to be institutionalised, they do not want to consult the T.U.C. This is understandable because even in this T.U.C. now they are not certain whether it will go along with this. They are not certain because of the contradictions which have developed in the working-class movement and within the body of the movement, the leadership.

So, what do they intend to do? The Bookers plutocracy held on to their company union for so many years because the movement in this country

was divided and weak, flirting with the British and American imperialism so that planters were able to maintain company unions until 1975 when the workers took action and forced a poll. That is how democratic trade unions and collective bargaining came in. They sought to subvert it with the 1979 agreement and even they themselves subverted that agreement by not fulfilling the last \$14, the increments.

What are they trying to do now? They are trying to say, "*The Labour Code Commission and everybody else have been fighting for a long time to have collective agreements have the force of law*" and they are showing that they are doing that. But take this again relatively and dialectically: Collective agreements with Bookers and the M.P.C.A., even if they had the force of law, what would it have meant? It would have meant slavery for the workers. That is why G.A.W.U. was fighting all the time, recognition or no recognition. Collective Agreements may have the force of law, yes, but under what conditions?

Now the State, under the P.N.C. Government, is not only the employer of a large number of people but will become the bargainer and they are going to make collective agreements with what is a collective M.P.C.A., that is, the new T.U.C., which they do not want to function democratically. They were rigging elections before in Linden. They lost that. Who is marching on the streets against them now? Not only the bauxite workers but the bauxite unions.

I hope I am making this complicated picture clear. They are not democratizing this society. What we are doing here is going in the reverse to the British practice when the people chopped off the King's head and brought in democracy and the rule of law. Of course, it has not gone very far. There are still laws and a far way to go because they have not established a socialist society in England but bourgeois democracy at least is practised there.

In the same way the other day with education, the T.U.C. signed an agreement for the teachers without consultations, and without serious discussions with the teachers. We have to see where this is getting this country. Where is it getting this country? What the Government should seriously examine if they are interested as they saying is the welfare of the people of this country who are the forces with them. They must examine concretely who are with them and who are not with them today. In all sincerity do they expect to be able to solve the problems of the economy in Guyana without the involvement of the masses of the people and their social organizations? Apart from the political parties, one cannot say all of them are working with the imperialists or all of them are chortling with the C.I.A. One cannot say that the church is reactionary. We see the church playing a progressive role in this period of history in Latin America, particularly the Caribbean or a section of it. Therefore, we cannot fall out the trap of thinking that everybody who is against us, is against us only because they are saboteurs. The Guyana Council of Churches was at one time working with them very very closely. It helped to bring them to power. The Guyana

Council of Churches was allied with the United Force which was allied with you. All of you were marching the streets together. You have forgotten when Burnham and D'Aguiar were marching and shook hands before the Parliament Building here. Ask the young lady over there, she was with them. She is hiding her face, she knows it is true. Do not worry about who were marching, you were leading the thugs.

Cde. Speaker, I want to say in all seriousness that slavery was not abolished as an institution because of the evil that it was, there were humanitarian reasons also. Those who were fighting like Wilburforce, Buxton and so on were fighting for human reasons. But the British ruling class did not bring an end to slavery because of humanitarianism. They do not care about that. They brought it to an end because it was an unproductive system. I am glad you read it. Well, alright then, apply it in your own country. Do not use big stick methods. Do not violate the rule of law. When your own judges – the judicial system which you created – go against you, you go and overrule them.

On the question which you yourselves agreed to pay, you made the agreement. You made it and what are you trying to do now? You are trying to amend the law to say that this agreement like other collective agreements do not have the force of law, therefore 1979 will be excluded out of the agreement. You can see what - to use a word – shysters there are. A shyster is like an underhand man performing three card ticks. That is what they are doing. Cde. Speaker, all we can say is that it is because of these old methods which have been going on now for some years, that is one of the reasons why this economy is going down. They are using that as an excuse not to give the workers their just shares. What the workers are asking for is not very much. However, there is no doubt that perhaps another case will be brought that is also excluded out of the Agreement, and they are now making collective agreements all legal so that when they negotiate, with their control over T.U.C., and bargain for everybody, it will here the force of law. May I say this too? The State can sue anybody for breach of law but as civil servant in this Guyana, no person can sue the State of Guyana. Very few can succeed.

Before doing so that persons have to get the permission first of the Attorney General. I believe they call it fiat. Cde. Chairman, this is a colonial institution which they are still using here although we are said to have decolonized Guyana. This is like the prerogative of the crown. The Pope can do no wrong; therefore you cannot sue the Crown. We are a Republic. We are Independent now but we are still holding on to that strong prerogative to penalize the workers. In England that law does not even apply. Here we see these so called benefits that they are giving the workers – making the agreements legal and getting the T.U.C. to become the bargainer for all this is undermining the principles of collective bargaining. In the western countries, the T.U.C. never bargains for the workers as a whole. Secondly, looking at it as I said dialectically, it is not going to give rights to

workers. It is intended to take away the rights of the people. We are concerned not only because of legality and legalism, but because we see this measure as being inimical, and not only inimical to the interest of the workers, but counterproductive, because it is going to achieve the results that you want. You are trying to save a few million dollars in one way but in the end you are going to lose far more and that is what has been happening in the last few years in this country. We advised them not to sign the I.M.F. Agreement. They went ahead and signed the Agreement and penalized the workers and now we are seeing the bitter fruits of that – less production and productivity. Therefore, Cde. Speaker I would again appeal to the Government to defer this Bill. They have the 2/3rd. majority. They can steamroller this Bill but they cannot steamroller the people to produce. That is one thing they cannot do. Therefore, I make the plea to them to defer this Bill as I said at the beginning. You made an agreement way back in 1963 that on all matters, all without exception pertaining to labour, the T.U.C. and K.A.G.I. will first be involved. That is part of our convention if not written law. Isn't that so Cde. Attorney General? You were there. You were part of that. Your Government agreed with it. You were the Opposition then fighting for it.

You demanded it and now that you are in the Government you are forgetting it. And it is not a question of forgetting the law. I am saying that if you fought for something while you were in Opposition; when you come into power carry it out. One would assume that was going to be the practice. You are saying now that you are not bound by that. And when we put the question to the Minister what about the T.U.C. legislation dealing with the rights to workers such as severance pay and Trade Union Labour Recognition Bill, we are told that the matter is with the T.U.C. That is the excuse. They blow hot and cold. When it suits them they put the burden on the T.U.C. and when it does not suit they say there is no law.

Cde. Speaker, I repeat that the Government has to take not a short-term pragmatic approach to every question. They have to talk to the working class people and try to come to some settlement with the working people of this country. Otherwise, you will not get anywhere. In that sense I appeal to the Government to defer this Bill and allow the Trades Union Movement to have further discussions on this question. Yesterday at the T.U.C. meeting even some of the people who I understand are with the Government wanted this matter to be discussed. But the Chairman who was put there only to say yes, who has not got the guts or the ability to do anything else, said no. In this case it was no. the yes-man's job became no on this occasion. He said we cannot discuss this matter. I am saying to the Government that this is not the way in which you are going to solve your problems. Economics is integrally related to politics, to institutions, to ideology, and unless you see this interconnection and interaction, and you act to work within that, you cannot solve the economic problems. You cannot solve it by using the hammer and fraud and force and fear. Fear will only

operate for a little while. History in all countries has shown that a time comes when it blows up, even spontaneously.

Cde. Speaker let better sense prevail. The Minister quoted Latin last night. He is a Latin scholar. But as I reminded him today, when Bookers were asking that they get part of the profit sharing – they had a lot of money, the Treasury was full then. Now they are reminding the workers that the Treasury is empty. I wish to close on this note, not with a threat.

Do not let us play with words now. We are in serious times. If this country goes on like it is going there would be war in the streets. There was a little war out there this afternoon. There are only two alternatives in this country. If the Government goes on this road, using force, they are then heading for a really serious confrontation as you have in El Salvador and other places. Therefore, it is for the Government to decide whether they want to take this country because, eventually, people will struggle, come what may, struggle for liberation, national liberation and social liberation in every country in the world, including Guyana.

## National Equivalency Board Bill: 27th August, 1984

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, I, too, would like to join my colleagues in saying that this measure, though long overdue, is welcome. Cde. Feroze Mohamed referred to the large number of people whom this country lost. When the P.P.P. was in power we sent over eighty persons to study in socialist countries. I think if you can find five today in Guyana, you will find plenty. This is because of two factors, not only discrimination in employment practices, but also other factors and that is first, the non-recognition of the degrees and, secondly, the fact that there was a yardstick which prevented people from entering into private medical practice, for instance. Let me amplify this.

In colonial times, only doctors trained in British Universities or say, in Jamaica, at the medical school there, could practice in Guyana. Degrees from the United States and other highly developed capitalist countries, even western capitalist countries, even though they were equivalent, were not put on the same basis. In other words, while a dentist from the United States could come here and practice, a doctor could not. This created big problems for us, because we had recurring shortages of doctors. That was one of the reasons why the P.P.P. Government sent so many people abroad to study. Jamaica University was graduating for us only a few doctors each year. By the way, we did not have only a shortage of doctors, I remember when we first started to set up the Embryonic Planning Unit, we couldn't find one economist in Guyana, nor a statistician, so bad was the technical infrastructure and professional infrastructure. That was the other reason why not only did we send students to the socialist countries, but we embarked on the University of Guyana so that we could have trained not only doctors, but a superabundance of professional and technical people for our needs, engineers included.

The P.P.P. Government went ahead to amend the law since there was so much opposition coming from the Medical Board at that time and the British establishment. We amended it, you may say, part way, because our wish was to make the medical degrees in the western capitalist countries equivalent to the degrees of Great Britain or Commonwealth countries. But, because of the opposition, we had to go half way and we met the Medical Board by saying, "*Okay, they will have to practice here in an institution say for a year or a year and a half*". I cannot remember exactly how long. "*After that, the person can go into private practice*". In other words, there was still a discrimination against the non-British trained or non-Commonwealth trained doctor. I am sorry to say that persists even today, because we were trying to make that amendment, or, rather, by removing the discrimination altogether. We were thinking not only of doctors who had graduated from the United States, but also of those who were coming back from the socialist

countries.

I hope that, while this Board will look into the question of equivalence and degrees, not only will consideration be given to the fact that degrees from socialist countries will be evaluated and recognized, but, as my colleague Cde. Ramkarran pointed out, that discrimination will be removed in employment; people who have passed through these Universities and who have an equivalent degree, that discrimination will not be applied in giving them jobs, because this was so in the past; secondly, the point taken by my colleague concerning the intake of students, that there should be no discrimination and no lowering of standards because that clearly would affect the future development of this country.

I would like to put to the Minister in charge of this matter, whoever he or she is, to remove this one year or one year and a half bar which still exists on doctors who come from non-Commonwealth countries. I do not know if it still exists. If it does, then please remove it, because we do not see any reason why it should continue. As I said, we had to do that years and years ago because of the tremendous opposition then from the Medical Board and the British establishment at that time. We do not have that at the present moment and therefore, if that stipulation still exists, then it should be removed forthwith.

## Sympathy on the death of the Prime Minister of India: 2nd November, 1984

**Dr. Jagan:** I wish to join, on behalf of the Members of this side of the House, Government Benches, on this Motion of condolence and expression of sympathy on the occasion of this great tragic loss of a great fighter who has fallen at the hands of assassins' bullets. Her loss is not only a loss to India. Indeed, it is not only a loss to the Third World but to the whole world. She was, above all, an indomitable fighter for peace, disarmament and for a New World Order.

She comes from a long and illustrious family of fighters. Her grandfather, Motilall Nehru, was one of the early fighters for India's independence and then, of course, there was her more famous father, Jawaharlal Nehru.

On this sad occasion we tend to see only those who are immediately involved - two Sikh bodyguards. What we must not forget are the hands behind those who pulled the triggers. Before this tragedy we had an earlier tragedy, again from the bullets of assassins. I refer to the death of Mahatma Gandhi. That also was seen as coming from the hands of a fanatic Hindu but there, too, we have to see that the British imperialists set the stage very carefully when, on the eve of Independence, they partitioned India and set the stage for millions of Hindus and Muslims to be slaughtered in India and finally for the Mahatma to be destroyed because he was fighting for unity, Hindus and Muslims.

I wish to say that, along with the Gandhi, there were the Nehrus side by side fighting. Imperialism has never forgiven the Nehrus for what they did, not just to get Independence but to build, after the attainment of political Independence. When the cold war was started in 1947, engineered by Winston Churchill, the arch-imperialist who had said, when the Atlantic Charter was declared in 1941, that he was not appointed the King's First Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. He was referring to India's Independence. He, along with Truman, in 1946/7 started the cold war and in their vital interest to keep dependent countries as colonies and to keep as neo-colonies those who had emerged free like India, they wanted to embrace these countries in their so-called security zones, be it Latin America, be it the Middle East, be it the Far East or elsewhere. Jawaharlal Nehru refused to go along with the military blocs which were being set up by imperialism - N.A.T.O., Baghdad Pact, S.E.A.T.O., Rio Pact and so on, and for that the Nehrus were never forgiven. Dulles, the then chief cold warrior of the US ruling class, described nonalignment as immoral. *"If you are not with us then you are against us. You cannot be non-aligned; you cannot be neutral."* That was the edict.

Indira Gandhi came to power in very tragic times, difficult aggravated times when the world was facing crisis in the Far East with the Vietnam War and aggression against India, difficult times reached Indian shores. In



1971 her brilliance as a political strategist was demonstrated when West Pakistan rulers invaded East Pakistan after Rahaman, the father of Bangladesh, East Pakistan, was arrested and many of the leaders were assassinated and nearly eight million people, to save their lives, fled across the border of East Pakistan into Northern India. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi went to all the western capitals asking for help. She said "*This is not our responsibility.*" It was costing India eight million rupees per week to keep those people in food.

I remember visiting that area in 1971 and saw the terrible conditions under which those people were living in refugee camps. Promises were made but nothing was done in a tangible way. How was the problem to be solved? Brilliantly, she went around, got public opinion on her side knowing that the only way was either to get help or to send back those refugees to their homes. Since the help did not come, the only other way to resolve the question was by military means. Before doing so, knowing that Pakistan was backed by China and the United States of America, she signed a 20 Year Agreement with the Soviet Union, a friendship agreement and, of course, that helped when resort was made to military means to drive out the Western Pakistan military forces from East Pakistan. She was able by that strategy to checkmate the Americans and Chinese from coming to the help of Pakistan. For signing this 20 Year Agreement, her friendship Agreement with the Soviet Union, she also, like her father before her, was not forgiven.

And so in more recent times especially in this very aggravated period when there is an attempt again not only just to resuscitate the cold war, but to roll back socialism, to stop National Liberation Movements, and to destroy revolutionary Governments, progressive Governments, anti-imperialist Governments and to set up puppets in various parts of the world, in that part of the world, Pakistan was being armed to the teeth with an alliance agreement with imperialism and \$3 ½ billion in weapons: this was the challenge which was facing India. It was not only to fight against revolutionary Afghanistan, but to destroy India, and particularly because of the role Indira Gandhi played in the Non-Aligned Movement. In 1979 there was a great deal of abuse in the western camp about Fidel Castro having the chairmanship of the Non-Aligned Movement. And there was no doubt, hope that when the change took place, that perhaps the changes will also occur within the Non-Aligned Movement but that was not to be, for Indira Gandhi carried on in the tradition of those who were firmly anti-imperialism, who were committed to the principles of nonalignment which were enunciated in 1947 in Delhi, and later in 1955 at Bandung – that is that states must not join military blocks and they must fight against colonialism, neocolonialism, imperialism, racism, apartheid and later Zionism. There were the principles which she stuck to.

Imperialism was not able to turn her from the course which her father reset in those early days and which militants and revolutionaries like Fidel

Castro carried on with. How then to move this great nation? A nation of so many people who can exercise a tremendous political force depending on which side she goes. It was for this reason that imperialism began its intrigues in India. We saw that before in Nigeria when imperialism attempted to break away from Africa, its most profitable state because of its oil wealth. Unfortunately that failed and so we had in India too in recent times, many attempts to break up India to cause trouble here and there so that India will not play the role it is playing especially in the Non-Aligned Movement, and on the world scene in the cause of people and progress. We have already, accounts of what happened in Punjab. We read where when those who wanted to make a separate state; they used the religious temple, the Sikh Temple as a refuge to carry on their subversive activities. We saw too when that happened there were suggestions by the Indian Government that Pakistanis disguised as Sikhs and encouraging them were also present. Unfortunately in that skirmish, the religious head of the Sikhs was killed and then there was a threat that Indira Gandhi would be assassinated.

It did not take long before this tragedy occurred and thus I relate this not because I want to give political lessons here, but for us to understand that when you begin to fight for peace, for progress, you find yourself coming up against imperialism and reaction. We have always to keep this in mind. If we are to progress to make the necessary alliances so as to create the necessary unity inside the country and the necessary alliances outside in order to circumvent the wiles and tricks and the stratagem of their reactionary friends who sometimes are very much in our midst in these countries.

Cde. Speaker let us hope that the Indian Government and the people of India will use good sense and judgment to stop any kind of bloodbath because in such a situation there is a lot of emotionalism. I think as the new Prime Minister just said, not all Sikhs are disloyal. The President of the Republic of India is himself a Sikh and we know that the vast majority of Sikhs did not go along with the extremists. They wanted a degree of autonomy, but they wanted to be within the union, the single State of India and not to have a separate State. Therefore, let us hope that the Indian Government along with his friends would be able to stop any further bloodshed in this very dangerous situation and at the same time let us hope that the new leadership will be able to hold India together. This was the illustrious role played by Indira Gandhi; because of her stature she was able to do this. Now that she has gone with the divisions and subdivisions which have taken place in the political life in India in the last one and a half decades. Clearly the will or means to resist imperialism has been weakened and therefore, I hope that the new leadership will be able to surmount these divisive influences and all these outside interferences whose aim is to break up India and turn India away from the path of non-alignment, the path of fighting for peace disarmament and social progress. I join with the Members of the Government in expressing our very deep sympathy and our condolences to the family of Indira Gandhi.

## **Bill - Second Reading: National Agricultural Research Institute of Guyana Bill: 2<sup>nd</sup> November, 1984**

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, the Vice-President in introducing the Bill said it is not a matter of much controversy. I agree with him, however, I would like to note that it seems rather strange after twenty years of being in the Government, now we have to see the light of day of such a Bill, but that is not the main point. It is not that there was nothing before. For instance, in the explanatory note, it says *"The main functions of the Agricultural Research Committee as proposed, are to advise the Minister on matters of policy relating to agricultural research and to supervise and control the functioning and activities of the National Agricultural Research Institute of Guyana."*

He was being advised all these twenty years. All we are doing is changing that organization for another one in the related committee and what about research? We had under the old colonial regiment in the sugar industry one of the best research stations in the world. A Bookers official – I forgot his name now, has written papers and all kinds of things about the wonderful research which was found in Guyana particularly with respect to sugar. What happened to that station, it is closed up. There are no more research stations, it is a private forum. We had Americans coming here to do research in rice; we had Indian experts brought here to do research in rice. What is happening now Cde. Speaker, the people are going back to ...because they cannot get fertilizers now and they have to go with grassknives now because they cannot get combines. What about the agricultural station at Mon Repos – that was supposed to be an external station but it is practically closed. Cde. Speaker, I think the North Koreans are now trying to pump some life into it. Now they are setting up a second agricultural committee within the National Research Council, so we are now going to set up this one after the others which I referred to failed. Cde. Speaker, nobody is against research but when we reach the stage where in the rice industry we are producing less than twenty years ago, despite all the research and the improved facilities and everything, then we must ask ourselves serious questions if we are to achieve the aim which the Vice-President spoke about, not only to feed ourselves but to feed the West Indies.

Cde. Speaker, the fundamental question which should be discussed is who is going to ...the American line...I have said it over and over again. Let the Board serve the farmers, right now the farmers are being pushed around. Right now the farmers are being pushed between the Board and the others. I was told in Essequibo recently that farmers have to leave their paddy for two or three days waiting for it to be taken in. This was at Anna Regina. Go to the West Coast, Demerara, and to Ruimveldt and it is the same thing – two, three days, sometimes a week. Paddy is being wet by rain: there is no protection. Now only are the bags ruined but the paddy is

germinating right there when it is waiting to go to the mill to be milled into rice. After the man has dried the paddy, either in the field or on the road, and he takes it there, it gets wet all over again and then they deduct for moisture content. Is that the research that they are talking about here? Go into the fields and see what is happening! What does the farmer do when faced with that calamity? He goes to the millers and I am told that in one case the farmer had to accept \$26 a bag when the price of bag of paddy is around \$36. What else is he to do? Do you think research is going to help him?

These are the facts which the Ministry and the Government must try to look at with haste. Maybe it cannot be done in this way. They are talking. Let us sit around the table, right here in a subcommittee, if you want, and discuss what is going to help agriculture in Guyana, because it is certainly not being helped. All you have to do is to walk out of this building and go right across the river and you will see what is happening.

I would urge the Ministers of the Government, if they are serious about agriculture, to do something. It is no use talking about it. Talking alone is not going to help. They have first to democratize this industry, not just to dismantle it at the whims of the Americans, and they have to see that the farmers have a big say in the running of this industry, not only in rice, but in other sections of the industry. Go into the Berbice River area where farmers were getting food through the F.A.O. and other agencies. They were getting flour and things to plant. Flour is cut out because the Government says that they cannot... So those poor farmers went and produced corn and so on, but there is no transportation to bring down the corn. Go and see all the big buildings they put up all over the country. Big million dollar structures, marketing depots. They are all empty. Nothing is running. The marketing division is practically closed. Where are we going? Talk alone cannot help. You are making a lot of noise on the air and every day there is something in the newspapers. That is not going to help the economy of Guyana and particularly the agriculture sector on which we are depending so much today.

I repeat, we are not against research. The bosses in the old days were only interested in sugar research. Wonderful! We went a step further and we did research in rice. We need research in cassava and plantains and those things but this has to do be seen as an integrated question – how you treat the farmers, how you recognize their organizations, whether you recognize them or not and, like everything else, put them in control. You are not going to develop agriculture with bureaucrats sitting in Georgetown in agencies.

We therefore would like to say that we have no objection to this, but I what to say this is only paraphernalia. It is not getting down to the root of the problem, Vice-President and First Deputy Prime Minister. It is not going to get down to the roots at all. Think seriously about this question. Agriculture, as you rightly say, is going to be the backbone of the economic

recovery in this country for the near future any way and, consequently, if you come up with any concrete proposals you can have discussions with our side. We are willing to talk at any time you want. Let us get down to solving the problems by removing all the bottlenecks and then research is going to work. Otherwise it will not help.

## Public Business Motion

### Approval of Financial Paper No. 2: 22nd November, 1984

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Chairman, I would like to join with the other Members in seeking from the Government more details on these Subheads. I speak generally about all of them because the country is in a very sad state today. Only recently the Government was claiming that it had no money to pay the ordinary people who cannot survive on the miserable wages that they are getting.

I will speak on Item 1, then I will come to Item 2, if you want it that way, Office of the President. Item 1, Current Estimates, Office of the President, "*To provide for the recruitment of professional services.*" "*To provide for the recruitment of professional personnel*". I am sorry.

I am not concerned with what he said. I am Cheddi Jagan, not Feilden Singh. I must make comments. We have a chance to speak on what is going on in the country. Why must I not speak? Let the Speaker answer the question.

I am asking a question on Item 1, the recruitment of professional personnel. Does this mean the cost of recruitment, that is, how much we have to pay to advertise abroad etc., or does it mean recruitment of personnel and we have to pay for the persons, that is, for the services of these people. If it is for the persons who have been recruited already, we want to know what they are, how many, what functions they will perform. This is buying a pig in a poke and we cannot run this country like this. As my colleague just pointed out about the Residence - we were told it was a little fire and I want to refer to the fact...

Yes. I am going to Capital Estimates, Item 1. We know that when the Prime Minister went into that house a sum of nearly half a million dollars was spent to refurbish it and I am sure that over all these years the house must have been kept in proper repair because I am sure that, as Prime Minister or President, Cde. Burnham would not be living in a house that is leaking and in need of repair. Consequently I am flabbergasted to see, when this country's finances are in such a parlous state, that we have to spend money to "*repair*" it. It says here "*to repair*". That sum of money would build a mansion. What are we doing? Let these people come and tell us. On the one hand, they tell the workers they have no money and ask them to say where they must find the money. Here the money is going down the drain like water. This is a disgrace. We cannot get cooperation in this country like this.

Item 2, Purchase of Equipment. My friend said that this sum is rather small for two motor vehicles and office equipment. I want to ask: is it a Lada car? Is it a Datsun Super or is it a Mercedes Benz? Is it a truck? We want to know because you can buy a Lada for \$3,000 to \$4,000 (US) and that does not come up to all this money. Let us find out in detail what is hap-

pening to the people's money in this country.

I am sorry to be so emotional but I cannot stand it when people are starving in this country, hospitals are leaking. The Suddie Hospital is leaking all over the place and you do not have money for repairing that. Schools are leaking; children have to raise money to buy chairs and blackboards and all this money is going down the drain here.

We have to account for it and that is why I brought this up now. Let it be seen in perspective. Item 3, Current Estimates, Office of the Prime Minister. Mr. Feilden Singh has already mentioned that, but we want more details about it. I hope the Prime Minister will give us the facts so that we may know exactly what are these unforeseen expenses and whether we are running the country in a very efficient and economical manner.

Cde. Speaker, Item 4 which concerns Supplementary Provision of \$1,234,786 to provide for expenditure for the commemoration activities in Guyana to mark the 150<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Abolition of Slavery. In the Commonwealth Caribbean it is difficult for one to understand this because the previous amount looked...expenses specific to the agency. This is almost 3 ½ million dollars. We on this side of the House are fully in support of the commemoration ceremony. My colleague on my right spoke at the session that was held in this compound to mark the 150<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. So far it is difficult to envisage that over \$1 ¼ million has been spent in this project and we would like to have full details of how this money is spent and exactly what is meant by the \$3.4 million, the note – expense specific to the agency.

In the past we have had many problems dealing with this very Ministry because the Ministry of National Development has never given details of expenditure and this House has always been expected to approve and support whatever is required for National Development. This is very bad. We live in times that are very difficult and what is my understanding is that there were attempts to have austerity this year. We can have celebrations, we can have functions, but they must be done in the spirit of austerity which is so necessary in view of the economic crisis and the very difficult times that people are having. We don't want to see waste of money, we would like to see full details, and not the type of details we have here from the previous speaker but actual details that will help us to understand how this sum of money was spent.

Item 5, Current Estimates. I was rather flabbergasted when I heard the explanation of the Minister because all along I was under the impression that this thing will be the cost of the registration, but when he tried to justify why this expenditure is here...

I thought, as we were saying at one stage, that the Minister of Home Affairs would do the registration, but I understood by that some of this money would be handed over to them for a contract. I could not imagine why we would spend one million dollars "*to sensitise the people*". That word needs a lot of explanation for a million dollars. First of all, National Regis-



tration, Cde. Chairman, do you know that there are many people in this country who want an I.D. Card and they cannot get them. As far as I am concerned – and we are concerned – National Registration should be a permanent feature, a continuous operation. You don't have to sensitise anybody about it. People want I.D. Cards just as they want birth certificates and cannot get them. They cannot get National I.D. Cards. What are we talking about when we speak of sensitizing people? This is a fraud. Let the Minister come and say clearly what they are doing. They are trying to vote one million dollars to carry out a P.N.C. propaganda campaign for the coming elections which are due next year.

All this talk of "*sensitizing*" people is a lot of baloney. I don't want to use a stronger word. Cde. Chairman, I repeat: this is immoral and wrong. You don't have to sensitise people to register. You don't have to sensitise them to go and vote. People are dying to vote out this Government. Don't worry. They want to vote you out. You have been postponing and postponing the elections since 1970. Why should you have to sensitise the people to come and register and vote now? I cannot understand how this piece of chicanery is going on in this Assembly to fool the people. The Speaker is supposed to hold the scales on behalf of the people, but he is not doing his job. I hope the Speaker in this Assembly would do his job and delete this Item.

One last point. I want to say that if the Government wants to vote one million dollars for election funds, it should come to this Parliament. Let them come here and say so and not do what they do in some countries like Puerto Rico. If you are going to finance an election campaign, then let the Government get a share and let the Opposition get a share. I was going to say that I had a private conversation with a top man in the Government hierarchy, someone near to the President. We began by discussing this same Ministry and a lot of jiggery pokery that is going on. We were speaking of the T.U.C.

I am not going to call any time. I said that after messing up the country they are coming to tell the T.U.C.: "*Tell us where to find the money.*". I said "*What about the Ministry of National Development. Look how much money you are wasting.*" I said "*It is immoral*", and he said, "*yes, we are thinking about coming to the Parliament and letting the Opposition and the Government have so much money.*" Let us do it that way. Why do we have all this manoeuvring and jiggery pokery? This is highly immoral and bad and it is bad for the morality of the country. That is why we have to go to Sri Lanka to bring people here.

Cde. Speaker, I would like to say a few words before...Cde. Speaker, this Head deals with a very important question and I would hope that there would be...on the matter between the Government and the Opposition if we are to move ahead in this country because I don't think this country can afford the reputation of what has happened in the past on the question of registration and elections.

When the Honourable Prime Minister was a Member of the Elections



Commission in 1968 when the matter came up about national registration – I speak subject to correction but I am sure I am correct. He said *“as a Member of the Commission that the national registration had nothing to do with the electoral rule because the Elections Commission which has a function under the Constitution including the conduct of elections beginning with registration was not involved”* and he told the Commission that registration will have nothing to do with the electoral rule but in the end subsequently the registration rule was obtained. What was the result in the 1968 elections, two films were made in England by...one was called... voters, they showed however, there was horses grazing in the pasture...this place was supposed to have been cleared for the railways since 1894.

One registration officer appeared in the TV. I forget his name. he said, *“I registered 41 votes in Wolverhampton but over 200 appeared.”* He was asked, *“how did that happen?”* he said, *“I don’t know how it happened but I am studying for law and I don’t want my business to be complicated.”* He is putting the record clear.

When the then High Commissioner in England, Lionel Luckhoo, was asked to appear in the second television film to explain these discrepancies, he effused and no doubt that is why he had to leave that post because whatever the faults of the Englishman, at least when you are caught he does not tolerate you any more. His Office, the High Commission Office, was obviously implicated in the fraud. National Registration became the voters’ list and when Granada Television totalled up the whole overseas vote of 48,000 and something, they said that less than half of that were really valid for they did research. The second film they called *“The Making of a Prime Minister”*. They showed it on the eve of the Prime Minister’s – then the President’s – visit to London. It won an award for television reporting.

Where are we going? We rigged it in 1968. We rigged it in 1973. We rigged the Referendum. We rigged the 1980 elections. Don’t we see where we are going, where the country is? It has to do with democracy and the rigging of elections. It has to do with people’s involvement. Instead of people getting involved, they are going away – skilled people. Wasted money! Now they are going to rig this one again. One million dollars to make propaganda for the P.N.C. That is why I ask: are you really serious about solving the problems in this country? Can they solve them? The evidence is there staring us in the face. Every year the country is going down and down. Ask the Prime Minister who is dealing with Planning and Development.

Where are we going? I said already that national registration should be a continuous exercise not limited to a certain period. More than that, it should not just be conducted by the Elections Commission, but Government and the Opposition. The Government party and the Opposition party should be brought into this exercise in order that we have fair elections.

Not only was overseas registration rigged. In the second film to which

I referred, "*The Making of a Prime Minister*", when the people wanted to come here to do research inside the country because it has been said that the overseas research was wrong, they cabled back "*no permission granted.*" They came in secretly with a box camera and in the second film they showed a house in Western Berbice. A man pointed to the house. He said a man voted from that house and he was hanged fifteen years ago. We are the laughing stock of the world. Those films were shown all over the world.

I showed you the connection right from the beginning that is why I started with the connection. I am thinking that with where we are going in this country, what is happening, what the implication of this registration can be if it is continued. As I said already, we have to go all the way to Sri Lanka to bring comrades. I don't say that they are not qualified.

Cde. Chairman, I want to say very seriously, please let us sit down and sort out all these questions because there are things that are causing loss of morale, disillusionment, exodus and everything else. We are too poor today. The comrade just spoke of police and transport in the Rupununi. The cattle population of one company in the Rupununi, the biggest there, has gone down to a quarter of what it used to be 20 years ago. Why? Ask them. I am saying that the police have no transport, rustling is going on. It is part of the general malaise in the country, the general crime which is a consequence. Therefore, let us sit down and find out how we can sort this question out in a fair and equitable way so that nobody can have any discussion about it. Let us set up a committee in this National Assembly with Government and Opposition to discuss what mechanism we can adopt in order to have a national registration so that everybody can be happy about it.

Cde. Speaker, I had the opportunity to intervene on this same question. I tried to get the Minister, I know he was very busy during the time with the visit of the Foreign Minister here of Cuba and not being able to get him, I wrote him a letter about the East Bank Demerara. Cde. Chairman, the people cannot get water, when I try to find out what exactly is the problem, it is either the electricity supply is burned out... I suggested to the Minister that while he can do nothing about the electricity works, he can have a sufficient number of pumps because I understand some of them are not good at all, they should be scrapped and I also suggested that perhaps through barter transactions when we are making counter-trade with different countries we put priority on this water question, for instance if you buy cement but a little less cement and buy pumps because clearly we have to make a decision of priority with water because water is more essential than cement. Cde. Chairman, water is the first essential of life and I appeal to the Government and the Minister – I am sure our socialist friend with them will help them out of this matter.

If they want me to put in a good word, I will put in a good word for them. Let us supply the people with water to cook, to bathe, to wash. It is a first essential. I hope that we will not have to speak in this National

Assembly again on this question, a priority one.

Cde. Speaker, Item 20, yes, Cde. Chairman. I am very perturbed about this fact because I understand the voted provision on this Head was \$2.75 million. Now we are seeking an additional supplementary provision of \$3,610,000. I would have thought that one had to be very careful about overseas visits and conferences. Rather, about making economies. We have the wages question. We were discussing a little while ago the water question. We were discussing just a few minutes ago the question about the hospital at Suddie. Incidentally on that story, people have collected materials and all have been stolen and gone. I am told that on this question certain visits are being made which are covered not necessarily for Government operations, but non-Governmental operations with respect to certain non-stable organizations with relation to the ruling party. When we want to tell people to tighten their belts we have to show them by example that we are trying to run this country in a most efficient way possible. Let me give an example of what I just read and I had it formulated in a question before the supplementary came. I read in the *Chronicle* that three Guyanese are going to Sri Lanka to look at lapidary operations. Cde. Chairman, three people are going all the way from here to Sri Lanka to look at those operations. It would have been cheaper to get a Sri Lankan to come here if we needed him. As I understand it in this case, since it is mentioned in the *Chronicle*, we have excellent people here. They do excellent work. It is not that they do not have the money, the equipment and the staff to carry on the work. A lot of foreign exchange can be earned in this area. We are going to waste foreign exchange now to send three Guyanese on a nice holiday all the way. Enjoy yourselves boys. Cde. Prime Minister, do something about this. People are crying out for help all over the place. Let us cut out this waste. That is why we are speaking about it. The T.U.C. sub-committee has said certain slashes should be made. Cde. Denny, Minister of Manpower, told the T.U.C. they cannot afford to send the T.U.C. to the Labour Conference and Cde. Pollydore of the T.U.C., General Secretary, said if you are not there every year you cannot follow what is going on. If you miss one year you cannot follow what went on the year before. Cde. Denny says you do not have any money. You do not have money for certain things but you have a lot of money when you want to send some people all over the place on some occasion which I will consider not necessarily in the interest of this country.

Therefore, we feel so strongly about this that is why we have written a deletion on this Head. We sent you a notice of this yesterday. We have now become a little ruthless. The Government must get down to brass tacks and stop. They must begin looking at the allowances which people get when they go overseas, allowances which are in some cases more than the monthly pay of the workers in this country. The daily allowance is more than the monthly pay. It is shameful and ridiculous. Therefore, I move the deletion of this Head from the Estimates.

Cde. Chairman, I do not want unnecessarily to delay the debate. I am a little confused on the question of the glass works. For instance, he did say that all that was necessary was the stand-by electricity to ensure a constant supply. We got the impression that everything was finished and that is all that is necessary. Then all of a sudden we hear the Koreans are coming to advise us on a number of things as if we are now doing the whole feasibility study. What are they advising on? As far as I understood it, the thing was ready to go. Two years ago it was ready and all we wanted was a sure supply of electricity. Now we have the Koreans here. Precisely what are they advising on? I assume that all the technical things were properly worked out, all the feasibility plans were already worked out?

## Financial Paper No. 3 of 1984

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde Speaker, this amount as you are aware – this has to do with the revision of wages and salaries and I would like to say that the sum voted is totally inadequate to meet the requirements of the situation in terms of the needs of the working people of Guyana and in terms of what it requires to live. We all know what a terrible time the people are going through today. The T.U.C. through its Economic Technical Committee gave figures and facts to show that in relation to the cost of living the minimum wage should be \$52.00 per day...and all that is being offered in order to make up this package is \$15.10 per day.

The question is that experience has shown that interim sometimes becomes binding and permanent and let us hope and pray that it will be as you say interim, although that word I understand has not been used. Our suspicions are that it will become permanent. This House not too long ago passed a Bill authorizing the T.U.C. to become the bargaining agents.

That situation, as brought about since then, has changed somewhat in the sense that when that Bill was passed and made into law the T.U.C. was under the control of the ruling party. A couple of months ago the situation was changed and that control is now no longer there and so the dialectics of the situation is that what was a useful instrument at one particular time has now become irresponsible. At that time it was responsible. Now it has become, all of sudden, irresponsible.

The Government is charging the T.U.C. with foot-dragging. The President has said – I am not a lawyer. I don't go in for semantics, splitting hairs. Let us face facts. What is the reference to, if not the T.U.C? Who was negotiating before? But you know what was wrong? They so manoeuvred the thing – the Government had made a decision of \$14.23 and no more, but they so manoeuvred it that announcement would be made before the Annual Conference otherwise they would have been thrown out lock, stock and barrel. They thought that they would have controlled the T.U.C. elections based on numbers on their side and what is regarded as the Opposition, the rebels. They would have still controlled and after that the foot-dragging would have ended and they would have announced the \$14.23 that is the scenario of what was intended. I am a realistic politician. We have to analyse everything that is going on. All of a sudden, as I say, the President comes along and says, "foot-dragging." The President of the T.U.C. put out a statement. They have not even put it in the *Guyana Chronicle*. That is the trouble in this country. The Government says so and it has to be so. The *Guyana Chronicle*, the radio stations and everybody have to keep silence. They do not put out the facts.

The fact of the matter is that the workers cannot live. In 1979 this same Government promised to pay \$14 a day and it said then that it will cost \$85

million. Now they are paying \$15.10 a day and they say it is going to cost \$80 million. I don't understand. When the \$14 a day and whatever else had to be paid was calculated, it would have cost \$85 million. Now is what they told us, that the Government could not afford \$85 million. Now they tell us the cost is \$80 million. Let us leave that aside because there is probably some discrepancy. It is inconsistent but it does not seem to mesh unless something happened that I am not aware of. Maybe it is because of the retrenchment and some people were knocked off – one-third of the labour force at Linden. Maybe that is why the wage bill at \$15.10 a day is lower than it was at \$14 a day.

Be that as it may, the question about which I am concerned is this: these people are being called "*irresponsible*". Note that they accepted the point at which the old T.U.C. left off. Their bargaining position was at \$25. These people said, "*all right, we will honour that and negotiate from there in a nucleus.*" In other words, they showed that they were reasonable because, as I said, the factual, scientific point was \$52 a day. We are told now that if the Government had to pay \$25 a day it would cost \$600 to \$700 million. On the other hand, we understand figures given by Professor Clive Thomas. Cde. Clive Thomas gave the figure of \$275 million and if direct and indirect taxation is taken out of that, about \$100 million would be recovered by the Government, so that the total wage bill would only be \$175 million.

One has to consider this from an economic point of view. Several years ago Pat Thompson said that what is affecting production and productivity in this country is the low morale. This was before he packed up and went off and gave my friend over there a big job and now he is promoted further. Morale is very low now and if you give the people only \$15.10 a day – as somebody said, the increase will not even buy a pint of cooking oil. One pint of coconut oil in the Bourda Market is sold for \$17.50. Look where they have brought agriculture.

We have been saying in this Assembly all along that what you want to do is to get more revenue for the Government and not from penalizing the workers, but from increased production and productivity. Not only will our revenues increase to balance the Budget and satisfy the people's needs, social services and so on, but we will export more and earn the foreign exchange to buy all the things which we want from outside and don't have now. So we are, as the Foreign Minister said, *ad idem*. The question is "*How?*"

We now come to practicalities: How to get this money to give the workers a minimum wage which is not at starvation level or even halfway starvation level. We must try to tell the people in this Assembly and, through G.A.W.U., the T.U.C. The Government put it to the T.U.C. "*Tell us where to find the money.*" We have always said it here that the first thing is to cut out the extravagances.

Judicious rationalization, call it what you will. We have been talking all day about it. I don't want to cut off the Minister of Foreign Affairs. He is a

nice fellow, but he has too much of a bureaucratic apparatus, all over the world. We don't need it. I want to cut off his vote, not his head. That is just one example. You can make a lot of savings at the Ministry of National Development.

The second point is the question of the debts. We have said that you are now in a vicious circle, that is, if you don't produce, you don't earn foreign exchange and you don't get foreign exchange, you don't get the wherewithal to increase production. And every year we are going down. So we have to do something about this debt problem which over and over I have been talking about. I have been talking about the debt problem for more than a generation. I made the first speech on this question at E.C.L.A. in 1981 and I was reading this speech the other day and I was talking of this debt problem, now becoming a global problem. The percentage of our revenue that was supposed to pay debts last year was 92. Our debt payments are using 42 percent of our meagre foreign earnings. Now is the time when we have to take revolutionary steps. This is what we told you through our unions, the T.U.C. You asked where to find the money. We said, all right, follow Bolivia. This is a working-class Government. They are faced with the same problem. Many countries are faced with the same problems like Guyana.

Many countries met in Columbia and they passed a resolution that the foreign debt payments should not be more than 25 percent of foreign earnings. But the Bolivians went a little further because they have commenced a working class movement. The Trade Union Movement is controlled by the left and when the revolutionary Democratic Government was... when the rightist elements, the workers, went on a general strike and had him released. On the other hand, when the President was weakening to go and sign the other I.M.F. agreement, the workers went on strike and caused the Government to postpone the...for four years. They have increased wages, indexation of wages for cost of living and they have workers' control, what Denny has not yet received. They have the majority in the Boards or whatever you want to call it. They have achieved it Denny. You must take a trip there and see how they are doing it.

You see what is happening with Chile? You want that to happen here? They will seize all our stuff. Years ago we said here when they did not want to pay \$14 a day, that if it is a choice of telling the workers we do not have let us make the revolutionary choice and tell the big boys they have to wait, we have to pay the workers \$14 a day. If we had done that we would not be where we are today. Let us face the facts. We are worse off despite all the I.M.F. help and all the US aid. In that period 37 percent of US aid was given in that period. So generous they were to this Government and all of that has come to zero.

Cde. Chairman, I appeal to the comrades on the other side. We do not have the Allende situation in this country. Allende had no control of the State apparatus, he did not have control of the military. You have it. Allende



had an Opposition in Parliament which was bigger than his party and they were right of him, pulling him down. In this country you are fortunate in that you have the P.P.P. in the Opposition. Therefore, imperialism has not got the same options that they had in Chile. Secondly, I am telling these comrades here, unity in this country and the solution of our problems is not going to come by talk here. It will bring unity beyond the Government, and the state will be strengthened. But you are penalizing the workers every day. Today, Cde. Denny, with \$15.10, you can buy one pint of cooking oil with that whole daily wage. How do you expect that we can motivate workers in this country to produce? You cannot. You know when you go in the hospital with a broken backbone sometimes they put steel in there. Put some steel in your political backbone and let us not only talk of anti-imperialism. Let us show it. I sent a Motion to Cde. Rashleigh Jackson, the same one that was passed in the T.U.C. We are going to him, we want unity.

Cde. Chairman, I am telling them to take a revolutionary course. They will have our backing. Let us fight them now and let us fight them and give the workers benefits. They do not want much, they want just little things like soap and cooking oil. We have good conditions in this country. Reagan won again and we know what he is, but he does not have all the cards. I want to tell the comrades that this is not going to work. Do not just tell the people you do not have money and they must tell you how to find the money. We can tell you on behalf of the working-class, but you have to take the political position and with us not only deciding to take a firm decision against imperialism but to make all the necessary legislation which may be necessary to find and anticipate attacks of imperialism. We do not see this amount which is being paid now to solve anything in this country...is in your hands, you are in the driver's seat, you have to make up your mind, we have been saying this since 1979...if the...can do it why can't we and we will get the imperial backing of the whole of Latin America because of course their Governments are not socialist oriented, they are not socialist. Some of them are...Governments but still they are talking against imperialism, they say we must not be granted 28 percent of our foreign earnings, we are paying 42 percent, that is the figure you gave us – 42 percent as foreign debt payment a few years ago...and so we would like our comrades to not only look at this thing from the point of view while they have the power to discuss them right here, this is the place to have dialogue.

Cde. Chairman, I just want to give the figures because the comrade in speaking seemed to say that I am confused about the figures and I am wrong or rather that I said that the debt payment in relation to revenue is 92 percent. Last year the revenue was \$566 million and the debt payments were \$521 million. Therefore, that is equivalent of 92 percent of current revenue. There is no confusion there. Secondly, the debt service ratio, foreign debt payments in relation to foreign earnings. I said that in the Budget State-



ment this year he said it was 42 percent. That is what I am quoting from. Forty two percent debt/service ratio. Where is the confusion? Maybe he can tell me whether his Budget was wrong because that is where we got the 42 percent. He forgot to mention that he gave us 18 percent and whatever increase and he forgot to tell us that sugar and bauxite, the two major industries in the country, will get a 10 percent increase only.

## **Motion: Seizure of Unaccustomed Goods: 22<sup>nd</sup> November, 1984**

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, this Motion has come to the Assembly out of concern for legitimate traders and against the high-handed action of the police on the wanton seizure of goods without proper checks. In our view the rule of law is being violated. On this question we would like to make our position very clear. I do not think anybody in this country can be in favour of smuggling and evasion of Customs Duties and taxation and so on. However, we submit that the Government is going about their own way in combating the smuggling on the parallel market. It is attempting to deal with effect and not cause. The fact is that the Government has helped to create the parallel market by failure to import sufficient quantities of food and commodities to meet the basic needs of the people.

We know as a fact there was no parallel market before. In the early days there were lines at Government stores and so on and we know people sued to faint. All those lines have disappeared and they had to go to the parallel market. It arose out of that question and that is why I am saying first the failure to import sufficient quantities of food and commodities to meet the basic needs of the people.

Secondly, failure to institute a fair means of distribution in this country and so you have some people who are let out and we are now dealing with basic essentials. They have to obviously go to the parallel market.

Let us deal with cooking oil. You cannot tell people to do without cooking oil and soap. These are essential supplies. The Guyanese people support the parallel market because the official importation system and distribution system has almost collapsed. This is not mainly due to smuggling of commodities out of the country, but primarily to the collapse of production and the drop in exportation because of the drop in production. The meagre foreign earnings from exports out of which 83 percent is taken up for payments of external debts and mineral oil, 42 percent is for servicing the foreign debt and 41 percent is for the payment of oil. There are the figures we got from the Minister's Budget statement. Consequently, there is very little foreign exchange left to import the basic food items; clothing, housing materials and so on and the raw materials, the spare parts and the machinery for production.

I think we have to recognize these basis facts, if the State cannot supply basic needs the people will support the parallel market. What can they do? You cannot go and tell the man out there you do not need soap and you do not need milk for the children. Incidentally, even state stores purchase from the parallel market. I do not know if the Minister knows this. The state itself is involved in illicit trading with Brazil. They take Guyanese dollars to Brazil and bring back goods. Is that normal trade with Guyana dollars in Brazil? I am just telling you how it is put. Perhaps if you have

other information that is an agreement with the State and you pay the State of Brazil in local currency and they are facilitating you with goods, very good. Pay them more Guyanese dollars. The fact of the matter is, as I understand it, that you take suitcases full of Guyana dollars and you buy from the shops over there like anybody else and then you bring those goods in and the man who has the Guyana dollars over there buys gold and cattle and carries them over the river. You are officially in illicit trading and you are blaming everybody and locking them up. You must lock up yourself too. My forefathers did not come from England and I was not educated at Oxford and Cambridge. I do not split hairs like you. I am talking in a way that the ordinary man can comprehend. Do not worry with verbs and adjectives.

Second fact we must note Cde. Speaker, is that we have a dissatisfied population. Smuggling cannot be stopped, you cannot stop it – this coast is too wide. Our borders are too big and you do not have the police patrols to stop it or the security apparatus to stop it. If the people are not with you, you cannot stop smuggling. If you had a case like in Cuba naturally they will stop smuggling but if they stop it here they will stop the whole country. Cde. Speaker, you must also understand that the consumers, the working people must have basic essentials, therefore if you are not providing them and the smugglers are providing them they will get it, they will go for it because they have to have it.

Cde. Speaker, you will recall the Minister put this note in his Budget speech earlier this year. The parallel market business – he said it must be stopped because people are smuggling out goods and they are bringing in whatever kind of goods they want, while if they Government were exporting the goods they will have the foreign exchange and they will bring production...as they put it simply, if I get the logic of the argument. Production he said, if we put priority on production then we will increase production and then we will export more and bring more goods in the country and satisfy the needs of the people – that is the argument. They are only dealing with one thing, that is why I start with saying you are dealing with food, not cost and therefore you are not going to solve the problem because you will not be able to stop smuggling. That is the point I am making.

Cde. Speaker, I am saying that if the Government does not get this point settled the whole thing will not be looked at in totality. I was going on to the next point to say there are certain businesses of production and productivity that must be removed also. It is not simply a foreign exchange problem that we have...

Let me come directly to the question you are talking about, if you want it that way. I have a draft to that that is why I ...anyway I will come to your point. Firstly, there should be rules as to how police must behave and secondly, they are not to work in carrying out their police functions using patrol methods. What are they charging the people for – for having goods

which have not come into the country legally perhaps or have been smuggled in and therefore tied in with... The point is that they have paid custom duties. Many of these people are people who are hustling to make a living. Many of them have been unemployed, have been dismissed and they have to earn a living. We already know we have a very high unemployment rate in the country, long before the parallel market and in recent times, the State has been putting people out of work. What are they to do? The parallel market is not only developing here but all over the wide world. Everywhere you go even in the developed capitalist countries because of the rate of unemployment. Now you want to stop it at this point. I am saying that we have to look at the gist of the whole thing. If you try to deal with it in a way where the people are selling goods on the parallel market and that from the Government's point of view it is not helping this country then put it to law.

People come to us when all their things were seized. The Government was saying that these things come in illegally. So we asked them; "*You did not pay customs duties?*" They kept them for quite a few days. And I asked, "*Where are your slips?*" All of them had bundles of slips. We are not saying that you must not do your duty as a police force, but if you are saying that this man has smuggled goods or has unaccustomed goods, ask him to show proof that it is not so and then, if he does not have the proof, and if you say he has unaccustomed goods, then seize them. If you want, take them. That is right. You are acting within the law, But they did not do that. That is your right. you are acting within the law, but they did not do that. They just brought everything, dumped them into bags and lifted them away. Comrades, you don't have knowledge only by being there. Knowledge does not only come by being present.

I prefaced my remarks by saying that no one would be in favour of smuggling but you have to face the realities of the country and if you fight crime by doing as some people are doing in the Muslim world – cutting off people's hands, cutting off their ears and so on – it is shown historically that is no answer to the question, it is no solution to the problem. That is what you are trying to do here on this level of smuggling. It is an aspect of increasing crime in the country. I am saying that the Government is using arbitrary measures, the police are using arbitrary measures, contrary to the rule of law and this big stick method is not going to help. That is our point. It is only going to create more dissatisfaction in this country, but if you want to do it that way and create further alienation, all right, it is up to you.

I have some suggestions to make because I relate this question, as I was saying before, to production and distribution. Take steps to remove the bottlenecks to production and productivity. We are going to get more foreign exchange not only by stopping what is being smuggled out. As I said already, you are not going to be able to stop that unless you get the people on the ground supporting you. You can check as many as you want on the streets, but it is still going to come in and it is still going to be distributed.

You can have the whole country become a policeman and you will not have the people with you. Therefore I say that you can have your foreign exchange and so on also by removing the bottlenecks to production and productivity which I have cited here. Productivity and production will be assured only with comprehensive programmes and policies embracing democracy at all levels.

I close now by saying:

1. Take steps to remove the bottlenecks to production and productivity;
2. Set up a Select Committee of this Assembly to examine comprehensively the importation and distribution of food and other commodities and the disposal of seized goods.

I am raising this question because some private people are getting very rich out of the Government's seized goods and therefore we must put a stop to that and see that whatever is seized is going back to the people properly. Let us see that the police do not seize goods which are covered by proper documents.

Those are basically the points. I know the Government has thought about this. In the presentation of the Budget it was dealt with in a comprehensive way. The three points are interlinked and therefore we would like to have the Government, either here or outside of this Assembly, meet with us to discuss these questions so that we can have more harmony in this society and achieve our aim, that is, to make more goods available to the people so that we do not have to harass people all over the place and break the law in so doing.

Cde. Chairman, I am glad that our Cde. Collymore put the matter very, very succinctly about what we are talking. I told you that life is not just a straight road. It is a complex road. You have to go around in bends and turns. Cde. Speaker, I know of my own experience with the police. After the last election they seized one of our vehicles and took it away. I went to the police in Brickdam...

I am saying, from my personal experience that this behaviour that happened this past week is a habit with the police, a habit I witnessed personally where people are beaten up in the police lock up, where a vehicle went with a loud speaker and it cannot be accounted for. That is what we are talking about in this Parliament, deny it. We are talking about smugglers because it is related to this question. They want to catch everybody, grab everybody. If you want to do that – as you said this is a violating law and the Minister did not answer to that point.

So I am asking you and the Comrades on the Government benches and so on to deal with this question and order the Commissioner of Police and Customs – give directions that they have the right to seize what is illegal but they have no right to seize what is legal...

Cde. Speaker, I am asking the comrades to get in touch tomorrow with the Commissioner of Police and the Customs because when we talk about the police they send us to customs, when we talk about customs they send us to the police. It would appear as if ordinary people are getting pushed around. I know of a personal case – the man was a security guard and the man left the job.

I am appealing to them, to the Government to give back the people their goods when they have their documents. We are saying if the people have the proper documentation of what was seized they must be given back their goods. If you suspect a man – okay, you have come to the knowledge that a man is smuggling goods and he is doing it for certain and he is caught and he does not have the documents to show... we are saying that this thing is being done indiscriminately. They seize the things and take it away and sometimes the next day you can see a policeman wearing the same things. You are laughing – it is a fact of life. By law, you have a right to seize illegal goods ... and therefore we are asking that the Minister give direction quickly to release those poor people's goods and he must also give direction as to how they must seize. I am dealing with a case right now – a man was on the list to make salt fish and when he went to the man who is dealing with this salt fish business he was told to go back to the... to be put on the list.

I am saying when they seize and sell they must sell in much a way that everybody must get. It must not go into the hands of the P.N.C. There are some people who are being protected and they are allowed to buy everything and they are becoming multimillionaires. They are getting protection from the police and from the State. They are getting protection and that is what we are talking about. We feel that whatever is to be sold – there should be a proper system of distribution that is why I said we should meet with the party concerned and set up a Parliamentary Committee to deal with this question because a lot of wrong things are being done. Ministers are going all over the place selling things to party areas... right now we want to make progress in this country. That is all I have to say.

## Motion - Condemnation of Hostilities against Nicaragua

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, we are here discussing what I consider to be a very crucial matter, not only with respect to the people and Government of Nicaragua but with respect to the whole region, indeed, I would say, to the whole world. What we are witnessing is an attempt by various means to overthrow a popular Government, a revolutionary Government, which now serves the people of Nicaragua. US imperialism is trying to repeat what it has done in the past in this hemisphere, what is trying to do in other parts of the world, to turn back... history, indeed, to do what it did in the early part of this century in that very same country. Having created a break away from Colombia to make the state of Panama, some of the sharks in the United States thought they should have an alternate site to the Panama Canal and Nicaragua was thought as one place. Imperialists then created all kinds of manoeuvres to inveigle the progressive Government of the day to surrender its sovereignty, to cede sovereignty of a particular part of the country apart from, in a general way, surrendering sovereignty so that another site would be available for a canal in case anything were to happen in the Panama Canal zone.

When we were discussing Grenada here a year ago the Foreign Minister quoted from a book "*The Shark and the Sardines*." In this book the author, who himself was a President elected by the people and subsequently a colleague of his was overthrown in 1954 by the C.I.A., wrote that a patriot, President Zelaya, refused to yield to the pressures of Yankee imperialism to concede generalized sovereignty and a specific portion of the territory. His Government was overthrown by a similar kind of thing which is now taking place against the Sandinista Government.

In this book, "*The Shark and the Sardines*", reference is made to a treaty which was made with the puppet Government and, with your permission, Cde. Speaker, I would just like to read a section of that. This is Elihu Root who was Secretary of State of the Empire, as Juan Jose Arevalo puts it. I am reading just a part of what he said:

*"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.'*

*And further on I have read in the same report the statement that those who oppose that 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...?"*

I do not want to read the rest.

When there was a progressive senator from the same place, Mondale he came from, Minnesota, Senator Borah. This is what he said. I quote:

*“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”*

Cde. Speaker, that traitor named Chamorro. One of them is now a contra-revolutionary C.I.A. financed and ....agent of imperialism. It seems it is all in the blood, although you give them credit. A section of that family has taken a revolutionary turn and has supported the Sandinista Government. So there you have it, that period which was called the period of the big stick where the marines landed all over the place and became the official receivers of the revenues of those countries to make sure that whatever loans were made were collected, whatever happened to the people.

I recall in that same debate on Grenada Cde. Jackson quoted from an article by a Major-General who was then for many years in charge of the marines. His name was Smedley Butler. Just to remind comrades again, I would like to read it from the paper I wrote, *“The Caribbean Basin as a Zone of Peace”* which was presented in Mexico. It states:

*“I spent 33 years and 4 months in active service as a member of our country’s most agile military forces – the Marine Corps. I served in all commissioned ranks from a second lieutenant to a major-general. And during that period I spent most of my time being a high-class muscle man for big business, for Wall Street, and for the bankers. In short, I was a racketeer for capitalism.*

*Thus I helped to make Mexico and especially Tampico safe for American oil interests in 1914. I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent place for the National City Bank boys to collect revenues in...I helped purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Bros. in 1909-12. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for American sugar interests in 1916. I helped make Honduras ‘right’ for American fruit companies in 1923. In China in 1927 I helped see to it that Standard Oil went its way unmolested.*

*During those years I had, as the boys in the backroom would say, a swell racket. I was rewarded with honours, medals, promotions. Looking back on it, I feel I might have given Al Capone a few hints. The best he could do was to operate his racket in three city districts. We marines operated on three continents.”*

Today, on the grounds of defending its vial interest the marines are also operating around the globe because every single area of the world now, every single region, is regarded by the Reagan administration as the region of vital interest. Cde. Speaker, we must see what is happening in Nicaragua as part and parcel of our struggle because the misery of the people in Central America, particularly and more in general in Latin



America as a whole and now gripping the Caribbean where Latin Americanising process is going on, is due to the fact of American economic, political and military domination of more than a century. Because of the gains which have been made by the Sandinista revolution and the Grenada revolution which opened a new era in the late 1970s, after the heavy hand of imperialism struck in Guyana, in the Dominican Republic, in Chile, in Bolivia – this was a new wave, a revolutionary wave – Carter in his last year and a half began to out-talk the hawks and he wanted to send in the marines around June, 1979 on the eve of the success of the Sandinista revolution. Fortunately, eight Latin American countries in the O.A.S., which is a weapon to imperialism, objected; five which make up the Andean Pact countries and three in Central America, including Mexico. So the Nicaraguan people were spared from the kind of marine landing which was endemic in the earlier part of the century in this area and where companies like the United Fruit Company became to Central America what Bookers was to Guyana. In other words, owned and controlled everything.

It is against this kind of battle and perpetration which imperialism has set up that the liberation forces began to fight and even from the very military that was set up by the public regime for the patriot...broke away from the army and became a guerilla in 1926. However, unfortunately, he was caught 10 years later and assassinated by the butcher Somoza, the father of the one who was overthrown in 1979.

Cde. Speaker, the people had to go through a long era of suffering and sacrifice. Finally, to liberate themselves from the second Somoza, a man who was not only brutal but corrupt – then the capital of Nicaragua, Managua, was destroyed by a hurricane. Instead of giving aid to the people he kept it for himself. In fact, unlike some other areas of Latin America where you had bourgeois Governments taking place with landlords and so on, here you have concentrated on one man everything; real estate, landed property, factories. Everything belonged to Somoza and as a result of that all sections united against him. This is why the popular Sandinista revolution succeeded because there was a broad liberation force. This is what Reagan is now calling, trying to pull some shots, to destroy him.

We hear a lot about democracy and so on. Restore freedom in Nicaragua. But we do not hear Reagan talking about freedom in Pakistan where they support a corrupt dictator who murdered a leader of the Opposition. He said Nicaragua is supporting the revolution in El Salvador.

In El Salvador what is Reagan doing? In Pakistan – openly financing counter revolutionaries in Afghanistan. Openly, at least if the Sandinistas are supporting the revolutionaries in El Salvador or wherever at least they are in the side of history because the United States itself, when it got liberated Frenchmen, the French Government helped the thirteen colonies. 7/8 of their arms came from France openly and a famous French General named General... to me in the United States, he and the whole State of France backed the American revolution yet Reagan is now calling all revolution-

aries terrorists and he is now employing state terrorism to destroy state revolutionaries.

One great President of the United States Roosevelt said once that Samozza was 'a son of a bitch' but he is our 'son of a bitch' and so Reagan and company want to bring back the son of a bitches again but we must see that if they bring them back in Nicaragua – it is not only Nicaragua, it is going to be all over in this hemisphere particularly and therefore we have to see this battle going on there as our battle too.

Cde. Speaker, openly nineteen million, twenty one million dollars are being given to these counter revolutionaries who are linked with Samozza – openly. They are being trained contrary to American law in United States territory where... itself and we saw and... the C.I.A. document. Only last week I was looking at television news where they talked about this book which was published instead of a manual of the C.I.A. where they are showing people how to commit torture and everything else including murder.

Cde. Speaker, I was given yesterday a document about the Assistant Secretary of State, United States for Inter-American Conference and he said that the Nicaraguans are doing what the Cubans have done, what they call 'Sandback theory' – that is they cannot solve their big economic problems, they are constantly projecting that United States is invading them. Cde. Speaker is it not fact that in the case of Cuba, the C.I.A. did invade – that is history. I have a book here written by a C.I.A. agent who left the C.I.A. This one is called "*The C.I.A. and the Cult of Intelligence*" by Victor Marchetti and John D. Marks. Before they had to publish this book the C.I.A. had to get it out and passages and passages are deleted. You see sections of it and a whole page is deleted. Let me just read this part about Cuba and the role that Nicaragua played because we are told now that Nicaragua is exporting revolution but see what they did when America and these puppets had control of Nicaragua. I am reading from page 110:

*"Large-scale paramilitary operations also necessitated special training bases for the mercenaries. For the 1954 Guatemalan invasion, the C.I.A. built installations in Nicaragua and Honduras. For the 1961 attack at the Bay of Pigs, sites were established again in Nicaragua and this time also in Guatemala, which had become available to the C.I.A. as a result of its success there seven years earlier DELETED constructed large support facilities in Northeast India and gave DELETED the guerrillas at a deserted army base in the mountains".*

It does not make sense. That is why when the new Prime Minister talked about conspiracy to murder his mother Indira Gandhi, we can see the roots of it mentioned here in this book. So it is not only Nicaragua who is on the battle front now. American imperialism is fighting all over the world. The Middle East, in Southern Africa, in the heart of Africa, in the East, everywhere and we have to see this because more than that we have the danger of a nuclear war.

Cde. Speaker, the Reagan Administration attacked the Nicaraguan Government that they are not holding elections, they are not democratic. Secondly, they said that they are exporting revolution and supplying guns to El Salvador. Commentary on the air last night on American television said up to now that all the surveys done recently show that four C.I.A. men were killed when the revolutionaries claimed or at least they claim they have brought down the helicopter in El Salvadorian territory and they said with all of them...side talking about the C.I.A. they have not been able yet to show that Nicaragua are supplying guns with all the equipment but nevertheless they continue to be a party, they are not holding elections, that they do not want to sign the Contadora Peace Plan. The Nicaraguans hold elections and were prepared and not only prepared but said they are going to sign the Contadora Peace Plan.

What happened? When the elections began to come around and no doubt American Intelligence and those who are there – I spoke yesterday to the Editor of the *Caribbean Contact*, the new Editor. He told me he was there and he saw everything and he can testify anywhere that it was free and fair. I spoke to ... and she wrote to him and said that it was amazing to see in the campaigning how big crowds were going to the Sandinistas meeting and the other meeting that hardly had anybody. This is a test of the popularity of this revolution. In other words the people, let us face it Reagan talks about democracy but if you can win in your armed struggle against the United States army who was armed to the teeth ... prima facie but let us... that you have universal support in your country.

That was manifested in recent elections when 80 percent of the people turned out to vote and nearly 70 percent of them supported the Sandinistas. Compare that with the mighty United States where there has just been an election. 51 percent turned out to vote as against 80 percent in Nicaragua, a drop from the last election by 1½ percent, a drop, despite the big campaigning. Of that 51 percent that turned out to vote Reagan got about 58 or 59 percent. Count how many votes he got and compare that with the Nicaraguans and see what a popular revolution we are talking about.

It is clear that the United States sees the battle in ideological terms. It is fighting communism as in the case of Grenada. Grenada, under Bishop, was exporting the Marxist virus and since communism is evil, since the Soviet Union is an evil empire, you must destroy it, root and branch. Reagan said that Cuba, Nicaragua and Haiti are agents of an evil empire in this hemisphere and so destroy them all.

The United States has no justification for talking about lack of democracy in Nicaragua. As I said, the Sandinistas called their bluff and held elections. The question of the Contadora Peace Plan – at first the Reagan administration said that the Sandinistas would not sign and when they went ahead and signed, the United States and its puppets in the region decided that they would not sign. They wanted changes. So it is very important that our country and the people and this Parliament speak out

very strongly against these threats of intervention, because US imperialism wants to repeat what it did in Grenada. Fortunately, when the United States invaded Grenada even its own allies, the N.A.T.O. alliance, like Margaret Thatcher in England... in West Germany, Trudeau in Canada, came out strongly and condemned the aggression. No doubt it was planning a repeat operation. Apart from the open criticisms which were made by the new Prime Minister of India, by the past President of Venezuela, who is a Vice-President of the Socialist International, there were open declarations condemning the intended attack.

There may have been, I have no doubt, other oppositions coming to Reagan's plans, the American plans, probably through diplomatic channels. I am happy to see over the last few days that tempers seem to have cooled down but the Americans are trying to exploit this by saying that the Sandinistas are only trying to build up the scars; they have no intention; they only do this to work up the people so that State control cannot satisfy the people. That is the argument that the Americans through the Inter-American Secretary of State are putting out, that State control of the economy is no good; it cannot help the people and therefore the regime has to use these blandishments, "*US is attacking*" whereas we are not attacking.

Back to the matter:- Even in their own camp fortunately people are now opposing the Reagan Government. Another excuse they have given is that the Soviet Union is bringing to the region sophisticated military planes, apart from other weapons.

Cde. Speaker, we know the argument they had in Grenada about the airport, how it was going to be a military airport. The irony of it is that the American military who used the airport to carry out their aggression, and now occupy it, have made it into a military airport which was not the intention of Bishop. Similarly, they are now using the scapegoat of Soviet presence in this area to decentralize Central America. Every schoolboy knows that the United States is threatening this country and this popular revolution.

What are they to do? In the United Nations Charter there are clear sentiments expressed that every nation has a right to self-defence and we must thank the Lord that there is a country like the Soviet Union which can give weapons because while we want South-South cooperation, as many are saying, they do not have the weapons which were so instrumental in finding a solution. In Lebanon and the Middle East, because the Americans wanted in the Middle East to do a similar thing – to impose their will by military means, but they were defeated in a military battle ground because behind it the Arabs were in Syria and behind Syria was the Soviet Union. In that aggression, in that battle, the American and the Israelis was supporting the minority Christians who are the bourgeois elements in the country. They were also involved, as we know, with the slaughter of Arabs in those two camps in that period when Israeli occupation took place. So, as I say, we have to be thankful that there is such a country as the Soviet Un-

ion. Those who are in the firing line know that help comes at at decisive times, especially when you came to defending your independence and sovereignty.

Cde. Speaker, we cannot stand still on this question. They are our brothers in the firing line. Their sovereignty is not only threatened. Our sovereignty indirectly is threatened. When freedom is destroyed anywhere, or threatened, all people's freedom is threatened.

I am glad that we can speak on this one question with one voice in this House. Let us continue on this level. If we ever reach a point on national questions and international questions, let us agree to constantly put up a united front against imperialism because imperialism is the No. 1 enemy of mankind and we have not only to unite ourselves at party level here, but to mobilize Guyanese people to lend support and solidarity to the people of Nicaragua. Everyday life is becoming harder for them. When the people should be picking their coffee, they have to be in Managua to dig trenches instead of picking coffee and then the Americans talk their nonsense about stand-by, when they are working every day to wreck the economy.

Cde. Speaker, on that note I close and I commend this Motion not only to the Members of this Assembly but to the people of Guyana to give full support to the Sandinista revolution and, if necessary, we must pledge to go there and help them to fight. This should be the pledge of this Parliament.

## Budget Debate: 30<sup>th</sup> January, 1985

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, we have had a very wide-ranging debate in this Assembly. From the Opposition, a blistering expose of all the shortcomings in our country, all deficiencies, the declining standards of living of the working people, the services are collapsing at practically all levels and social welfare is becoming something of an abstraction. I regret to say that from the Government side we had the same old story even at this late hour. Their speeches tended to give the impression that we are not speaking of Guyana, we are speaking about some dream world - business as usual; everything is okay; we are doing all alright. All the indicators point to collapse and bankruptcy. Be they financial indicators, be they welfare indicators, they all point to that.

We had three agreements made with the I.M.F. and because of the failure to get financial and other ceilings, the agreements collapsed on each occasion. I am not talking about the relative merits and demerits of the I.M.F. Our position on that is well known. We advised, we urged, we fought not to go to that road but they went anyway. I am talking about indicators. They have not been able with all the help they got to meet those financial and other ceilings. If we take one indicator then we will see where those financial and other ceilings are. If we take one indicator then we will see where this country is going. We will only take one and forget all the rest. I refer to the debt payments. In 1964 when they came into power, the country was in a healthy financial position. Yes, laugh, the budget deficit was \$4 million in spite of the turmoil which they created. There was a balanced budget. Social services were not in the situation where they are today. Goods were plentiful so much so that the President, the then Leader of the Opposition at a debate in 1961 said when the People's National Congress get in they will be giving free milk and cassava for everyone. So plentiful was milk and cassava that he wanted to make it free. It was practically free. So what about the debt payments then? They inherited a sound situation financially; debt payments were only \$10 million out of revenue of \$76 million. In other words 15 percent of the revenue went to debt payments.

What is the position now Cde. Speaker? How many times have I not talked about all the money that came here? We had the I.M.F., World Bank, Britain, Canada and from all over the place. Now we are up to our necks in debt. The proportion of debt payments is climbing every year. The Minister tells us we are using wrong indices. We can use his own. I am practically relating to Guyana in relation to how much we are collecting from people not from production, because production is steadily going down so much so that this country is not producing in the three main sectors of the economy that it produced in 1964. Sugar is now half the amount. They should have produced more according to their declaration. In 1980 rice

exports were 101,000 tons. They are boasting how it increased last year to 60,000 tons as against 301,000 tons the previous year, and despite all the loans there is no recovery. We are sinking and indeed there is further decline because that is no recovery. We are sinking and indeed there is further decline because what they borrowed they have now to pay from \$10 million in 1964, last year it was \$699 million and of the current revenue, it is only \$600 million. I ask anybody in this Assembly and the gallery whether anybody can make a go of life if you are collecting \$600 million and you have to pay out in debts alone of \$699 million. I am not going to go into the other entire figure. The debt payments as far as our exchange is concerned, last year what we paid out was 42 percent. He did not tell us what it was in 1983 maybe he is afraid to tell us. So Comrades we heard about welfare and development.

I would like to say I do not argue which one is first and which one is second. I want to say that it is inexplicably linked, dialectically linked. If you do not have welfare then people who are alienated every day become more and more dissatisfied. They will never produce, they will never develop and if you do not have development, welfare will obviously suffer. And if we have no development, no economic development well, consequently there will be no progress in this country. What are we going to do about it? I spoke to some of the Ministers and they say everything is going fine. Cde. Corrica told us we have all the food here. We have no food storage. Okay, there is no food storage, thanks to the production of the Guyanese farmers. But go and look at the quality of rice consumers have to eat. Maybe the Ministers in Parliament do not have to worry about that. But you see, Cde. Speaker, broken, discoloured, hog feed. The people have to eat pig feed and he is saying we have plenty of food. We must not only have plenty of food, it must be within the ability of the people to buy it. You can have plenty of food, in the capitalist countries food is plenty but people are dying of starvation and suffering from malnutrition. Let Corrica and the others tell us what the working wage is? \$14 a day. Was that paid in 1979? The T.U.C. Technical Committee gave statistics year after year. What was the main wage based on? What of the agreement made by the T.U.C. from 1977 to 1979? And they came to the conclusion that last year wages should have been \$52 based on the rise in cost of living.

Cde. Speaker, if that is the salary the workers are supposed to get – we are not now talking of socialism, we are talking where workers get free services, subsidized food and all sorts of subsidized things. We are talking of even capitalist countries like Brazil and Israel where they have wages indexed to cost of living. They do not want to do it here. The Government absolutely refuses to index wages to cost of living. All they are telling us is that we have plenty of food. Do the workers have the ability to find the food?

I read in the *Chronicle* yesterday that in the Soviet Union real wages went up to 9 percent in the last 4 years. I read also, not in the *Chronicle*,



where the prices of certain luxuries were reduced. Prices for basic essentials were not increased for the last 29 years in the Soviet Union. That is socialism.

They tell us about plenty of food. What is the price of milk? It was to be free milk and cassava. There the price of milk is 30 cents; one litre of condensed milk is 31 cents. Here it is \$1.50 a pint if you can get it from the Pasteurization Plant according to a release two weeks ago in the *Sunday Chronicle*. In socialist Cuba, one litre, 1 3/4 pints of milk, is 30 cents, one litres of condensed milk is 31 cents. Here it is \$1.50 a pint if you can get it from the Pasteurization Plant. Outside in the street the vendors sell it for much more. When I went to Dental School I was told that a child must have two pints, a quart, of milk per day to have healthy development of bone structure and teeth.

Calcium, Yes. Tell me what calcium they are getting from the food you are giving them in Guyana? Cuba, 25 years after the Revolution, can give the people not only milk at that price, but bread is cheap. Cuba does not produce wheat but they give the people bread, a big loaf, for 10 cents. Now they are telling us that to want bread is a colonial mentality. Who brought the flour mill here, who brought it but they themselves? Who brought the cassava mill and said they are going to make cassava flour and mix it with wheaten flour? Who brought it? You heard Cde. Basir say the mill is not working because there is no cassava and yet the Comrade said we have plenty of food in the country.

What is the price of cassava, plantain, yams and tannias in the market? Can a family of six afford to buy it? All along the nutritionists have been telling you that you cannot live on carbohydrates. Where is the protein? Where is the balanced diet? Can the workers afford a balanced diet, pay house rent, transportation and all these things on \$15.10 a day? The boat breaks down all the time here and across the river many workers have to go by taxi across the bridge when the bridge is working. They pay \$5 to go and to come back and the man is expected to live on \$5.10, what is left over from the \$15.10 a day. These people are not realists and they must cease talking if they are serious about building socialism. It is not built only by rhetoric and repeating it over and over. There is a theory; there is a practice of building socialism. It does not come by pragmatism and opportunities, wavering and meandering all over the place. It has to come from looking at the situation and seeing what we can do, first of all to deal with this problem of alienation, the masses of people who are fed up.

They are telling us about all the ten regions. They forgot to tell us about the 11<sup>th</sup> region. One man said the only one which is developing now is the 11<sup>th</sup> region. I asked him which one he is talking about. He said the United States and Canada. That is the only one developing. How are you going to develop people? Cde. Corrica told us we have food. How many times have I been to him, not only for the general country, to talk about distribution, but to talk about G.W.I. specifically, sugar workers, who as they say are the



net foreign exchange earners. Other workers are getting a little bite but they cannot even get that.

Last Sunday I was coming from Mon Repos after a meeting and I was stopped by two trucks loads of people. I asked the Comrades what was that. They said the people were coming from Hope. So I stopped and began questioning them. I saw their packages. There were two sets of things they had to buy. One set contained two packs of Bristol cigarettes and one *New Nation* costing \$44.55. The price for *New Nation* has gone up, 55 cents. It is compulsory to buy it or you do not eat the food. This is how you are going to build socialism? The other hamper was \$20; two cakes of toilet soap, one cake of ordinary soap, some soap powder, some margarine- one pound – half pound of salt and something else. They had to pay \$20, Comrades. What is the price for that that the people had to pay, \$3 to go and \$3 to come back in a truck like cattle. The people have to pay \$6 and they have to give free labour from 7 o'clock in the morning until 2 o'clock in the afternoon and they have to carry their own cutlasses and shovels to dig drains.

We have gone back to the days of indentured slavery. If you want voluntary labour you must so enthuse the people that the people will rush as they do in the Soviet Union and in Cuba on their holidays, the weekends and the afternoons. But what you are doing? This is a form of compulsion. The sugar workers should have been getting all of that at their work places, Cde. Corrica, and if you do not give it them, there will be strikes in the sugar industry, I am telling you. Stop this nonsense of talking all the food and distributing it at Hope Estate whether Burnham owns it or does not own it. It is not correct to do that. Just because he is President he has no right to take the food and corale thousands and thousands of people to go to Hope Estate and the President's College to build it. Have we discussed in this Parliament whether we need President's College? Anyway Cde. Speaker, I want to say that if you do not stop all this nonsense, if you do not stop it...

We are interested in seeing how we can help to bring this country out of the mess but you can give some workers back pay and the sugar workers get nothing, I went to the Minister of Finance, G.A.W.U., nothing and when the strike came they said sugar workers are sabotaging the economy. Have you ever heard such nonsense? Last night we had a meeting at Cove and John, they broke it up. You do not want the people to know what is going on. Cde. Speaker, we have a rule we are supposed to observe. The Prime Minister told us we are supposed to operate by the rule of law, the rule of law in Guyana. Discrimination is rampant, methods are being used, you cannot solve the problem of alienation, you have to come down and talk to the people. The majority are there backing us. You realize the fact that the P.P.P. is a force to be reckoned with in this country and no solution will be found without the P.P.P.

Cde. Speaker, we have been telling them over and over what has to be done. Look at our 1972 Congress Report, we had a seven point programme,

look at our 1974 Congress Report, we had a twelve point programme, look at the time when we had talks with them in 1976 we had a seventeen point programme. Look at the National Patriotic Front document we produced in 1977 where we had a sixteen point programme. I have read some of these already in this House and I do not want to do it again. In 1979 we put out a prescribed programme outlining in detail what has to be done in this country. In the last congress in 1982 we said what must be done to solve the industrial and production problems of the economy. As regards debt payment we said pay one quarter of the current payment and take the rest and pay the workers money, subsidize the cost of living and improve social services. We said further to reduce the number of Vice-Presidents, cut the number of Ministers by half, cut Ministers' salaries by one third. Reduce the size of the army and police personnel. Ken Dans at the University of Guyana gave statistics that we have the highest rate of army and military personnel in relation to the population. This year they have increased money for the military; they have no money for the people but more for that.

Reduce the Foreign Affairs Ministry by half, also National Service or severely restrict it. Reduce Information Services by half- propaganda. We put out a statement yesterday Cde. Speaker, and if you see what they had put in the *Chronicle* yesterday. I will read it for you because you cannot get it from the *Chronicle*. I know I am coming to the end so you will hear it now.

*"The P.P.P...of the foundation of the P.N.C. the P.P.P. was conceived as a National Movement for Liberation and Social Justice but succeeded in uniting the people, but regrettably, this unity was shattered in 1955 and 1956".*

From 1957 to the present time numerous proposals have been made to the P.P.P. for a political solution. More recently specific ideas had been reported for the formation of a broad-based National Patriotic Front and Government with a programme based on democracy, anti-imperialism and socialist orientation. The P.P.P. has always expressed the view that even though it can win free and fair elections, it believes in the interest of national unity and social progress. We wish to emphasize that the P.P.P. contends that the very poor state of the economy requires massive involvement of all sections of the population. The P.P.P. in its New Year's message calls for the convening of a conference of all democratic and political forces to iron out good ways and means whereby all Guyanese can cooperate and build a new Guyana. The Party intends to hold dialogue with its membership and will also carry out the broadest possible consultations with other progressive political and social forces including trade union businesses, professional, religious and other bodies.

In the meantime the P.P.P.'s calls for an opened national debate in the media and Parliament on the grave economic and social crisis facing our country and ways of resolving it. Saying that the P.P.P. was once engaged in some discourse for the formation of a Coalition Government is totally

wrong and without foundation.

The trade union movement forced the Government to suspend debt payments for four years, not to play hanky-panky as the Minister of Finance did. He said we needed the foreign exchange for our own development in sugar and bauxite and elsewhere, yet he was so generous that he gave it to the I.M.F. Forget the I.M.F.! Nowhere has the I.M.F. brought prosperity, democracy or peace. Let us solve the problem right here. Take the money that is going to them. Let them wait! Take the money and help the poor people. Build up their confidence. Get them to do the job of production. We said, *"Take drastic steps to stop corruption, that is in the whole body politics today."* The President, when he was Prime Minister, said he had a draft law in 1970 when Kwayana brought two Ministers before the Ombudsman on corruption charges. The law is not made yet. Lionel Luckhoo was appointed to head a Corruption Committee. Two years have passed. He has not got his papers yet to convene a Committee. They are jokers. What are they doing about it?

There is a more fundamental point for medium and long term development. We say –

- (1) Ensure a democracy;
- (2) End political and racial discrimination.
- (3) Have a centrally planned economy with simultaneous emphasis on agriculture and industry.

We heard about planning and cooperatives but there is no central planning in this country.

- (4) Ensure a meaningful economic role for the private sector.
- (5) Resist denationalization in any form

They have done that this year with the Rice Marketing Board under pressure. Part of the industry has been privatized.

- (6) Establish a National All-Parties Committee to monitor imports and distribution of commodities. P.N.C. monopoly of trading through K.S.I., W.R.S.M. and Y.S.M. outlets and stooges must be abolished.
- (7) Diversify our foreign economic relations by strengthening links with the socialist world.

I read in the *Guyana Chronicle* that the Minister of Foreign Affairs is going to do that now. It should have been done long ago.

As regards Non-Alignment, don't let us only keep talking about two super powers and two imperialisms. Don't let us sit in the middle. Why don't they want to recognize Kampuchea and Afghanistan? Because they want to tell Uncle Sam *"We are not with the socialist community. We are not*

*with you: we are not with them. We are not allying with them.*" They are hiding in the business of Non-Alignment as if it is something in a vacuum. Non-Alignment means "*Fighting against imperialism, neo-colonialism, colonialism, and racial discrimination*". Imperialism means imperialism, whether it manifests itself in Angola or Nicaragua or Afghanistan or Kampuchea. That is an ideological question which they have to answer.

They have this pragmatic opportunistic basis of political practice, not based on principles, so they drift here and there and try to manoeuvre. As the President once said "*politics is the art of making deals.*" There is no principle so that Chandisingh is teaching people now about the Juche idea.

- (8) Reduce the large and costly standard army, and make a truly country-wide People's Militia for national defence.

\$15 million in 1970 for the whole police, army and everything. This year it is \$190 million. They are throwing away money and they say they have no money.

- (9) Special treatment for Amerindians to permit their accelerated development.
- (10) Prevent the Parliament from being used as rubber-stamp to enact P.N.C. edicts.
- (11) Permit the revolutionary and democratic forces access to the mass media (newspaper and radio) for the political and ideological education of the masses and the development of a genuine anti-imperialist, socialist-oriented people's culture.

Lenin made it clear that socialism cannot be built without class struggle, without democracy. Class struggle includes ideological struggle. You have to wage a war against the formation of the principles like "*Cooperative Socialism*". Wage war against that and also wage a war against bourgeois capitalist ideology. Is that being done? They have stopped talking about Marxism/ Leninism. They don't talk about it any more because they want to please Uncle Sam and the I.M.F. They used to speak about it in 1976. Nowadays they do not talk about it any more.

- (12) Counter the P.N.C.'s denigration of socialism and expose the unscientific, utopian and petty-bourgeois cooperative socialism.

If we want to go forward there are three things we have to do. Any broad front in this country – and it is necessary – must be based on three principles – democracy, anti- imperialism and don't confuse the people that the U.S.S.R. and US are the same. That is the ridiculous position of the P.N.C. today. They have to make issues clear in this country. socialist orientation means improving the people's living standards.

Therefore, I ask the P.N.C. to let us use this Parliament. We are going to come here with specific proposals whether we talk to the P.N.C. or we don't talk in a room. Specific proposals we are going to come based on some of these things we have been talking about for years. We want to have an open debate and we want the people all over the country to be debating. What is the way forward. The P.P.P., as I said in my press statement, intends to invite all the progressive forces in this country to see what should be done to take our country out of this mess and to build a new Guyana, a people's Guyana.

## National Security (Miscellaneous Provisions) (Amendment) Bill: 24<sup>th</sup> June, 1985

**Dr. Jagan:** I described them as sophists and I see nothing wrong with that. As I said, as I listened to the gentlemen I saw visions before me of Hitler, of Eugene McCartney, of Botha in South Africa and of Pinochet in Chile, for the arguments they used would have been used and repeated by those same people in justification of what they have done historically to destroy the people's rights. We are told that this Bill is necessary and that this Bill is not anything new.

Cde. Speaker, the Government is making into permanent law what normally, even in a fascist dictatorship like Chile, is done by state of Decree and lasts only a limited period. The state of siege which was enacted by Pinochet not long ago was recently removed. But here we have a permanent statute repeated over and over, when there is no State of Emergency, when the State is not threatened, provision in the statute books for detention without trial, for violations of the use of law. The rule of law says that a man can be charged and when he is charged, he must be brought before the court in a reasonable time and the court must be independent etc. The Cde. Vice-President, Deputy Prime Minister and Attorney General referred to Article 9 of the Civil and Political Rights Covenant of the United Nations and he said that none should be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention and so on. But he did not read clauses 2 and 3 of that same article which says that people should be promptly informed of any charges against them and they should be brought promptly before a judge or other officer authorized by law to exercise judicial power and shall be entitled to trial within a reasonable time or to release. In other words, that is the law laid down in our Constitution, that is the legal framework under which we are working and the Government has gone beyond that to accept international law because the Covenant of Civil and Political Rights is the international law to which this Government subscribes. They are now setting it aside. They are creating new procedures without declaring a State of Emergency or, as the dictatorships do in Latin America, declaring a State of Siege. They are not doing that. They are now worse than the fascist dictators. I say worse because they are violating not only their own Constitution but the international law to which they pay lip service.

I would like to read another section, Article 4, because when I saw the Minister of Foreign Affairs a few weeks ago when this Bill was just published, I asked him if his Government had informed the United Nations Human Rights Commission that they proposed to do this, to make this law, which is a violation of the Covenant. He said he was not aware of it. Today he said he has looked at it and it has not violated the Covenant. The Article states:

*“In times of public emergency which threatens the life of the Nation and the existence of which is officially proclaimed, the State parties to the present Covenant may take measures derogating from their obligations under the present Covenant to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation, provided that such measures are not inconsistent with their other obligations under international law and do not involve discrimination solely on the ground of race, colour, sex, language, religion or social origin.”*

Section 3 of article 4 goes on to state:

*“Any State party to the present Covenant availing itself of the right of derogation shall immediately inform the other State parties to the present Covenant, through the intermediary of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, of the provisions from which it has derogated and of the reasons by which it was actuated. A further communication shall be made, through the same intermediary; on the date which it terminates such derogation.”*

That is their Party. But they go about breaking the law without declaring a State of Emergency, violating, making steps which can violate the rule of law without declaring a State Emergency or a State of Siege as is the word used in Latin. Now what is the justification? The Minister of Justice read from the *Mirror* about the case of the Conservation Party of Guyana and talked about marines coming here and so on, inviting marines to come here but Cde. Speaker, where is the Minister of Justice living? He is living in the clouds. Doesn't he know that, doesn't their intelligence tell them, the police informers tell them? Secondly, the United States and Canada declared a State of Emergency to try these people and apprehend them and put them in detention. They tried them according to law and fined some of them and jailed some of them. Why you can't do that here. You claim to be a democratic society and you say they are imperialist and everything else, criticize them and they are applying democratic methods to try people who are subversive, to try them and punish them, but you must take on powers of Emergency without declaring a State of Emergency. This is the hypocrisy. Let me read it again. *“The Government claims that the citizen's rights against arbitrary detention and other impositions are protected by the virtue of their rights to appear before a Tribunal for which provision is made in the act.”* That is what the Minister of Justice just said. This is a blatant piece of hypocrisy.

Cde. Speaker, when the Bill was first introduced in this Parliament, way back in 1966, it was not then this Minister of Justice or Attorney General, we had the other one, Mr. Ramphal and this is what was said in this House. I quote from *Hansard*:

*“I got the impression that on the one hand he was fooling us with many assurances and guarantees while on the other hand he was issuing fire threats”.*

Ramphal told us that not only we will have an independent judiciary but we will have the right to appeal to the Privy Council, and from the Privy Council we will have a Caribbean Court of Appeal or a Commonwealth Court of Appeal. We do not have it. Sure we have a judiciary and the sophist said that the previous Premier says the judges and the judiciary were appointed on the advice of the Prime Minister. Okay, that is the procedure but we know that laws and procedures they are honoured sometimes by convention, as we know in the British Parliament where there is meaningful consultation in keeping with democratic practices and conventions, we know that but it does not happen now. We are nowhere. Not only have we known Cde. Speaker, where as in the case of Arnold Rampersaud, you know that case very well where manipulations took place and had it not been for the intervention of Amnesty International and international lawyers here perhaps he would have been hanged, you were there on your guard. We know how they manipulate cases, where people are supposed to go to jury trial but they put them to be tried by the court, by the judges and magistrates. We know that, so why tell us about this independent judiciary and so on. We know all that is going on here.

The Minister of Justice said something about justice, that we charge that this was preparation for the election. This is what this *Hansard* said:

*“...they are resorting, through this Government, to methods of intimidation, of repression, and most likely in the near future to prepare the way for the rigging of elections in this country so as to prevent the possibility of a clear majority of the people of this country from exercising a greater degree of democracy and control of their own country. This is the significance that I attach at this time to our country. What could justify the introduction of such tyrannical legislation by this Government? In my opinion it reveals nothing but the fear, the uncertainty of the class that rules over Guyana for the future of their interest in Guyana.*

Cde. Speaker, the Justice Minister said liberty is threatened, it is not liberty that is threatened, it is liberty of the ruling class, Mercedes Benz and big fat salaries as we saw recently when the workers got a miserly ten percent, the sugar and bauxite workers, and the big boys a hundred and one hundred and fifty percent plus a lot of perks, and that is why this Member spoke so strongly about protecting interests. It goes on to talk about political police, how when you got to the airport, how you are searched etc., it says they are using their powers illegally, they are doing it quietly, they do not want people to know what they are doing. It went on to say that they are using their powers in order to intimidate persons and that they are not trying to preserve security as such, in other words they are not trying to prevent people from making bombs and guns but they are using their powers for political ends. We know one Minister once said that critics of the P.N.C. are enemies of the State. He is still there. He is no longer a Minister of the Government but he is an Adviser to the President, a Presidential



Political Adviser. Now we hear about the political police. Listen to this. This is talking about the searches going on at the airport:

*"You are asked certain questions, which I do not think the police have any right to ask persons who are going about their private business in a normal way."*

It goes on. He said:

*"These are the activities which are carried out by 'political' police in Guyana. I regard such activities as encroachments on the rights of citizens. Neither in England, where I have lived for a long time nor in the United States where I have lived for some time, have I come across the sort of activity that I have experienced here in Guyana."*

Then he goes on to talk about picketers:

*"One of the techniques which are used is that a picketer or demonstrator is picked up by the police, hustled into a van and thrown into the lockup. Then what do we find? These persons cannot get bail because, either conveniently, the policeman who made the charge cannot be found."*

Freedom in Guyana! Democracy! The Minister of Justice knows all about this. I want to see if he is going to keep his mouth shut. He does not do anything at all about it.

Then comes this juicy bit:

*"One the other hand the Bill is directed towards the suppression of the progressive movement of the working class in Guyana."*

We heard how Gordon Todd, after his Union gave solidarity...

That matter is not in the Courts. The Clerical and Commercial Workers Union and three other unions gave solidarity to the bauxite workers when they went on strike in 1975 against the non- payment of \$14 a day and nonpayment of increments. He was picked up after the workers were beaten on the second day. The police beat them. He was arrested and put on a plane and was taken to the interior and Cde. Pollydore, the General Secretary of the T.U.C., said that he intervened with the Prime Minister and that is how Gordon Todd was released because the Congress of his Union was on the following day. This is how things are happening here. I want to read you this juicy piece. He said we should-

*"Have no illusions about this because in Germany also, the moment Hitler assumed power with a minority vote, he banned, first the Communist Party..."*

He is talking of unity of all forces. He goes on to say how he banned the

Social Democratic Party. Then he said:

*“ . . . Many of the leading trade unionists, the militant trade union leaders, those who did not sell their souls to Hitler, also found themselves in the concentration camps.”*

The P.P.P. was in detention from the time of the British. Everybody knows that. The P.P.P. was in detention from the time of the P.N.C. Government. They divide and rule, like the British, but now that the working people are coming together, no doubt they want to intimidate first with the intention later on of detaining people like Gordon Todd, George Daniels and so on. This is the intention, as Hitler did.

And then the speaker said:

*“I do not wish to say that fascism has entrenched itself in Guyana. It has not yet reached Guyana and, perhaps, what we are seeing today are elements of fascism entering upon the fabric of Guyanese society.”*

Cde. Speaker, we want to see what we get this country out of this mess. We are concerned that is why in 1975/1976 we gave critical support. We wanted to see the security of the State, the sovereignty and independence protected. But if you are talking about security of the P.N.C. Government, a corrupt regime, a regime practising discrimination and now wanting to terrorize the people, including the working class – now that the T.U.C. is united, the working class is united, we have an independent T.U.C. - you will not get the support of the P.P.P. for that. You understand that? And we will see how you are going to solve all the problems which every year are compounding them, borrowing more money and taxing the people more. That is obviously is a dead end.

I wish that all the Members of this Assembly would seriously come to Freedom House to let us talk about the economic situation. If you want to contain these people- we want to see that our country does not get to the stage of El Salvador. We do not want that. We do not want people being killed in the streets. We do not want that. Fifty thousand are killed already in the last five years, 200 being killed every week. We are trying to avoid that. But, Cde. Speaker, Thwarte the Americans puppet, has the American marines and everybody helping him. But they cannot eliminate the guerillas. But what is more important is, no matter what detention orders the Thwarte Government has, with the American marines backing them, they cannot contain the guerillas, and they cannot destroy them.

Okay, come home, stop all the nonsense. Look at those people there, organized to come and picket for you. Hitler organized a lot of them too, fooled the working class. Later they were sorry because not only their trade union leaders, but they themselves burned in the ovens. Some of them joined you- not you, Mr. Speaker, those people here – in the 1960s to work

with the C.I.A. Feilden Singh supported them in this measure, the United Force. But what happened? When that happened Feilden Singh did not know that the axe was coming in the next year in the elections, when overseas votes came in and they rigged the elections and kicked out the U.F. when they had an absolute majority, from 40 percent to 55 percent. So what you expect now? You expect Feilden Singh, after he helped you to block us out and you then turn around and throw him out, you expect him to support you now? I do not think he is a sophist, jumping all over the place. He defends the capitalist imperialist system but I am sure his Party would not support this Bill now.

I remember the time when the Chairman of the U.F., Dr. Makepeace Richmond, was a Member of this Parliament. He said, in principle, he was opposed to the Bill when it was introduced then. He resigned from the Parliament and resigned as Chairman of the Party. We have, therefore, to ask the Government, are you really serious? You say you want talks with the P.P.P., are you serious or is this just for show? Whom are you trying to please? Are you trying only to please some people? Are you trying to use us to blackmail the I.M.F., the C.I.A. and the marines? Get off of all that. That is not going to help you. Get down and talk sense so that we can have peace and security. Thank you.

## Hostilities against Nicaragua: 26<sup>th</sup> June, 1985

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, we are meeting at a most opportune time to take this Motion which stands in my name. Only last evening I heard on the radio that a state of alert has been declared in Nicaragua and the Government is taking all necessary precaution, including military manoeuvres, in the capital of Nicaragua, Managua.

The United States, for some years now, has declared an all-round warfare against small revolutionary states. This has taken the form of intense propaganda, economic warfare, military and ideological warfare. The propaganda warfare has been very sophisticated and extensive. Books have been produced; films have been produced at tremendous costs. Yesterday the Prime Minister referred to the campaign of disinformation against Guyana and read a few statements from a few papers, most of them non-descript. But when we look at Nicaragua, it is something very, very intense; nothing is held back in trying to defame this people's revolution of Nicaragua.

Propaganda about how the economy is faltering, propaganda about American and Nicaraguan relations, propaganda about what is taking place on the military front that is the frontline of the Contras against the Nicaraguan state. All kinds of propaganda, not to forget those of an ideological nature. The Secretary of State Schultz for instance said that Nicaragua was behind the Iron Curtain and that recently Ortega the President visited the Soviet Union to embrace President Gorbachov after he had succeeded in getting the Congress to vote down the fourteen million dollars request aid to the Contras.

Cde. Speaker, this kind of propaganda is nothing new; we know the hysteria which has been created all over this hemisphere on this front. The moment anyone tried to bring about real independence, an economic and political campaign is launched to defame such a regime in order to prepare the way to bring it down. If I may just say a few words about the visit of President Ortega to the Soviet Union and other countries in Europe. It had to do basically with the very lifeline of Nicaragua. We know some time ago that the Contra Revolutionaries had destroyed all the depots and lots of pressures were put by the Reagan Administration and the Mexican Government for instance, not to supply fuel to Nicaragua. In an airport interview that the President gave after returning from his trip to Europe he pointed out that the Mexican Government had been very generous in supplying aid especially in the form of fuel to Nicaragua. The words he used were '*generous and good*' he went on to say that because of the economic difficulties which that Government was still finding, that is, the fall in the price of oil and its huge debt payment it was not possible for Mexico to

continue to supply oil on credit. President Ortega point out that even at the inauguration of the Brazilian President he had conversations with several leaders of Government in the hemisphere to see whether they could help in solving this vital problem for them, but he pointed out that those did not succeed because many of these Governments were in the same position as Mexico with their huge debt payment and their inability to make loans. Apart from that, obviously, the United States must have been behind the scenes applying pressures on this Government not to extend any kind of credit facility to the Nicaraguan Government, so it is really on that score that the Nicaraguan President made the visit immediately after. The matter was so urgent that he had to do it immediately after the vote was taken in the House of Representatives, particularly where the request of President Reagan for fourteen million dollars was defeated. Perhaps it was unfortunate that the Nicaraguan Government did not immediately say why it was making this trip, but due to that mistake and public relations, perhaps the American Administration was able to make heavy propaganda that Ortega had given assurances to the Congress, sought their support etc., and having got it he went ahead to embrace his friends in Moscow as the propaganda puts it. I think we should be thankful that there is a country such as the Soviet Union because I understand that in spite of their own problems in supplying oil to Europe they were able to meet 80 -90 percent of Nicaragua's oil needs for this year. This is what is stated in this publication which is called *Intercontinental Press* of the 10<sup>th</sup> June, 1985 and if I may quote this section it says "*The Soviet Union is a country that is a friend that offers collaboration in a framework of respect. In a framework of true friendship*".

I think this is a good example too if I may just make one slight diversion of those who think and those who keep saying that we should sit in the Caribbean right in the middle and beware of the two super powers. It has always been our contention that when any progressives or revolutionaries come to power in any state and want to make serious, radical transformations, they will come under attack from imperialism and their collaborators and therefore the only thing to do in such a situation is to have help particularly from the socialist world because we know the position of the Third World countries are very bad, with the present situation particularly. This situation Cde. Speaker, we have to see what the reality is. This Government of Nicaragua is being described as one which is linked to the Iron Curtain and which is totalitarian but Jonathan Steel, the article which I referred to, he is the chief foreign correspondent of the London *Guardian*, the liberal paper. He pointed out that there are three catholic bishops, you had a priest in the Government, certainly not as in Poland or Hungary or even to take two Catholics which are not behind the Iron Curtain, Italy or Spain. And yet the Reagan Administration continues to make anti-communist noises by hysterical propaganda against this Government.

As regards the question of freedom, this article also says the following – one newspaper *La Prensa* is constantly talking about censorship but pub-

lishing very freely. As I understand it, censorship is limited to a restricted area. For instance, reporting on activities on the war front and so on, about casualties etc. This very renowned journalist said the following on this score when speaking about *La Prensa*:

*“While it complains legitimately on censorship, La Prensa is also – whether its editors like it or not- a symbol of a degree of media openness which does not exist elsewhere in Central America.”*

This is the newspaper which is being supported by the United States. I heard over the air not too long ago where some organization in the United States is going to provide this press with about \$100,000 (US) so that it can carry on the fight for press freedom, but it is instructive to see that even a liberal bourgeois journalist who obviously does not defend revolutions speaks very realistically and objectively about what is taking place in that country. *La Prensa* has printing presses, has all the newsprint it wants, and can only print in a limited sphere. They make big propaganda about it and that is why we said so far as the media is concerned, Jonathan Steel says there is more openness in Nicaragua than in the rest of the Central America which the United States is always upholding.

Another charge which is levelled against the Government, when the declaration is made of its being totalitarian, is that there are no free and fair elections. When Reagan made his speech to the O.A.S. in 1982 this was the high point of his speech, that the Sandinista regime had gone back on its promises to hold elections within five years and did not hold them. Well, elections were held. Having held them now the Americans turn around and say that the elections were not free and fair.

Jonathan Steel again in this article says – this is how the Americans put forward their propaganda:

*“The country was under a State of Emergency. Conditions for free campaigning by opposition parties were not available. The press, radio and television were dominated by the Sandinistas. The boycott by the three parties who formed the Coordinadora Democratica left voters with no real choice. All four complaints could have been made with greater force against this year’s Presidential elections in El Salvador, though the United States did not do so. In fact, it praised the Slavadorean poll as a democratic exercise.”*

And then in this article Jonathan went on to debunk these other points which are being used against the Government to make it appear that there were no free and fair elections in that country. He also quoted in this same article from the Report of the three British parliamentarians. The British Government published this. He said:

*“The three British Parliamentarians who attended the elections, one from the*

*Social Democratic Party, one Conservative, and one Labour, concurred that the vote was secret, the voters were secure, and the count was fair."*

All those who were whispering just now that we charge that elections are rigged here, please note that they did not object. Sandinista did not object to people coming to look at the process. They welcomed them; they invited them. Five hundred were there. They did not invite Chitnis.

Since the Comrade has raised the question of Chitnis, I would like to read from the Chitnis Report on the Nicaraguan elections. They should have a copy of this. I will send them a copy. What did he say in his Report, which is called "*Elections in Nicaragua*"? He said:

*"The Government made a significant move towards a pragmatic and pluralistic force".*

This is to debunk the charge that it was totalitarian and Communist.

*"...and despite its problems had given priority to spending on health and education. The financing of a cheap food programme is also a key priority. The poor were eating better than before."*

That is Chitnis. Then he spoke about the Emergency and he said the Government made several relaxations. He said these meant –

*"Those political campaigners were free to travel to every part of the country, hold outdoor rallies, speak and write openly about every subject except National Defence. In every relevant aspect the situation in Nicaragua provided the necessary conditions for all political parties to participate freely."*

This was not the case in El Salvador.

*"The state made available to each of the registered parties, irrespective of their national strength 9 million cordovas, approximately \$225,000 which would make some parties in this country green with envy. It also was almost insufferable pious in describing proper electoral conduct."*

It goes on –

*"Parties were free to buy time on radio and television"*

Note, Mr. Minister of Home Affairs.

*"...up to a maximum and, in addition, time was assigned to the parties both on radio and television in a way similar, though greatly in excess of, that used in Britain."*

He also asked himself; were there human rights violations in the country? He said he wanted to get impeccable sources, some senior officials in the British Embassy to ask them if they would recommend someone who he could contact to find out about the state of human rights in the country. He was recommended to a senior U.N. official and he said the latter gave the country a remarkably clean bill of health. The official was convinced that there was little abuse of human rights and certainly no systematic abuse, that where individual cases were reported, the perpetrators were duly punished. He added that a sorrow to him was that when he believed many foreign Ambassadors in Nicaragua were reporting this to their Governments, these Governments preferred to listen to other less objectives sources.

Then he concluded:

*"The President of the United States and the British Prime Minister has no doubt that President Dwarté was validly elected in El Salvador. If this was so they cannot argue that Daniel Ortega is not the validly elected President of Nicaragua democratically chosen by the people."*

Cde. Speaker, I have quoted extensively from his report because I want to lend support to the Nicaraguan situation because Lord Chitnis is not a flaming radical. He is a member of the Liberal Party. But in answer to my friends across the table, what has just been read also implies clearly that he is not a counter-revolutionary. If he was such a Report would not have been written. But they are trying to say that we are consorting with a counter-revolutionary. The P.P.P. will never do that. They are not like you, you know they will never do that. Cde. Speaker, there is now a threat of military intervention. In fact on this charge by the United States that the Government is not representative, one can say that it is even more representative than the Reagan Administration in the United States. In the recent elections the S.F.L.N. also won so many seats that they have control of the National Assembly. We know that the United States although there was a big vote and relatively big support for Reagan as a person his Party did not get that mandate because the Democrats as we know still compose the House of Representatives, the Lower House, and I believe also the Republican Party lost a few seats in the Assembly. What is more significant is that whereas the voters turned out in Nicaragua in 80 percent, in the case of the United States it was only 53 percent, so disillusioned are the people with that process of what is happening in that country, only 53 percent turned out to vote and out of that President Reagan got 59 percent. Whereas in Nicaragua despite the sufferings, despite the hardship created by the counter-revolutionaries and the campaign of harassment, sabotage and so on, despite all of that people turned out freely, 80 percent of them, and 76 percent of them voted for the Ruling Party. This should be a good lesson for our friends opposite.

Cde. Speaker, the military was calling for this \$14 million vote just when



the Reagan Administration was calling for this \$14 million vote for the Contras. George Shultz warned that if that money was not forthcoming he said we will be faced with an agonizing choice about the use of American combat troops in Nicaragua. This threat comes three weeks after Washington had announced an embargo on May 1 against Nicaragua. So the United States is now tightening the noose on this small country. What is behind their thinking at the moment? They know, they are aware that the Contras by themselves cannot defeat the People's Army of Nicaragua, they are aware of that and only recently they got a good beating. What some of the people in the American Administration are bargaining for is for the Contras to invade, create a base, declare an Independent State, and then call on the United States for troops to support them. In other words, an Independent State, within a State, having the sovereign right to demand support from outside. That is one option they are playing with. The other is carrying out provocation on the Nicaraguan/ Honduran border. We know that the Honduran regime is virtually a puppet regime of the United States. It is hoped that these incursions around the border will give the American Administration the excuse to say that one of their allies, Honduras was attacked by Nicaragua. Already there was such a charge recently that Nicaragua invaded their territory of Honduras. I heard last night that this is the 36<sup>th</sup> year of the anniversary of the Korean War when it was then said that the North invaded the South. But this was later debunked and that invasion later incidentally led to the American intervention in the name of the United Nations. That intervention was proved to be false, and this was fully documented in a book: *The origins of the Cold War* by an American Professor.

This is what the Americans are trying to respect, to claim that the Nicaraguans want to take over the whole of Central America and they want to take over, not only to help the Revolutionaries in El Salvador, being a very large army. Propaganda is made about that too, that the army is so much larger than that of all the Central American countries put together, and therefore, the intention is to take over. That is the kind of propaganda that is being made. Obviously, Nicaragua has a large army because it is under attack and it had to be defending the Revolution. Cde. Speaker these are the manoeuvres which the United States are taking over at the moment, to pave the ground or to give the pretence for intervention by the United States troops, US marines. The real reason is more than that. President Reagan not too long ago when addressing the organization of American States in 1982 said the following and this is also from World Trade Union Movement, No. 3 of 1984, page 23:

*"The Region (Central America and the Caribbean) is a strategic commercial artery, absolutely vital for the United States. Almost half our trade and two-thirds of our imports of strategic minerals pass through the Panama Canal or the Gulf of Mexico".*

Other U.S. officials have made similar statements, indeed talking about the income, how much they get from this region. That is the real reason. The plunder of the resources of the people of this area, their labour, their raw materials, their resources, which has led to so much poverty, so much backwardness, and which in turn led to the Cuban and later to the Nicaraguan Revolution. This is what the famous liberator of Latin America foresaw many years ago. I refer to Simon Bolivar when he convened his Congress in Panama in 1928. Simon Bolivar refused to have the United States of America take part in that Conference. That was his wish. Unfortunately, because of a mix-up, the United States was there. This is what Simon Bolivar said on the same page 23:

*"The USA seems as though they are sent by providence to plague Latin America with all forms of misery in the name of liberty."*

Bolivar, who fought for independence against Portugal and Spain and who wanted a United Latin America. He saw then in those days when the Monroe Doctrine was just enunciated, in 1823, that the United States wanted to stretch the tentacles of the eagle all over this continent. We saw that, especially under Theodore Roosevelt, in the early part of this country.

Cde. Speaker, let us not be fooled by the hypocritical utterances which emanate from the White House and the State Department about why they are doing all of this. That is aggression in all its manifestations, and very intense. Not like the little pinpricks which we were hearing about yesterday here. Intense, all abrasive. Let us note these, that these are all based in a great deal of hypocrisy.

Therefore, I would like to ask not only this Assembly, but the Guyanese people, this Nation, to lend support to the Nicaraguan Revolution, more particularly the declaration that the Nicaraguan Government was not prepared to sign - the Nicaragua Peace Plan. But after the Government signed it then the Americans decided not to sign. Indeed, they have even put a lot of pressure on the Contadora Government themselves. Contadora talks have broken down. I read in the newspapers today where the Vice-President of Nicaragua is making a visit to these countries to talk to them, to make a plea for the resumption of those talks. President Ortega has also called for the resumption of talks with the United States, and this is good. We must support that also because negotiations, especially in the present charged atmosphere, are much better than bullets flying across the borders.

Above all, as is stated in the Motion, not only must this Assembly condemn the United States for its aggressive acts, but also that the Guyana Government should give all round support. We are calling on the Government to give material assistance. The Nicaragua Revolution should become our own and we must see that the preservation of that Revolution is also the preservation of whatever liberties we have. We must also not only ask for material assistance, but we must ask the Government to make a coun-

try-wide appeal, and let us see the majority support they have here, for Guyanese to go to Nicaragua to help. I do not mean to fight, I mean going there to help in the economic reconstruction of the country, whether it is picking coffee or whether it is digging ditches to protect the sovereignty of the country. We must put our muscles behind it, not only to pay lip service. Let us show in a militant way that we are behind the revolution 100 per cent. Cde. Speaker, in that we, as I said, we will be defending all we would have fought for in this country. With those words I beg to move this Motion standing in my name.

## **Rice (Regulation of Manufacturing and Marketing) (Amendment) Bill: 25<sup>th</sup> October, 1985**

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, the Hon. Vice-President in moving the Motion spoke about the need for cooperation, getting together in order to solve the problems instead of simply involving oneself in a lot of political bickering and so on. He did not use those exact words but that was his meaning. He referred to the structuring of the rice industry, talks between the R.P.A. and the President and the outcome of that being this Bill. But, Cde. Speaker, I would like the Vice-President and his colleagues in this Assembly to look at some other realities and let us get to the root of the problem to find out what is causing the grave problems facing this industry.

What is the position today? A few weeks ago the President said by personal intervention he will solve the problem of rice shortages. The weeks have gone. Rice shortages and the black marketing of rice are still with us. You will recall on my return I brought a sample of rice here which was given to the farmers at Cane Grove. The quality of rice is disgraceful. I heard over the radio not too long ago where the people of St. Vincent were jumping up with joy welcoming a boat which brought rice from the United States of America. The Antilles news said that the rice from Guyana was so poor in quality and so irregular were the shipments that other arrangements had to be made to get American rice.

Go in any supermarket now in the Caribbean, you will see Uncle Ben and other varieties of packaged rice all over the place, and Guyana rice, in many cases, being in a little bag in the corner as if it is stock feed rice. I was not in the debate when the rice shortage question came up, but I understand from the Deputy Prime Minister in charge of Planning that the Government is meeting all its export requirements.

It is not a fact that last year the Government failed to meet contractual obligations? I challenge them to say that what I said is not true. Look at the overall statistics. What we were producing in 1964 we are still producing today. What we exported in 1963/1964, we are exporting about half as much today. What we exported in 1963/1964, if I remember correctly, the export was 83,000 tons or 84,000 tons for one year and the other year it was 101,000 tons. Last year it was 47,000 tons, these are Government figures, and this year they are expecting to export 60,000 tons. We have a crisis because we do not produce enough, we do not export enough. We have markets which we cannot supply, a stupid policy of forcing people to eat rice morning, noon and night. We have to get down to the root of the problem. What the Government is doing here is mere tokenism. I see Mr. Kennard here, one-time Minister of Agriculture, and probably still is Agricultural Adviser to the President – ask him if it is not true that the R.P.A. went to him when he was sitting in that high post as Minister and showed him what was the cost of producing one acre of rice and what was the income from one acre of

rice. I helped to prepare that document. I helped to make it more realistic in a sense that what was deemed to be excess expenditure was fringed down so no holes could have been put on the estimates of cost of production. Mr. Kennard will tell you that when they come to him they showed a figure of a loss of around three hundred dollars per acre, cultivating rice but he was a technocrat Minister, not a political Minister although I think he is now in the P.N.C. But be that as it may, he said to the R.P.A. – go and see the Prime Minister, he is the big boy who has to make the political decisions. I would like to help you but I have not got the power, the Prime Minister has to make the decisions. They went to see the Prime Minister, now President, the R.P.A. was fobbed off. I am going to Canada when I come back I will see you again- nothing was done.

Cde. Speaker, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (I.F.A.D.) issued a Report saying that every dollar earned by export of rice to the Caribbean the farmers get either forty-three or forty-seven cents. Where does the rest go? That is why when I went there during the campaign people showed me notices which they received from the management telling them if they do not cultivate the rice land they will be expelled, people were putting cattle on the rice land. Land will be taken away from them because the agreement when they got the land was that fifteen acres must be put in rice. Why were they doing that? Farmers are not fools. They are stupid to want to be expelled from the rice land- no, they are withholding- but it was uneconomical to grow rice and the end result is although we have truly improved varieties and so on a twenty-five percent increase in productivity per acre, still our production per acre remains stagnant at what it was in 1963 and 1964.. If the same rate of production had continued we would have had at that time 10.6 percent per year, we would have had to make at least three times the rice production. What is the end result? Although we have twenty-five percent more yield per acre, true improved varieties and so on, fertilizers and what not, the production today is the same, but on the ground one-third of the land has been vacated, is not any longer in rice and one-third of the farmers are not planting rice in Guyana, many of them are planting rice in Surinam, some find themselves in North America. Is the Government – except talking that we want cooperation, is the Government getting down to the root of the problem? I was sitting once in the Rice Board years ago when I was President of the R.P.A., and who was the manager? A famous cricketer named Peter Bailey. His qualifications for management was cricket, not rice, cricket but the rice farmers had to pay him then \$1200.00 a month as manager. If you correct that today it may be \$2000.00. The first house built in millionaire's row in Bel Air Park when it was a pasture was for Peter Bailey. When we objected to it in the Board – (we had eight members and the Government had eight out of sixteen) the Chairman would use his casting vote on the side of corruption, on the side of extravagance. The famous Rayman Gagraj, your predecessor was in the chair, so when the P.P.P. got into Gov-

ernment we changed the law and gave the farmers eleven out of all sixteen members of the Board. From eight to eleven, we gave them control. Cde. Speaker that is one of the main reasons why the farmers prospered in this country. That is why production expanded, that factor of control of their marketing, plus the P.P.P. opened up all the lands which the sugar planters were buttoning up and out in drainage and irrigation. Farmers prospered, the country prospered. What do we have now, so far as rice is concerned we cannot supply Trinidad with rice and so we cannot get fuel oil now and instead of telling the people the truth why we have a blackout everyday- every day in my house I have a blackout. Tell the people the truth that we have no fuel. I know the Electricity Board told one member that they have to go into fuel conservation and more load shedding but the publicity boys are saying that we cannot afford it, we do not have the foreign exchange, we do not have the rice to send to Trinidad and we cannot pay our debt. Five hundred million dollars we now owe Trinidad and we are now going to suffer from more blackouts. That will affect production also, it must affect production, energy production, energy is very important for production. So Cde. Speaker, I come back again to the root of the problem. The Government wants to have its cake and eat it too, they want more rice production, but they do not want to give up the big salaries, the big allowances, they do not want to give up their ways, their own ways of life. Just like in the days of Peter Bailey and the rice management of the Board. What is the end result?

I showed him that just in the same way as he practices tokenism at the industrial level – one or two members on the board of management- similarly now the President, with all his great generosity is going to bring token representation. Face the problem!

At one time they wanted to destroy the R.P.A. and they reduced the numbers from 11 to 3 and then they took them all out in the place of the structure of the R.P.A. They set up Rice Action Committee in every district but fully nominated. These took the place of the R.P.A. district committees which were all elected. They want to produce things but bureaucratically from the top with a lot of corrupt people. I gave you an instance once in this Assembly when Cde. Burnham was Prime Minister. I told him of one man from the Rice Action Committee, a Vice-Chairman was renting subsidized G.R.B. machinery which was under his control at a lower price and renting out his machinery to the farmers at a higher price. Such rascality was going on, but it could go on because there was no democracy. The farmers had no control either in the Board or down at the bottom. The R.P.A. had no say.

They set up parallel bodies but not democratic bodies. We are not here to complain but we are here to see how we can increase production in the rice industry, because this country is sinking and one of the ways to recover quickly is to reverse the tide. Plans to make an industry are all a fiasco – the glass factory- the sum of \$40 million has been sent there al-

ready – a bicycle factory, glass factory, tannery- none is working. Let us try agriculture. In the short term it needs less investment once you get the cooperation of the farmers and people.

What is your proposal? I told Cde. Denny the other day, *“Forget the tokenism business. Forget the elitism- that the workers are so stupid and that farmers are so stupid that we have to educate them first and when we educate them, then we are going to put them in control.”* That is Cde. Denny’s formula. As a schoolmaster he is going to educate the people. I can tell you from my personal experience that those ordinary farmers at one time ran the Board and it was a thousand times better than it is now because they knew what was in their interest. When the Board was run economically all that was left came back to them, directly or indirectly. It was an incentive to produce more. Therefore, of course, the officers in those departments were not taking orders from any political party. Therefore they could be neutral. It was not like today. Today using the principle of paramountcy of the Party, the boys have to go along and technocrats have to become Party members.

I am saying that you should again accept the principle of grading, namely that there is a buyer and a seller and if there is a dispute in the grading, then you have a neutral person as arbitrator. That machinery was set up at the time of the P.P.P. Government, but that was changed when the P.N.C. came into office and the R.P.A. was completely out. That is why there were a lot of rackets and all sorts of things. Every now and then you are hearing rice mills and other things are burning up and all the records are destroyed.

Did you not say that all rice farmers or the great majority of them were ardent on certain proposals of the People’s Progressive Party and that the R.P.A. represents them? Would you wish to change your mind now, it would not be too late because we here on this side seem to have a different impression, that a goodly proportion of the farming community, the majority of them, are supportive of the Party represented on this side.

Surely, with great respect, Cde. Speaker that was a graceless response to what everyone would appreciate is a positive proposal from the Government which was emanated after free, frank and careful discussions between the accredited representatives and speakers of the R.P.A. and the President of this country. We have not heard any suggestion to the effect that the measures, ideas or elements involved in this Bill do not reflect the nature, tenure or purport of those discussions.

A great deal has been said but for the reasons I have offered I say with much respect that it does not bear upon the essential import of the Bill before the Assembly and they may all be dismissed and given short-shift that they all really belong to a realm of discourse which is more apposite to the vocation last December when the principal measure was being debated, and then indeed we had a very full discussion. And, I must say, recalling the nature of that debate, Cde. Reepu Daman Persaud who spoke in place of the Cde. Minority Leader, he being elsewhere, made a very useful contribution indeed which attracted in its term a very full and authoritative

review by the Cde. Prime Minister, as he then was. I think, really it would be a waste of time and a wearing away of the patience of this Assembly for me to endeavour to traverse the ground already so well covered by the then Prime Minister. However, one or two things may be said on this occasion.

On this side, we are not aware of any credible evidence supportive of a thesis that the transfer by the P.P.P. of control of the rice industry to the R.P.A. was in any way linked with any improvements in the performance of that industry. We bear in mind a number of other things which existed then and went in favour of the industry, and a number of other things which also led to the detriment of the industry and which were entirely beyond the control of the Government. The Cde. Minority Leader spoke so very irresponsibly about this phase of the matter that he ignored altogether such things as exchange control difficulties, deterioration in markets and in terms of trade, escalation in the prices of essential spares and equipment required for the operation of an industry which is nowadays a lot more heavily mechanized than it was in those ancient times to which the P.P.P. are referring.

On this question of farmers participation in the democratic processes related to the decision-making of the industry, there is something I need to say. We have heard from the Cde. Minority Leader about the change in the balance of forces in the controlling body of the rice industry which was effected during the regime of the P.P.P. but what has not been explained and I think is an open question, is whether the transfer of control which effected to the R.P.A. was motivated by economic or industrial considerations or whether perhaps the motive purely was really political?

So I close by saying, come back to deal with the reality and put the farmers, the R.P.A., the farmers' democratically run organization, in control as it was historically, to prove that it can do the job. That is the only way to save the rice industry.

**BILL REPORTED WITHOUT AMENDMENT, READ THE THIRD TIME AND PASSED AS PRINTED.**



## National Security (Miscellaneous) (Amendment) Bill 1985

**Dr. Jagan:** We heard about the right of every Guyanese to vote. I fought for that, Burnham fought for it, but you have made a farce of that. Take the overseas vote. Shedding crocodile tears. We just heard that it did not make up a big percentage of the total voting. That is not the point. He read some Motions that I put in Parliament and why did he not talk about the main one, the counting of the vote at the place of the Bill has a lot to do with that because whether you received 68,000 votes overseas- which you reduced to 34,000 in 1973 – or you get 4,000 now, you still have no control over the ballot box because in the colonial days the civil servants were neutral people. Not today. They are all servants of the ruling party. They have to take orders or out they go. Cde. Speaker, you know that.

At one time, when the previous President was Prime Minister, he said that overseas voting was rigged because people were being paid on a commission basis, the more votes you got, the more money you got. In one of the Grenada films a man, Joe Hughes, who was studying law, said that he registered only 41 persons and he is shown in the film doubting that over 200 persons could have been on the voters list for the town of Wolverhampton in the United Kingdom. They are saying that the people registered more names in order to get money. This man said, *"I am studying law and I do not want to be involved in any fraud because if I get in a fraud, out I get of the University."* Yet they say, *"Put the blame on the people like that man."* They say that because people like him were being paid according to the number of heads registered, they padded the lists. The fact is that the officers, including the then Ambassador, Lionel Luckhoo, were engaged in rigging the published list. That is why the man from the overseas Research Centre said – I quote from this book *"Rigged Elections in Guyana."*

They are saying that people working in embassies will vote now. They are restricting it to them. That is one category. Two, students. Listen to this. It is page 35, the same page, the second film, the *"Making of a Prime Minister"*, when the commentator said he was made by fraud, he should not be attending the Commonwealth Conference in 1968 after the elections. They showed the fraud in New York, outside of England. I will read this part:

*"And so it went on. One fictitious case after another. About one of the most amusing cases..."*

This is about a student, Cde. Speaker:

*"Another American citizen, William Bob, lives in Brooklyn. His occupation is listed as student. I am 71 years old and I think I am a darn old student, too old to go to school now. So I do not know if it is a joke being played or what. But if that is*

*a joke it is a dastard of a joke and I am dumbfounded."*

Who registered him? The office, the Embassy registered him and the man is dumbfounded. How did he get registered? We have a case of a member of the Elections Commission in the last elections who was a member living here and her name appeared in the Canadian electoral role as a student. She did not apply for registration but her name appeared.

Who applied for Gail Tiexeira? She did not apply. The Embassy applied for them and put their name in the book and the Embassy voted for them. Who controls the Embassy? Who controls the sending of the ballots? Cde. Chairman, they say other countries have it, Britain has it, and Canada has it - overseas voting for officers. But in the British system of running the elections the officers do not rig their elections. When I say they do not rig I mean by and large, not blatant like these people. When I spoke to the President and he told me about this student thing, immediately this man's thing came to my head. So I asked him and he began to tell me it will be a limited number of people, students being sponsored by Government. I asked him what about people on P.P.P. scholarships? He said that too. But there is no such thing in this Bill about that. Revd. Bob can also be added as a student. Who registered him, he did not apply. Can we go and look at all the registration slips and check the signatures and go and see whether they applied. No. That is what I was planning to do in this election, by the way. This thing still has a lot of loopholes. That is why the President said he is putting his reputation on the line. I said, all right.

I spoke to the Minister two days ago. He told me he has to wait until the Vice-President comes back the same night. When I spoke to him I said give us some more time, let us sit around the table, if not here, in a Select Committee, in an Inter-Party Committee. Let us have dialogue. He said we have to go ahead. For what? Why the hurry? Cde. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that they do not want to stop their rigging. They cannot afford not to rig. All right, go ahead and rig it. We are making an appeal to them. This is the only Assembly in the world - I am using the bourgeois word where they do not have Bills going to a Committee, you have provision for a Select Committee in this Assembly but nothing ever goes to the Select Committee. We asked them to give us two or three days to go to a Select Committee, they said no. That is how you are going to have democracy? I am wasting my time here, I should be out in the street cursing you up for rigging the elections, and I am going to do it too. I am wasting time here that is true. To them it is a joke. They will rig the elections, they will be back in power, they will get all the money and everything will be okay.

The people are starving in this country. I want to come to these Comrades and talk to them. Let us sit around the table and iron out all these things. A new area of fraud is coming here now. Who will control the ballots over there? Are we going to have counting agents and polling agents in all those Embassies? That is provided for in Guyana. Why we do not

have it over there? Is the Elections Commission authorized to go and check those signatures of people who are alleged to have applied? No, because as the Avery Commission said, the Commission has become Burnham's poodle. Bollera is a poodle.

Cde. Speaker, you may know him as a colleague of yours, but I am talking to you as a man. The man is a worse than a poodle. I am going to bring a Motion here for his removal and I am calling him a poodle now so he would know what I think of him. Not only what I think of him, I am only relating how the whole international community thinks about him. I am just relating that. Anyway, whether it is 2 per cent, whether it is 20 percent, whether it is 80 percent, we are not saying the people must not vote overseas, but what mechanism of control do you have so that legitimate people vote overseas? As I said, the President gave me one impression but what I read in this Bill is another. It opens the flood gates. That is why I want to talk to them over the table. The President gave me the impression that this will be restricted to people sent by the Government. But this is nothing like that. This says any *bona fide* full- time student.

## Approval of Government's Policy in President's Address: 6<sup>th</sup> February, 1986

**Dr. Jagan:** Mr. Speaker, the President in his Address to the Assembly regaled us with his usual platitudes and thick shades in a lot of sloganeering like '*economic dynamism*', '*social justice*', '*concern for the workers*' and '*involvement of the people*'. One would have thought something new would have been heard in his speech now that we have a new man at the helm, coming to the Government for the first time after the party has taken power. But, Cde. Speaker, twenty one years have passed and I thought we should have something a little more concrete, something more tangible which would tell us where we are going. Some of the proposals are old hats like N.I.S. benefits which are long overdue, increases to pensioners which was already announced, and now we are hearing about joint ventures that will bring about the Government's objective of infusing economic dynamism, infusing dynamism in the economy.

I do not know how this will be done but this will be like breathing life into a dead man because, obviously the economy is flat, it is dead on its back. We have the path of Masco; I hope that we will see the economic side of it livened. I do not see how that will be done. As regards economic dynamism Mr. D'Aguiar, the first Finance Minister of the Coalition P.N.C./U.F. Government told us too about economic dynamism. That was the slogan of the United Force. The approach then was the same we are hearing all over again. The United Force told us then about high waves to happiness, and without using the same words the President and the Minister of Economic Planning is telling us more or less the same. Mr. Peter D'Aguiar was regarded as a business genius and it was said that he will breathe life into the economy and make something great. We have seen where that led us, and now we are hearing about that same kind of approach, pragmatic, managerial, technocratic approach.

Mr. Speaker, I will '*bear chafe*'. The present President was in the driver's seat as Minister of Finance, as Minister of Economic Planning and Finance, as Vice-President of Production and Agriculture, as Prime Minister of Production and Agriculture. In the last years with Mr. Burnham's indisposition, Hoyte was in a key position. He was in the driver's seat, and where has he driven the economy? Into the mud, and now we are hearing that Hoyte as President will breathe new life into the dead. The Minister of Economic Planning, Mr. Haslyn Parris, he was also in the driver's seat for a long time. I remember when we put two people in the Economic Planning Committee, then not with a high-flown name as it is now, Planning Commission, we were then hearing of this model and that model, the Chinese model and the Yugoslav model. Well, you are still there, reading us nice speeches which are rather dry, but the fact of the matter is what have they

got to tell the Guyanese people about the quality of life and what they intend to do tomorrow in precise details to raise the standard of living to improve the moral of the people so they can get to work and produce?

Instead of doing that, the Minister or the Vice-President and Deputy Prime Minister launched an attack on those who are spreading misinformation about the state of the nation. Who is spreading misinformation, me, Jagan, Kwayana, the Patriotic Coalition for Democracy? No, we are not spreading the misinformation; it is what you have done to the economy. You have driven our people to the shores. They are insulted everywhere they go. Have a look at all the newspapers all over the world and see what they have to say about fraud in this country, about discrimination in this country, about no food in this country; split peas, flour, oil and soap. Even capitalist countries aspire to having motor cars and videos. Those are their aspirations. But here we have to aspire for soap and salt and split peas and flour. This is what these so-called socialists have brought our country to.

They talk about the father of the nation bringing political independence to our country. Even the political independence which they got through the C.I.A. which was handed to them by the C.I.A. – they are now returning the country to the C.I.A. and telling the world that we are misinforming.

The state of the nation is bankruptcy. Imagine! Jagan made these statistics? The P.P.P. made them? The 1984 Deficit Budget current account was greater than the revenue. The revenue was \$600 million and the deficit was \$669 million. We have to borrow to pay debts. We have to borrow to pay salaries. We have to borrow for social services. Are we misinforming the world? It is what you have done to the economy of the country that speaks louder than words.

With respect to foreign exchange, 45 percent is for debts, 47 percent for oil. There is practically nothing left for food, for medicine, for building materials, for raw materials, for spare parts for machinery, and yet they are now crying about the private sector and development and all that nonsense. Cde. Speaker, it is not we who are misinforming the world. It is by their deeds, the world has come around now to recognize what they are. At one time they were praising them. In the early period when they were given a lot of money which they squandered, the paper like the *Conservative* said Guyana was a model for the Third World. Now it is no longer a model. The Caribbean used to think, especially after the break-up of the Federation, that Guyana was an important link, so much so that when they rigged the 1968 elections and when they rigged the 1973 elections they were silent because they thought Guyana was the bread basket of the Caribbean and because L.F.S. Burnham initiated Carifta and he and Sonny Ramphal later played a big role in the Chaguaramas Treaty which launched out CARICOM. Yes, they were silent then about fraud because they were still hopeful that Guyana was going to play a big role in rescuing the Caribbean. Then we were bracketed with the big four. Today, we are no longer

called the bread basket of the Caribbean.

Cde. Speaker, we owe \$400 million to Trinidad and \$19 million to Barbados, \$19 million off the CARICOM Facility which resulted in the collapse of that Facility. They are talking of creating another Facility but without Guyana. Still they say we are spreading misinformation. Can you see how they are misinforming the world with all the video tapes and all the documents which they took to Mustique? Lies! Half truths! They do not want Jagan and company and everybody else to go abroad and inform the world about what is happening. When you do so you are deemed traitors. But, Cde. Speaker, the real traitors of this country are those who have wrecked our country and who today have put our country in such a perilous situation that they are going to sell it back to the imperialists. That is why in this paper you do not see anything about imperialism. You do not see any reference to socialism, nothing. It is left to my friend over there now to talk about socialism. From the President we got nothing at all.

Now we hear of a pervasive mood of optimism. Cde Speaker are you optimistic about the future? Everybody is running away. You know that Cde. Speaker. People are running away. After this election they are voting with their feet.

Sugar workers were on strike in 1975 for thirteen weeks, as a result they got a poll and in the poll G.A.W.U. won 98 percent of the votes – they got recognition. 1977 they had another strike for one hundred and thirty five days and after the election they were on strike for two days. Sugar workers and their families alone make up more than the votes of all these sitting on this side. Rice farmers – we take rice farmers, one third of the rice farmers have vacated the land, and one-third of the rice lands have been abandoned.

The ex-Regional Chairman of Region five said – Barkat Ally after the elections – am I permitted by the rules of the House to call it pre-elections, I just want to know before you rule me out of order. Yes, Barkat Ally said that out of 46,000 acres of rice land which was ready to be cultivated only 12,000 was put under the plough for rice. 46,000 families were in the rice industry at the time of the P.P.P. Government. All those people who voted with their feet, many of them have gone away to Surinam. We are now told they are voting for the P.N.C. They breach the racial frontier, Mr. Burnham said that in 1973 when they took three quarters of the votes but when Arnold Rampersaud was framed up for murder they did not trust the police in Corentyne because they said it would be prejudiced so they asked the court if the trial could be held in Georgetown yet they breached the frontier.

Cde. Speaker, they were summoned to Mustique, before that they were saying...they were stamping out meddlers because they people said let us come and see, let us observe. They called them foreigners but they had to go – orders – they had to go. Cde. Speaker, we have all over the place, one paper is calling in the whole Caribbean area, and everywhere you see this.

How is it? What drove Mr. Hoyte to go? Is it due to the orders from Uncle Sam that he went? Is he going there to join the club? Or is it that he is trying to find how he can get the boys in the Caribbean to tell Uncle Sam to give them some money? Is that it? Maybe the boys in the CARICOM are worried that CARICOM will break up. Maybe they are concerned about the money owed to them and maybe they are asking that the Guyana Government to toe the line, toe the ideological line of Uncle Sam so Uncle Sam can lend them some money so they can pay back Trinidad and Barbados. Is that it? Yes Cde. Speaker, let them borrow money to pay back debts, but that will not help this country, they might even borrow money to buy flour but when you borrow to buy flour, when you borrow to develop is another matter. The Soviet Union buys grain from the capitalist countries but they pay from their foreign earnings, but here we are borrowing to pay debts, now we will borrow to eat because I hear they will bring flour in the country. Maybe Uncle Sam is willing to give them a loan to buy flour. At one time when the ex-President was alive and when on May Day 1982 he said the I.M.F. proposals were a recipe to riot and then they began attacking the I.M.F. and attacking the Americans and everybody else, at that time no loans were coming, no flour, maybe the flour will come now, but Cde. Speaker, I want you to understand this that one of the things which is killing this country today is the debt burden. 45 percent of the foreign exchange in 1984 – had they heeded our advice we would not be in this situation today. Therefore Cde. Speaker, I say, end the mass alienation and the only way to end the mass alienation is to see the interconnection and interaction between economies and politics. You cannot have economic development and social development without democracy.

You cannot have rigging of elections over a continuous period, racial and political discrimination, extravagance and corruption and expect the economy to develop, and mere borrowing is only adding to the problems of the Guyanese people. A lot of money is coming in this country and it is because that is one of the reasons for the mismanagement and the mispending and the lack of democratic management. The Deputy Prime Minister told us about the good they have done in taking over the commanding heights of the economy, but he did not tell us anything about democratic management. He quoted from Lenin, why he did not tell us what Lenin said about management and what did Lenin do about corruption, they tell us those things too – but they do not read what is not convenient.

Yes Cde. Speaker, they now have a new slogan '*Stand up for Guyana*' and '*Moving the Nation Forward*' – that is a new slogan. Not so long ago we had '*Produce or Perish*' but they neither produced and they have been perishing. Now you must '*Stand up for Guyana*'. How you will '*Stand up for Guyana*' when you are running the country with ten percent of the people and the military. Ten percent of the population behind you parasitically holding on and ruling with the military and the police.

How are you going to '*Stand up for Guyana*' when you are running the

country with ten percent of the people? Ten percent of the people are behind you, holding on parasitically. You are ruling with the military and the police. How are you going to get Guyana moving forward again? Guyana has resources, abundant resources. We do not have as many resources as Cuba. We have half the land, fewer minerals, less forests and other natural resources. We have one-twelfth the mouths to feed. Yet basic problems have been solved in that socialist country. Instead of going forward, we are going backward. Yes, we want to '*Stand up for Guyana*', but we cannot '*Stand Up*' when votes are not counted at the place of poll. In Mystique the impression was given by the President that he met all the demands of the Opposition.

As I told you, Mr. Hoyte told them that he met all the demands of the Opposition but it was a big lie, a prevarication, because the main one, the counting of votes at the place of poll he refused to allow. He told us we could accompany the ballot boxes, but all who tried to do so were beaten up and several of them were not there to set their eyes on the count.

I will therefore conclude. We in the P.P.P. have been '*Standing Up*' for democracy and for Guyana and we say that the two things are interlinked. You cannot move Guyana forward without having democracy. If we want to stand up for Guyana, then all of the Members of the Government benches must recognize this fact and must see that we have a democratic society.



## **Petroleum (Exploration and Production) Bill: 14<sup>th</sup> April, 1986**

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, President Hoyte recently said and I quote:

*“Guyana’s total dependence on imported fuel has made the exploitation of the nation’s oil potential is imperative”.*

This will imply that President Hoyte, like a squirrel, has awakened from a long sleep, a long hibernation. A squirrel sleeps from one season to another avoiding the winter, but this Government has been sleeping for twenty years and now at long last we are recognizing that it is imperative to develop our oil potential. What a shame!

Guyana does not need a new Bill about oil, what it needs is a new Government. This Government has been an absolute failure, we are moving from one crisis to another. The latest is the energy crisis and no doubt that is why we are hearing all about the potential and about the nature of urgency and also that we are having the Bill before the House at this time.

Cde. Speaker, this energy crisis that we have now is going to compound our problems and even if we succeed with this Bill to over track these multinational sharks when are we going to get out of this crisis. What guarantee is there, considering the experience of many oil producing countries which are today in serious trouble? If one were to look at Mexico, Nigeria, Venezuela and Trinidad, nearer home, with all the bonanza arriving from very steep oil prices, their economies are today in serious trouble, almost as serious as ours and therefore we say and I repeat what we need in this country is a new Government, not just more gimmicks and this is another one of them.

The P.N.C. claims credit Cde. Speaker, for bringing Guyana to independence. What it hides however, the Prime Minister is not here, he was lecturing to students the other day and he was telling them how the P.N.C. brought the country to independence. What it hides however, is that it came to power with the help of the C.I.A. It is well known and established and that imperialism not only handed it political independence on a platter but also dictated its policies especially in the first decade of its misrule. It is well known, the Puerto Rican Model which was the basis of the first development plan and so on and so on.

It is said that energy is the lifeblood of a nation. On this basis any intelligent Government would have worked out a coherent energy policy. What did Lenin do after seizing Soviet power? He made, apart from the first declaration, the declaration of peace; the next one was the electrification of the country – synonymous with communism. Energy is important. He worked out a comprehensive programmed based on oil, based on water

development, based on coal and other things to solve those problems so that industrialization can proceed. That is why the Soviet Union is today the mighty industrial state emerging from a backward country in 1917. That is historical experience. After 20 years of P.N.C. rule, 16 years of independence, we are talking about a fuel crisis. We are seeing it in the streets. Go to the filling stations and see the long lines of motor cars when people of those cars should be working. How are you going to get production?

What did the P.P.P. Government do with regards to energy? It nationalized the Demerara Electric Company in 1960; purchased two additional 15 megawatt generators, and negotiated with the Cuban Government for the financing of the Tiger Hill Hydroelectric Project Demba was looking at. When Demba said they were not interested any more, they passed over their plans to Pryst Cardew and Ryder, the consultants to the Government and Pryst Cardew and Ryder advised the P.P.P. Government not only to buy two steam generators but also to go ahead with the Tiger Hill project. I was able to negotiate with the Cuban Government to get them to agree to finance that development. That time they passed a meagre sum of \$32 million and then through the United Nations Technical Assistance we brought here a Soviet oil geologist. He said, after examining all the data that they indicate the presence of oil in Guyana and he recommended a series of tests. The understanding was that they do not go in for the wild-cat type of exploration in the Soviet Union like the big multinationals do, but they go in for a lot of testing and when they drill a hole most times they find oil. That is their method. That is what I was told to do. Of course, the multinationals have a lot of money to gamble with. But as I said the Soviet geologist has recommended a series of tests and the P.P.P. Government would have gone through with all of that had it continued in the Government, of course with United Nations assistance.

Cde. Speaker, what did the P.N.C. do? As a client of the USA and the C.I.A. they pursued a pro-imperialist policy for more than a decade. Thereafter, it wobbled, sometimes with imperialism, sometimes against imperialism and consequently abandoned the tests which were recommended by the Soviet oil geologist and brought in the multinationals. They were here before. Let the Minister tell us what happened with all of that. What did they find? We know, of course. Whether they found anything or not, at least it has not materialized into anything. They severed all relations with Cuba; trade, cultural and the Tiger Hill Project went out the window. Then the P.N.C. in 1968 placed its hopes on a multi-million Mazaruni Hydroelectric Alumina Smelter Project to be financed by the World Bank. That was later abandoned after squandering a lot of scarce resources and building a road to the site. The P.N.C. naively did not anticipate that imperialism was not going to cut off its nose to spoil its face to make it partially self-sufficient from the tentacles of Omoco and Texaco in Trinidad. Those two multinationals then dominated the Trinidad oil industry. Of course we were linked to purchasing, by all kinds of agreements which were made,

from those multinationals. Even the Trinidad Government and people were exploited by those multinationals. One of them, Tosors, cleaned up money in Trinidad in a very short time. So the imperialists did not want that and at the same time they did not want Guymine as a potential cheapest producer of aluminium in the world to become severe competitors to the North American aluminium transnational.

This is how they came to power. They came to power with the help of the C.I.A. and the big boys. They talk about independence and they expect the very big boys, the very sharks, to liberate them, to give them \$2 million US to develop the hydro project and the Mazaruni hydro project and aluminium smelter. They are living in a dream world. Of course, they had to come down to reality, having wasted over \$100 million on building infrastructure. They had to face reality when the World Bank and all the big boys outside said no, no more. Of course, the imperialists at that time were very angry with the sugar levy that the Government imposed in 1974 and took away the excess profits from Bookers.

That is another reason why they did not respond. At the end of that year we got the "bible", the "bible" of the P.N.C. - the Sophia Declaration. I remember when we were discussing the 1966 to 1972 Development Plan, I did a similar thing. I brought forward to this Assembly the P.N.C. manifesto for the 1964 election. I said it did not go as far as we could go but it programmed for the future. But it was not the basis of the plan. Now I raise this one to remind these people of their utterances and their own declarations.

Cde. Speaker, what did they say in this Declaration? That the state will own and control all natural resources and foreign capital will be permitted entry into Guyana only in partnership with the state or cooperative. We have here in this Bill - why is it we are moving away from the title. We are told by President Hoyte that we will carry on with the legacy of the 'Great Leader' but Cde. Speaker, it seems that all we will be left with is a mummified body of the President because all the principles enunciated are being cast overboard now. We are now being told, of course not only now, it started with the New Investment Code of 1978 following the I.M.F. Agreement and now the New Investment Code undermines the Sophia Declaration and now that they are ready to sign another I.M.F. agreement, all the indications are in the card. You are not signing, okay technically you are not signing, but they have already agreed to include you in the basket of the poorest countries of the world to qualify for a special fund of the I.M.F. of three billion dollars. Why don't you publish that in the papers? It is common knowledge everywhere else but you refuse to let the Guyanese know how you are selling out, you do not want them to know and all this here that we see now is part of this betrayal, part of this sell out.

Cde. Speaker, Home Oil came after the New Investment Code and so on from Canada. Home Oil was drilling in the Rupununi area. I understand when they were drilling there the Brazilians were drilling right across the

river too, considering that you have a leak in the bottom and probably it crawls out across the borders and I understand, I do not know how true it is, the Minister may be able to tell us that Home Oil after a while said they are quitting, they do not have any more money to continue, that what they had then found was not clear that it was in commercial quantities but meanwhile the Brazilians were also drilling and I understand whatever information Home Oil got they probably made a deal with the Brazilians and so we are the losers. Now after the Deputy Prime Minister's trip abroad we hear that four companies, British Petroleum, Oxidental, Exxon and Scottish Marine Oil have indicated an interest. The last bit is wrong; I copied it from your papers. I copied wrong, I am sorry, I don't know if the Scottish Marine Oil is the one who is doing offshore oil up in the Scotland area, but Cde. Speaker, once again we are putting our country's independence and its energy policies in the hands of the transnational. I say once again because all along we were looking to the multinationals to find oil here and let us face the fact, those fellows are looking for oil not for today and tomorrow. You may want it today and tomorrow but they are looking for oil for the next century and they will determine where and when even if they succeed in exploring for oil, and when they explore you do not know what they do. They do not necessarily even give you information; I had that personal experience when I was in the Government with the Bauxite Company Demba. Information which they had, they refused to give to the Government and the oil companies do that. How are you to know, you are too small but I repeat Cde. Speaker, we are now once again repeating the same old thing, but I ask this question. Why would the oil companies come now when oil prices have hit the bottom and US oil companies themselves in Texas especially in that area have cut back production? I understand five thousand people have been thrown out of work. I was listening to a broadcast on V.O.A. two nights ago and you have a big war going on now between the Administration of the United States where the Vice-President said something must be done about the low price of oil and he suggested that Saudi Arabia should probably restrict its production. He was not saying that when the price was high or other when the O.P.E.C. Organisation was trying to get Saudi Arabia to restrict its production. The US was not saying that, but now that it is affecting their own backyard the Vice-President of the United States comes along with such a statement and I heard one commentator say that the Vice-President is hurting his chances for the presidential elections to come because he is showing that he has partisan interests only linking to those oil producers, he is not thinking of the consumers and others who can gain and the economy which can gain from low oil prices, but more than that the President and his boys considering that the Vice-President was going against the American free enterprise philosophy of capitalism came out and said we still believe in market forces to determine prices and they said maybe the Vice-President was not understood properly what he said.

Cde. Speaker, I am going off into that tangent only to show you that when those big fellows are cutting back in production, throwing people out of work, how do we expect them at this time to come here in Guyana? Are we giving them a blank cheque, is that what this Bill is all about too? Take a blank cheque boy, come along. You can write your own tax laws, you can write your own measures, and we need you so badly today you have open house. Cde. Speaker, we are told that Guyana is committed to CARICOM, a firm commitment. Are we now moving therefore to entice the multinationals on their own terms so as to undermine Trinidad oil industries which have now been taken over by the State?

Are we doing that? I remember sitting at a meeting once, the Heads of Government, when Wills Isaacs, the Minister of Trade and Industry, threatened to walk out of the meeting if his Government was not allowed to give 15 years tax holiday to an oil refinery that they wanted to set up in Jamaica. Trinidad argued you do not need another oil refinery; we have enough oil refinery capacity in Trinidad. Wills threatened to walk out and up to today they cannot agree on a common incentive programme because each one of the territories wants to solve its problems with the international sharks. In the end that course is very illusory. It has proved to be illusory in Jamaica and it has proved to be illusory elsewhere. Cde. Speaker, has this Government approached the socialist countries to look for oil here?

I ask, have they done that? Probably not. The socialist countries have helped many Third World countries to find oil, Romania, the Soviet Union and so on.

On the question of taxation, I wrote the Deputy Prime Minister a letter asking him whether he has consulted the United Nations. There was an article in the *Sunday Chronicle* a few weeks ago talking about how transnationals have more power, they are so big, more than Governments, since the time of Allende. The United Nations have been looking at these transnationals to set up a code of conduct and I asked him whether he had consulted them – because this is a highly technical subject – about a tax holiday, about tax legislation, about depletion allowances, a very complicated question and there is nothing in the Bill here about all of that. All we are hearing is about flexibility. In other words, we are going to pander to these people and give them what they want.

Cde. Speaker, having rejected our call for a political solution and the formation of a broad-based National Patriotic Front Government, having rigged elections, alienated the working people and put our country into a debt track, the P.N.C. is now forced to renege on its principles outlined in the Sophia Declaration and to place our nation in a status of political and economic dependency. That is the road we are going on now. Tell us whether Guyana will have any shareholding on a minority or majority basis.

Cde. Speaker, the Mover of the Motion asked us for unanimous support for this Bill. Let me repeat, Guyana does not need a new Bill. What it

needs is a new Government. That is our answer to this question. We are interested in the development of this country but we cannot see this country putting its eggs in this basket which will be moving away from the Declaration of Sophia, which will be going away from the principles which have been enunciated by the Leader of the P.N.C. in 1974. What we want is real political and economic independence. This Government is moving now not only in the alliance with the big bourgeoisie of this country as they showed us during the elections, and the parasitic bourgeoisie, but it is also now making an alliance with the foreign bourgeoisie and this is part of all of that. What a shame! Resign, let the people of Guyana chart the destiny of this country in a real independent course.

## Off-Shore Banking Bill: 15<sup>th</sup> April, 1986

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, the question might be properly asked, where are we drifting? Yesterday I asked what happened to the P.N.C.'s *'Bible'*, the Sophia Declaration. Since yesterday there were some expressions of pleasure expressed that I was reading the Declaration of Sophia for the first time and supporting it, let me make some observations. I read it a long time ago. And let me say too that there are some parts of it with which we agree, that is, the state will own and control the natural resources of the country. Other things such as the miniaturization of banks etc. were in keeping with what we regard as moving towards economic independence of a country. But then there were other things in it. I want to make that clear.

I agree with it and I want to make my observations right away because I do not think I can get the *Chronicle* and the radio to air my views. I want to say that I do not agree with the notion of "*Cooperative Socialism*", Guyana being the first Cooperative Republic and the P.N.C. being the vanguard party, and the P.N.C. concept of the economy being carefully and competently managed. As I said, we had a certain perspective in the Declaration which was enunciated. As I said, the main thesis being to make this country economically independent and thereby also protecting its political independence.

What is one of the arguments put forward by the mover of this Bill, that it has now become more or less fashionable; it is the practice even with our Caribbean brothers. That does not necessarily mean that it is good. Some of our Caribbean brothers are fishing around too; they are in a lot of mess and in the process trying to grab anything they can get. All we have to do is to read some of the critical remarks of what is happening from people like Alistair McIntyre who said that we need careful planning, where we are going and how to get there instead of just shooting after stars which eventually do not materialize into anything. We had here in this same thing the miniaturization of banks. Then later, after the sugar and bauxite industries were nationalized, there was even talk by the P.N.C. in 1976 of nationalizing the local banks. After the I.M.F. agreement was made all of that was silently dropped. Of course, we understand that with the I.M.F. came a lot of political measures. Now we have a new Bill. As I understand it, there are two types of offshore banking centres; those in the metropolitan countries; London, New York, Zurich, etc., where they have facilities for customers and so on. I do not think we are going to have that kind of banking. Obviously, we do not have the basic infrastructure, good air services, telephone and communication services, the well developed legal, commercial and accounting systems. Perhaps some will say that we do have it, with an abundance of expertise and political stability.

The Minister referred to political stability. Of course there was political



stability under Duvalier too, but suddenly one day it erupted. So do not be misled by appearances and the people abroad are not fooled by P.N.C. propaganda that there is political stability and how they won the elections with an overwhelming victory. So much so that the Ambassador of Guyana in Britain is complaining that the newspapers would not publish their letters. That is because they are not fooled with all your propaganda and they do not wish to become your agent. So I want to say clearly that we are not going to be the centre for the first type of offshore banking which has some advantages. So what are we going to be then? A secondary type of offshore bank, if at all we get them?

What are we going to do? Does it mean that the P.N.C. Government will enter into a rat race to begin to provide some of the things which the Caribbean countries can already provide for those people, infrastructure facilities, and what would be the net gain if we are to provide those things which these offshore banks might require? As I understand it there are certain facilities which are provided. If you go to Barbados for instance, you do not have the hassle that we have, people coming in here to the airport. You have air transport practically every day. These people who are doing banking business and so on, they can come and go everyday freely. What are we going to do then? We are going to encourage them to come here and not to go to Barbados, not go to the Panama, not go to the Bahamas, to encourage them to come here. What are we going to do? We will start providing all of this infrastructure service and so on and what are the advantages we will get? Nominal, negligible if anything at all. Okay, we are told that we will probably get some investments for things in the Interior possibly and then we are told okay, we will be able to audit these people properly, we will be able to keep control of them. Did we control Mr. Green and Global Agri? Did we control the Jonestown man Jim Jones? Jim Jones set up a State within a State, with their own guards, their own guns, their own everything else. Guyanese could not enter there. In fact if it was not so, if it was not a State within a State maybe the tragedy would not have happened, everybody would have know what was happening. Is this the kind of thing which we want? Cde. Speaker, I do not think we must enter into a rat race with the other Caribbean countries by granting incentives and other things in order to allow these people to come here and compete with our brothers in the Caribbean. We saw that kind of rat race already in the industrial arena and now it seems we are entering into this in the banking arena. This seems to be what is happening. Well, I do not think it is good enough. Apart from the rat race competition with our neighbours which seems to be ensued by this kind of thing, offshore banking is also likely to cause strained relations even with Third World countries from which some of this money is flowing away, like in the Arab countries and we talk about Third World collective self reliance. If we want to attract money from some of these people, let us have bilateral relations with them, let us talk to them, let us have friendly political relations with them, let us



today express our solidarity with Libya, support Gadaffi and maybe Gadaffi will give us some money. We do not have to go to crooks and narcotic dealers and parasites and people like Marcos who are hiding their money all over the world and bring them into offshore banking in Guyana. This is what we want? Do we want to encourage especially now Cde. Speaker, people who are involved in drugs? They come here and they say they are in business. I went to the Pomeroon River one time and I saw a Colombian running a sawmill. That was a good front for the narcotics, for the marijuana trade and we know today that the drug business is a multi-billion dollar business. The Mafia is linked up with it, a lot of international gangsters are linked up with it and Guyana is good place. Already the Commissioner of Police, I read in the *Chronicle* that the Commissioner of Police said for the first eleven weeks ten thousand or twelve thousand ganja plants were uprooted. I had to send some people to the Commissioner of Police from the Berbice River. Some of our friends are worried there now because ganja has taken over the place. That is a provision area, corn, provisions, this was to be the global agri-area where we will become self sufficient, the Caribbean soya bean and corn project. At one time we even had the Libya and Guyana project – what happened to that project? What happened to the Caribbean project? Everything is failing, you are here and you are causing it to fail and you are keeping your mouth closed. I know what is happening, I go all over this country and I am saying this is, for the little benefit that we are going to get out of this thing, the disadvantages are so great that I do not think that we should enter into this thing, this country should not do it.

We have as I said, okay we have auditors and what not but can we be constantly be policing these people and they have, I understand in the Bill, measures by which they can have, if you want to carry out any investigations you have to go to the court. The court, clause 54, I am told the court and it is known how the courts operate here. How many years does it take for a case to be heard? By that time these people fly away and so on. There are definite disadvantages and I think on balance the disadvantages outweigh the gains. Of course a few lawyers will be well off, they will become agents of these banks, these paper banks and no doubt the P.N.C. lawyers will be well off like Clarke and Martin, a company which is the legal representative of all state corporations in Guyana. This will give way to that. Already there are a lot of rackets going on in this country and we want to indulge in a little bit more of it. Why do we want to help out the P.N.C. to become multi millionaires too like these narcotics sharks, some of them are already in it, some big boys are here and what are we going to do now, get foreign dollars to start growing marijuana plants all over the place. Some of the big boys, some who are even in the agency of security, they are even linked with it now.

Cde. Speaker, I do not think that we have much to gain. The Comrade said it will not be easy for capital to take flight from Guyana. I was just

hearing a broadcast a few days ago about capital flight and how this thing is now such a big problem facing Third World countries which is contributing to the problem of nonpayment and so I do not think that we have the machinery, the Government has not got the machinery for supervision and control and to bring in this kind of machinery, to establish it would be very costly and I do not think it is worth it from what will be gained. Cde. Speaker, I repeat, this is not the way forward. I would say that what we want is to get the policy, where we can get this country going forward by the people getting down to producing, producing in the country and that is not happening. Why we are flying all over the place trying to grasp at shadows. This is not going to get us anywhere. What this Government should have been exercising their minds at is why it is production and productivity is going down every day? Why is it?

Why is it we have markets for rice and we cannot supply? Last year we could not supply certain countries with rice. A man was telling me there is no rice for him. Where bauxite is concerned, we have markets for bauxite which we could not supply last year. The Deputy Prime Minister said yesterday we are better off than Jamaica with private enterprise because we were able to make certain barter agreements with some socialist countries in the last period, and as a result we were able to obviate this world crisis in the aluminium industry, to get around it by the barter trade. But we are not able to produce the bauxite to supply the markets which we have.

Jamaica cannot find markets because of poor bureaucratic management without the involvement of the working people, without democratic trade unions in the country. Only Viola is left now talking about the old anti-imperialist things and so on. She made a brilliant statement the other day when the Nicaraguan representative was here. That is the kind of thing we want to hear. Today this Assembly should have been getting up and throwing stones at the Americans for bombing Libya. What they are doing? They are remaining silent. They do not want to debate because they are looking to Uncle Sam for some little dollars for peanuts. Go and ask the Caribbean who sold out their rights and soul. They are getting peanuts now and they are quarrelling about the peanuts. Stick to principles and we will get somewhere. Principles got you markets for bauxite because you were able to go to the Soviet Union, to the G.D.R. and Yugoslavia and you marketed and you cannot even supply the bauxite. You want us to grow marijuana? You want to do like Bolivia where the people...

Farmers over there told me the dams are sinking into the trench, no maintenance, and after a while the rice lands will not get any proper drains. I am saying why don't we concentrate on these basic problems at home, like how to get unity in the country, how to take clear-cut anti-imperialist positions, how to stick to the declaration and its major principles and not the propaganda inside of it and get this country moving. We have the capacity, we have the potential in this country, we have the wealth and we have the people. This country really can be a great country. It is poten-

tially rich but very poor now, almost relegated to the poorest of the poor in the world. Today the poor in Bolivia and Columbia are producing narcotics that came about because of the ruination of agriculture, because of foreign domination, because of things like this which we are not trying to grasp and bring into this country. Let us move away from this.

The new President has set a new course, changing at least some of the things which were being done in the last few years, after it was said in May, 1982 that the new I.M.F. proposals would be a recipe to riot. Okay, you had stability because of...but that is not going to last forever if you keep going on like this. This is not the way. Cde. Speaker, we oppose this Bill.

## Affirmation of the External Loans Offer: 15th April, 1986

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, this Bill is now asking the House to approve an increase for the Government to borrow to a limit of five billion dollars.

Cde. Speaker, where are we going? We are piling debts upon debts and this country is up to its neck in payment of debts. We had in 1984, for the first time in 1984 the debt payment was more than the revenue. The revenue in that year was six hundred million dollars and the debt payment was six hundred and ninety nine. That means to say we have to borrow to pay debts, we have to borrow to pay salaries, and we have to borrow for social services and whatever else the Government might be helping the people with, old age pensions and things like that. Cde. Speaker, in that same year 1984 the Budget deficit was six hundred and sixty nine million dollars.

Borrow that from the banks, it comes to about \$18 million interest alone. They are borrowing here, they are borrowing abroad. Our payments now given to us amount to nearly 45 percent of export foreign earnings. What are we doing, borrowing more and more? What are we trying to do? Why don't we try to put the house in order? Why don't we try to do things which can get the people to produce more so that we can export more, so that we can earn more foreign exchange? I understand we are going to bring flour now in the country. When the Russians are buying the wheat and grain they do not borrow to bring it in. They sell gold and oil and from the earnings they are able to buy millions. We are not borrowing to develop, we are borrowing to eat. The P.N.C. has put this country in such a mess. They are borrowing to eat, borrowing to develop, borrowing to steal. That is part of it too. I do not think this is the answer. Borrowing more is not the answer.

We have defaulted. The I.M.F. declared this country ineligible. We have defaulted in Trinidad - \$500 million. As a result, the Trinidadians say give us foreign dollars before you get oil. At one time we could not even supply them with rice. We have now lost the Caribbean rice market because we were not producing rice at a sufficient quantity or quality to supply them. They have taken over where we had a monopoly under the old rice agreement which was carried over into CARIFTA and CARICOM. Now we here we do not have it any more.

Cde. Speaker, we are extending the borrowing limits so that we can borrow more to pay more? One would have expected to hear something from the Minister. Why is it that we want to raise the limit and what is our capacity to service the present debt that we have. We own \$90 million to the CARICOM facility as a result of which it has collapsed. I do not think there is anything fundamentally wrong with borrowing. Even the United

States is caught now because they were borrowing and borrowing and the interest rates that they have to pay and that huge debt is now causing the big deficit they have. Already we have a big deficit in the Budget which is resulting from the fact that we have two factors; a big bureaucracy and a big military apparatus. The bigger the Budget deficit, the more we have. So we are now going to the vicious circle, we borrow abroad, we borrow local. Therefore, if you borrow so much you have to pay so much of your foreign earnings for debt payments, then we do not have the money for the raw materials or for the spare parts. That is why I talk of the vicious circle. That is why the Government of Guyana has to get down looking at the problems.

Why is it you are not able to motivate the people of Guyana to produce? Since 1982 when Pat Thompson quite the Guymine industry he said there was low morale among the people of Guyana and unless you can stimulate and motivate the people you cannot solve any problems. Since then the situation, as he rightly said, has gotten worse. You are borrowing and raising the limit. But I repeat, the more you borrow – for the deficit in the Budget you borrowed \$669 million. Let us say that is the deficit. You have to find it somewhere even if it is internal. But that adds to the debt payments. You borrow from wherever you can catch. Now, because some of the countries like the US refuse to lend you money, some of the institutions refuse to lend you, you want to go into the same course. I think we must not always be blaming external factors. We must begin to look at our own situation.

Government is very anxious at all times to talk about external factors. I was reading here where the Prime Minister was talking of how much international terms of trade are affecting countries like Guyana. How much more sugar we have to sell and how much rice? That is well known. It has become a cliché. We know the imperialists are not going to bring in a new international economic order and we will never get it if we keep hugging them up. We have to unite with those militants in the Third World, like Rajiv Gandhi who today got up and condemned the American aggression against Libya. I hope Rashleigh Jackson, Foreign Minister, will join him so that we can show solidarity with those who are fighting against imperialism. You are not going to get a new international order by begging and going to the I.M.F. asking for crumbs. Things have to be put right here. We have to fight imperialism to get a new international order. We are not going to get it by remaining silent in this type of aggression that is going on, and we are not going to get internal factors changed until we stop rigging elections. We try to get democratic processes in the country. We try to get democratic trade unionism where the workers can have the unions of their choice, unions run democratically and the workers have through their unions a key role to play in production and productivity. This is how we are going to be able to solve the bottlenecks...

Cde. Speaker, they are asking for loans, for an upper limit, to be able to

borrow more. Cde. Speaker, it is understood that if they want to raise the limit that they intend to borrow more. If they do not intend to borrow more why they raise the limit? My God, I thought you were a lawyer with logic. Learning logic is part of legal training.

Let me come back to the main point. I am saying that raising the limit has to do with the intention to borrow more. If you do not intend to borrow more you would not raise the limit as it is now is obstructing you from borrowing. I am saying that borrowing more and more, and raising the limit is not the answer, it is getting us deeper and deeper in problems because of the debt payment. If the Government had taken the line taken by the P.P.P. way back in 1962 when we said suspend the debt payment and pay only a quarter which Governments are doing now, we would not have had all these problems, but they do not want to take such a course because they are afraid. They do not want to do like Bolivia and the Peruvian President who said I am not going to pay more than ten percent of my foreign earnings, so keep borrowing, keep raising the limit and get the country further and further into debt. Please tell us where to find the money. If you are taxing the workers to pay debt, if you are cutting down their social services to pay debts, how do you expect the workers to produce? How do you expect them to live and this is one point that we have to tackle these fundamental problems and the internal problems including the external ones which we are always complaining about.

I am opposed to this, opposed to further raising the limit because it has already reached a point where this country cannot properly service its debt. What it is doing, now, it is not only defaulting but it is doing it at the detriment of the workers and this is affecting the production and productivity of this country and we cannot go on like this.

## Sympathy on Death of Cde. A.I. Crum Ewing, A.A.: 4th June, 1986

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, I too would like to join with the Government in expressing regrets of the People's Progressive Party members of this House on the passing of this great Guyanese. I think we all will agree with the observations made by the Minister that we had in Mr. Crum Ewing a dedicated civil servant, hard working and a person who put a great deal of energy in what he was doing.

I recall my own experience with him as a freshman Parliamentarian in 1947. I understand from the Minister that was the year in which he became clerk, and the very useful advice which I got from him, then with the kind of fervour with which I spoke in the Parliament, I remember the occasion when the Bar of Guyana in Mr. McDavid and the head of the plantocracy of Guyana in Mr. Seaford would get up and interrupt every time I spoke and I must admit they at times flustered me and after a while Mr. Crum Ewing seeing my discomfiture told me one time very privately, he said *"young chum takes a little bit of advice, when they get up to interrupt you just quietly sit down and note where you stop"*.

He told me as soon as they sit down you get up and blaze away again. So I learned from him the art of being a Parliamentarian and doing it with a smile. As I said, I learnt a great deal from him and he was a friend of the day and my guide. I am glad that the Minister on behalf of the Government mentioned all the useful qualities that he had, but perhaps I should not add this discordant note. I remember that Mr. Crum Ewing was willing to continue in the job after his retirement. We all felt that he should do so because of his great experience. No doubt, because he was a civil servant in the tradition of an independent civil service and since it might have not been in keeping with the doctrine of the paramount, that opportunity was not given to him and so he had to leave the very useful public service life. We had even proposed him as Speaker, but I repeat, because he was not a Party man at any time that was not in agreement with the Government. I think the position he held as a Member of the Police Service Commission, he probably had a Report from me when I was consulted about nominating someone. However, be that as it may, I repeat, there are people like Mr. Crum Ewing who remain in this country, people who are willing to serve without fear or favour and people who will do without limitations, the best for their country.

I wish to express our great sympathy on his death and to express our deep sympathy to his grieving family.

## Financial Paper No. 1/1986: 12<sup>th</sup> June, 1986

### Item 3 - Guyana National Service:

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, a Supplementary Question. Would the Minister tell us how many people have been settled in the Interior under the National Service? I recall that this was one of the main purposes when the National Service was started that these people will become familiar with what was then said to be the best part of the country and then we will have settlements in the Interior. Well this was in 1974 and up to the present time I think we should have had some result from this huge expenditure. The Prime Minister said we will continue to spend more and more money. I know very little is being obtained from the production. What are we getting in terms of this other side that is to create a person that is all round and interested in the Interior. Maybe the Minister will give us the answer - if he cannot give us the answer now then I hope he will give us a written answer because the answer to that question is very important, because we do not want to spend more money on this Head. It is not that we do not want to spend money on this Head, but there are other Heads such as the University of Guyana. There is no money there. We are bringing teachers at tremendous expense from other countries, it is a disgrace. Not that the Sri Lankans are disgraceful, what is disgraceful is that we have to go to another Third World country where the illiteracy rate are much lower than Guyana and yet you fetch them all the way here at a great cost to the tax payers. And our University because of lack of essentials...

[**Mr. Speaker:** Which one of the questions are you speaking on?]

**Dr. Jagan:** I am saying that the Head No. 1, with all the solutions, due to the fact that the education system is breaking down, the University has no money, there is no science lab properly equipped and as a result we do not have enough students to go to the University, we do not have enough graduates especially in the scientific field. What kind of business are we running here? You cannot train your people, those who you have trained are not staying here and then you are sending for people from all over the place and you have to pay thousands and thousands of dollars. Maybe the Prime Minister ought to look at this aspect and transfer the money from the National Service to the University and the Cyril Potter College where they are training teachers. The whole thing is a bankrupt situation at the moment.

I want, Cde. Chairman, to follow up on the answer given, which was not an answer really. Is the increased cost for dietary supplies due to an increase in population of the prisons or is it due to a bigger quantity or a better quality of the diet?



[The Chairman: Page 8, Item 53.]

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Chairman, I would like to raise a point on the amount of money under this item 53 - \$653,200- to meet an increase in salaries and allowances to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Regional Democratic Councils. I want to draw the attention of this Assembly to the fact that we are creating a more burdensome bureaucracy by this so-called Regional System and we are not making things any better for the people who live within these Regional Districts. All we are doing is just increasing the bureaucracy. We have problems too to be solved. Therefore I would like to draw it to the attention of this Assembly.

**Item 4 - Office of the President:**

**Dr. Jagan:** According to my calculations for 1985, we have spent 1.3 million on repairing the Residence which does not seem to be occupied. I pass by almost every day and I cannot see that it is being occupied. I would like to refer at a later stage to another item on the up-keep. But why should it cost \$1.3 million – and I believe it is more than this because this is the only amount for 1985 - when all that was involved was a little flare-up in the attic. We understood that some children were playing with matches. So it was only to repair the result of a minor fire and now it has a major amount. I do not know that this country, poor at it is, can afford such exorbitant expenditure.

[The Chairman: Capital Estimates, pages 2 and 3, items 7 to 14.]

**Item 14, Ministry of Finance, New Glass Works:**

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Chairman, the legend states to finance operations for the Guyana Glass Works Limited. This Head is now going to cost nearly \$8 ½ million. What are we doing? We were told not too long ago how the North Koreans came here and how wonderful they were and we gave them big decorations, how they saved the country so many millions of dollars and everything was going fine. This country is owed an explanation. What is going on? Why do we have to keep pouring money down the drain? If we have made a blunder, if the millions that this Glass Works cost are not going to produce any results, let us have an explanation of what is going on and let us decide to give it away to somebody or dump it in the Demerara River. The question is what the position is.

Not too long ago I read in the *Chronicle* where they said that the thing would be put out of commission for three months and alternative employment might be found for the workers. What is the position since then?

Have the three months gone, or we are still in the three month period?

What happened to the workers? Are they getting any alternative employment? What are the prospects for this thing? Are we going to keep pouring money down the drain? Why is it not working? I understand bottles which were produced were rejected by Banks Breweries, they are no good. The country is owed an explanation of what is happening.

Here was an opportunity to set up a viable industry based on raw materials which we have plenty of. We have sand all over the place. This Government in 1965 cancelled a Glass Factory that we were going to bring from Hungary and West Germany and that was going to cost less than \$1 million. How many millions have gone down here? That time they were taking orders from Uncle Sam. You cannot buy anything from Hungary. I do not know where this one came from. How many more millions are we going to throw down the drain when we do not have bandages and essentials for people at the hospital? How long? I think we need a proper debate and a proper explanation of what is going on in this factory. The Government must bring the Members of this Assembly into its confidence and tell us exactly what is happening. Do not keep coming and asking for more and more billions for this deal. If it is dead let us bury it. This is a waste of money. Let the Minister tell us precisely what is the actual position and whether this thing is going to work or not, or let us close it off.

Cde. Speaker, the Hon. Vice-President and Prime Minister in speaking about the glass factory said, as I understood it, that the major problem was one of a managerial and technical aspect. This brings me to the point, and then he gave us a long meandering about different people in the glass industry like Libby Glass. The question is Cde. Speaker, where does this factory come from? When we bought it, when it was purchased was it in keeping with the most modern technology at that time? There is a view that Third World countries can in industrialization surpass some of the developed countries because they can take advantage of the most modern technology that is used. That is how Japan and Germany out passed the USA because they were retooled after the Second World War with more modern technology. Now we are hearing about those technical problems what are they? I remember when we were discussing the question years ago about buying the factory and part of the package was that we would send technicians to Hungary to work in a similar glass factory. This was supposed to include managers, technicians and everybody. So when the factory comes here after signing the contract, then we would be prepared to work the factory and in the early period the people abroad were supplying the equipment to make a managerial contract to manage the factory for two or three years. This is how you run things but these people are dumping everything. Somebody gives them something, they take it.

This Government is making too many blunders. The railway, the glass factory, the textile factory – and therefore through their blunders we have to pay. I come to the next point, managerial. We are told that paramountcy is here to stay. The Prime Minister said in a debate recently that all coun-

tries have paramountcy, paramountcy in the sense that the Ruling Party will decide on the policy that the Government will pursue, but not that the Ruling Party will decide x, y and z, will become the employer and so on. The State and the Party have become indistinguishable, that is, beyond paramountcy. Nobody is disputing that the party must decide the policy...

No, I am making a comment. If we are going to manage properly we have to stop this distorting of paramountcy to suit P.N.C. purposes. Ask the Vice-President, Cde. Chandisingh, how paramountcy works in socialist countries. In our country we are supposed to have independent Commissions, the Service Commission, etc. But things are failing in this country because the Ruling Party is dictating who the people must be, who must get the job, who must be promoted. That is why so many people are leaving this country and we have to spend so many millions to import people from Sri Lanka and all over the place. That is why we are failing in management and we will continue to fail. The glass factory is one of them. He said so. He said it was managerial and technical.

I move to the last point quickly, Consultancy Services. I want to know whether this consultancy firm is the same one which owes over \$13 million to the Guyana National Cooperative Bank and does not have any assets. Please investigate it. A lot of money is going to the big boys, their friends, and you will find there is no money to back it up.

### **Item 3- Georgetown Hospital:**

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, I understand that some years ago a miniature hospital design was put out at the Fogartys Building, in the lobby of the Parliament too. What has happened to that design? Cde. Speaker, let us go back to the Mazaruni project, they went and spent millions and millions to build roads to Mazaruni on the understanding that there will be a big hydro electric project there and the millions wasted, it never materialized because the money did not come for the project. We want to know, where in the estimates, when has it been told to this House and this nation that we will get a new hospital and where is the money coming from?

## Financial Paper No.2 /1986

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, I just want to ask the Prime Minister about this consultancy charge here. Why is there this charge? I remember way back in the 1960s our engineers in the Ministry of Works and Hydraulics were able to do the consultancy work for the first stage of the Mahaica/Mahaicony/Abary Scheme. Why is it that we need to have consultancy charges for a simple road like this when there was a road already there? How much was it? Who was it? Would the Prime Minister tell us who was the consultant? How much did we pay him for this job? I think we have to stop wasting money not only in the priority which we were discussing a little while ago. Why was this kind of consultancy work carried on within the Minister of Works? This is not such a big complicated engineering project that we need to have consultants to do that. Or is it just a means of giving a job to our friends.

We are taking bureaucrats of the Government who are working for salaries and we are allowing them to set up little companies of their own. A kind of parasitic capitalism is developing in this country. This is very bad and the Government has to stop this type of thing. A lot of people are starving, Cde. Speaker, the Prime Minister is irrelevant. That has nothing to do with bureaucrats of the state and parasitic existence on the side. So a state capitalism is developing here. The State is giving jobs to the boys who are already getting big salaries and so on. They must do their work as state employees and not give them opportunities to get lucrative contracts on the side and set up little companies. Hammie, I thought you were building socialism.

I said the Prime Minister, only the other day, was talking about building socialism. How are you going to do that and develop parasitic capitalism? How? Jobs for the boys? And not only jobs, perks on the side. Big perks.

[**The Chairman:** Capital Estimates, page 1, items 2 and 3. Current Estimates pages 4 and 5, items 23, 24, 25. Capital Estimates, page 1, item 4. Current Estimates, pages 5 and 6, items 27 and 33.]

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Chairman, Item 27. It says here \$29 million to meet a 10 percent increase in salaries to the Public Service and some public sector agencies. I do not understand why it is that the sugar workers have not been paid this increase which has been paid to every single category of worker. I would like the Minister to tell us how it is. This matter was taken up with the T.U.C. It was taken up with the Minister of Finance and he, I understand, said that he was looking into the matter and an answer will be given very shortly. As I said, all public sector employees have been paid the amount but sugar workers in factories and so on have not been paid.

Why? Maybe we can get an answer now because as I said the T.U.C. delegation along with the sugar workers union met the Minister or somebody in the Ministry and they were told the matter would be settled very shortly. It is still going on and on.

Cde. Chairman, there are two sections of workers in the sugar industry. There are the job workers who work by job, and it is agreed that you cannot assess productivity for time rate because they either work or they do not get anything. They have to produce. So far as the job-rated workers are concerned, they had agreed to give them a certain percentage; I believe it was 6 percent, and the rest was to be paid on the basis of assessment of their productivity. But since in the case of those employed there was no record from the past to assess them on what would be the performance from last year, it was agreed to pay them all the full amount and beginning probably in the future they could then keep records of their performance so as to see whether they merit the additional percentage which brings it up to 10 percent or whatever it is. I am saying, a delegation from the sugar workers' union went to the T.U.C. I was a member of that delegation and they tried to get in touch with the Minister. Let the Minister tell the Assembly whether it is true or not that for all other public sector employees it was agreed to pay them the full 10 percent, and whether for the time-rated sugar workers they have agreed to pay them 10 percent. Cde. Chairman, let me repeat. There is a certain percentage, I believe it is 6 percent, and the rest has to be based on merit. It was conceded, as I understood it, for all other public service employees because there was no record-keeping, of how to assess the workers but it is not being done for sugar workers. This brings me to the fact that as is always discriminated against. So let the Minister say if it is true or not that all other public service employees are given the full 10 percent and why the time-rated sugar workers are not given the same 10 percent.

Let me just make this last point. The question of discrimination against sugar workers, sugar workers and bauxite workers for some time now have been given an extra percent, because they are workers who if they do not produce in this country nothing will happen. I am talking now of discrimination in implementing that decision. GUYSSUCO is saying, sticking to the letter of the law – the letter of the law says you will get a certain percentage; the rest would be paid on your merit, as merit increment. GUYSSUCO is sticking to that, whereas the Government has waived that part for the rest of the public service that is all I am saying. I am saying please expedite that, it has been going on for too long and other workers have been paid, why it is taking so long?

### **Head 53 – Ministry of Manpower:**

**Dr. Jagan:** In view of what my good friend said I would like to ask whether the Government can consider having the means test abolished and

the pensions paid at a pensionable age. If the Government give that matter serious attention, that is, whatever the pensionable age is be it 65 or 60 without any means test, because that is what is causing many of the problems. I am therefore, Cde. Speaker, suggesting avoiding all this problem and so the persons when they reach qualifying age will automatically get their pensions. We have a lot of corruption and discrimination and all kinds of things going on.

## Restrictions on Importation of Wheaten Flour: 18<sup>th</sup> June, 1986

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, listening to the Minister of Trade I would have thought that I was in a lecture hall in the University listening to the principles of economic development and how to develop agriculture in the Third World. And so we heard such words as food self-sufficiency, food security, etcetera. For twenty-one year's this Government has been at it. When L.F.S. Burnham was in the opposition he said: "*Colonialism is still rampant. We still depend on the same three products, rice, sugar and bauxite.*" Today we cannot even produce what we produced in the 1960s under the People's Progressive Party Government. What have you done in 21 years? Nothing to speak about. Whatever they put their hands on like the glass factory...

What about self-sufficiency in agriculture? The Minister said we must have flour but it does not necessarily mean we must have wheaten flour. When the People's National Congress Government set up the flour mill, were they talking, or were they intending that cassava flour and plantain flour and rice flour will be the only thing produced and that those would be a substitute completely for wheaten flour? Was that the conception? Obviously not. But they are trying to make a necessity out of a bad thing, having wrecked the economy when they have to pay about 45 percent of foreign earnings on debt payments and 50 percent for oil, when they have nothing left to import food, medicine, clothing, building materials which they failed to produce in the country. Shortage of foreign exchange also affects our industry, whatever little we have, like the saw mill industry, the rice industry, and even the sugar mills.

No spare parts, no equipment, is affecting our production. Where is self-sufficiency in cassava flour? You banned wheaten flour, okay and you brought the cassava mill from Brazil. We were supposed to grow all the cassava, following the logic of the Minister that banning flour created the conditions to produce more substitutes because you had the environment, the demand for it. Where is the cassava flour? Where is the plantain flour?

In the time of the P.P.P. Government we had tons and tons of cassava and plantains were given away. Where is the mill, where is the beef, where is the sugar? Five hundred thousand tons were to be produced by this time. They are now stabilizing the industry at 240,000 tons, having reached that target in the last two years. These people are not even good theoretician's much less poor politicians. They are over there because of rigging and it is because of rigging and force that we are in this parlous state today. A few years ago they made a necessity out of their own failures by saying if you want flour you have a colonial mentality.

We could produce more. Mention was made of dumping, dumping from the industrialized countries. But what the Minister did not tell us was that

in the industrialized countries they are using large-scale farming, they are using the most modern scientific methods of production and the farmer is subsidized. The farmer is subsidized under a two-price system, where the state buys from the farmer at a high price and sells it internally to the consumer at a lower price. That is a reality and if they have surpluses, which they do have, they dump it. All right, that is the logic of their production system. What is the logic of our production system? Ban it, restrict it. Why it is your agricultural policies have not been so fashioned that you can give the farmers the opportunity to produce without having to ban. In the P.P.P. time there was no banning. We only banned when we had the product. When we had sufficient ground coffee in Guyana we banned Chase and ... ground coffee. When we could not get the extract of coffee factory because the people who have it would not give us the factory here, we took the coffee, sent it to New York, made it into extract of coffee, then brought it here and then we banned Nescafe. This is how the P.P.P. did it. When there was a surplus, tons and tons of cassava we did not ban imported potatoes. We put a 3 cents tax per pound on potatoes and that was to help the farmers and also those who want to eat it will pay a little more. And the surplus, by the way, of cassava and plantains, we started shipping to the Caribbean, from Pomeroun, from Georgetown. What trade we have now in the Caribbean? We cannot even supply rice. We could have supplied oil. We could have supplied many things in the Caribbean but we do not have supplies because we have not supplied rice in the Caribbean. We have lost our market. I am speaking now of the failure of the agricultural policy. Why didn't the Government here like the imperialist countries? They subsidise their agriculture. What do we do? Our ruling elite want to live at a higher lifestyle than even the Reagans, the elite in those countries. Instead of subsidising agriculture, they built a big military apparatus, they subsidized themselves with 100 percent and 50 percent salary increases when the farmer has to pay \$75 for a cutlass and \$70 for a grass knife and they cannot get spare parts for their engines. This is the same Government that removed duty from gasoline for the farmers and they are now telling us about foreign competition. What do you expect? If you treat the farmers like dirt, if you lose police dogs on them when they march to demonstrate against maltreatment, lowering of prices, you have to expect that production will go down. Therefore you have been caught in a dilemma.

You have to also think of the working class. What are you doing about the working class whose wages are not keeping up? You refuse to index the wages to cost of living. You pay the man \$16 a day which is only worth about 40 percent of what it could have bought in 1977. So where are we getting? Workers also produce. Your policies are failures. You not only have to think of one sector – agriculture – you have to have thought of the whole country. The fact is that what is wrecking agriculture in countries like Guyana and Guyana particularly, is the way this Government has treated the farmers. Right now they have removed graders from all the



silos, from all the rice mills where there should have been R.P.A. representatives. The farmers cannot have a man to look at what grades they can get in selling their products. So do not tell us about what the imperialists are doing. Tell us what you are doing to protect the country, to develop this economy. Clearly your policies are a failure, that is why you now have to eat your own words. It is not that you have become sensible and you are flexible. You are now eating your own words. How many in the front benches here did not say 'never'? I sat with the Prime Minister, the First Deputy Vice-President and Dr. Reid when Mr. Mugabe was here at the State House and we had a little argument about flour. Vehemently all of them said no flour. Maybe Uncle Sam has become generous now because I remember once Mr. Burnham said Uncle Sam is not giving us any wheat, they are putting pressure on us because we would not agree to the I.M.F. Maybe now they are agreeing to I.M.F. and so they are getting wheat. But, Mr. Speaker, let me warn. The Soviet Union buys millions of tons of grain for human consumption and also for animal feed.

They paid for it from their exports. We in Guyana have reached the point where because we could not pay it was stopped. Take a note of that, because we did not have the foreign exchange, not because of all the high policy that we are hearing about, because they did not have the foreign exchange, they ran into foreign exchange problems and therefore they said no flour. Now they are going back because the Minister said two years ago or last year, black marketing must stop and they will let loose the goosey gander all over the country. It did not stop because you cannot stop anything when you do not have the people behind you and especially when the people want flour, when they are hungry, how you will stop it.? You can rig the elections and win it and use the army to take ballot boxes but you cannot stop smuggling. The policemen get caught up in it and so they are studying tides as the Comrade said. Therefore Cde. Speaker, I am saying that now they have made a decision to bring flour ... we are borrowing not for development but to eat.

Next point I come to is split peas. Where are the split peas that the Prime Minister had been advocating, when he said that every yard must have a pigeon pea plant, where is it? We were told at one time that split peas will be substituted by black eye peas. Cde. Speaker, we were told that there are other substitutes for split peas such as mung, urid and all kinds of things and they gave us demonstrations how it will be grown, where is it? Cde. Speaker let me make another interesting point here that the Minister is talking about import substitution as self sufficiency. In discussing this question I said to him, do you think it will be better if we import the split peas and sell the black eye peas because the split peas was half the price of the black eye peas and we had a market in the Caribbean? You know what he said, he told me, Dr. you know we never thought of that. Cde. Speaker, these people don't do their work. The fact of the matter is we are not saying that the Guyanese people must not substitute, we are

not saying that when substitution is equivalent or near and also reasonable in price. Cde. Speaker, at the moment there is no substitute for flour, there is no rice flour, there is no cassava flour, and there is no plantain flour. Where is the substitute? There is no substitute for peas at the moment that is a reasonable price and in sufficient quantity. It is not available and it is in this situation we are saying, bring in the peas and the flour and let the Guyanese people at least be able to get a cheap source of food so they can balance their own family budget. They cannot do so at the moment. We are all aware of the fact and statistics put out by the T.U.C. in 1981 when they said a family of six ... is \$54.00 and since then it is worse off. In this circumstance we want to appeal to the Government not to be so heartless. If they have made a mistake, okay, they must be man enough to say yes, we have made a mistake and not only that, we want to see agriculture developed. Let them cut down on the expense they have spoken about, the military, which is taking up much more than even agriculture in Guyana. Let them cut down on the foreign embassies, let them cut down their own salaries and allowances, let us cut half of the number of Ministers and then use that money to help the farmers so they can get grass knives, cutlasses and spare parts. Give them subsidies as Europe is doing, as Canada and North America is doing. That is why they are producing. We must not only talk of producing, we must also talk of helping the people, so that the country can be better and the economy can prosper.

## Local Government Elections: 18<sup>th</sup> June, 1986

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, the Motion is very simple. We did not speak about fraud but the man has a guilty conscience. He has to talk about fraud. Let me put the record straight because he is not only rigging elections in this country ...

Cde. Speaker, the Hon. Prime Minister was all the time referring to the People's Progressive Party rigging elections. Jagan was known throughout the world to be the Leader of the People's Progressive Party, therefore he is talking about the People's Progressive Party and he is talking about Jagan. Let us not go into fanatics. Let us put the record straight. They are prefabricating or doctoring up the history of this country, we have constantly complained about rigging elections since 1953, therefore because we have constantly complained about rigging, whatever we say about rigging is not true. I want to put the record straight. What did we complain about in 1953? We did not complain about the boundaries. What we complained about was the Elections Commission and the Constitution that did not go far enough to give us powers of independence. That is why I was challenging him to tell us about what we were complaining about in 1953.

The British in order to help them after Burnham split the People's Progressive Party wanted to put them in power. The Robertson Commission said that Burnham is loading the socialist wand and that imperialism is marking time and will come to an end if that party took over. After they suspended the Constitution the twenty-four districts were made into fourteen in the 1947 elections, when there was no adult suffrage. Going back to the polls three and a half seats were made into one in Berbice and Georgetown with five seats was made into three and yet they lost. In Corentyne, I alone won more votes than the three People's National Congress candidates together. That is how the Robertson Commission and the British Government were trying to put them in power. That is the record that is the history. Let them reject that. Go to the Teachers' College, when I write to them they are not allowing me to speak there.

They sent a man named Sir Hugh Hallet, a British ex-judge. He was to demarcate the boundaries. The record is there. You can see it where they made little... to suit the P.N.C. like Western Berbice and so on. All that is on the record. You will see how it was inequitably distributed because we went to London in the 1960 Conference to demand independence. Burnham said no independence. They said go back and have another election, and sent an Englishman to divide it...and they lost that one. Go and look at the boundary. That is what we complained about in 1961. We complained about the ... monitoring of the seats to suit the P.N.C. as in 1957 and yet this man has got the guts to say that I was concerting with the British.

With regard to the 1964 elections, the Commonwealth team of observers

was here. They put out a Report and said the one thing which was open to administrative abuse was the proxy vote, because Sir Hugh Hucks who they brought here to head the Commission...the P.P.P. never had any charge of the elections, but they brought this man to again divide the P.P.P. They brought him in and watered down the provisions for proxy voting whereas in the 1961 elections there were 300 proxy votes. In the 1964 elections it became 6,635. Of those proxy votes the P.P.P. got 80. The P.N.C. got them all and what they got was equivalent to two seats in that election. These are facts of history. That is what we complained about. The rigging was done even when we were in Government and we know they concerted with the C.I.A. It is in black and white too where Schlessinger wrote in his book "*A Thousand Days – John F. Kennedy in the White House*". This is after Burnham met Schlessinger. This is the way to defeat the P.P.P. and to bring back P.R. and the man to be backed in Guyana is Burnham and not Jagan. That is in the history book. And in order to bring back P.R. which was rejected in 1960, the C.I.A. created hell in this country, linked with the P.N.C., caused a lot of strife so that the British Government can have the excuse to go back on their word and not allow Guyana to become independent according to the 1961 formula. Whoever won the 1961 elections would take the country to independence. That is when they were silly; they were joining with the Americans and the C.I.A. who were saying no more Cubans in this hemisphere. That is history and in 1964 I said Mr. Hucks was solely in charge of the 1964 elections. The P.P.P. Government was not in charge of the 1964 elections and he, contrary to my opposition...a letter which I wrote to the Government and said that elections are irregular and the observer team which came here in 1964 made a comment that proxy vote was subject to abuse. It was and it helped them to win. That is the history. I am willing to debate it at any time, radio, university or anywhere. But they would not do that. They would try to lie and rewrite history.

Now I come to the Motion, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said that elections are going to be based on the existing legal procedure. That is what is wrong. Even when they have an Elections Commission in this country the machinery is in the hands of the P.N.C. and that is why it is possible to rig elections. It is not only that the machinery is in the hands of the P.N.C. but it is because they were placed in the military and paramilitary forces in the country in order to seize ballot boxes and so on.

As regards the Commission, there was a Commonwealth Commission here – I do not know what he is talking about. It is not true that because you have a sovereign country but they went ahead and brought an observer team. In the elections that Mugabe had in Zimbabwe, they had a Commonwealth observer team. If you are not hiding anything why are you objecting? They are not coming to take away your independence. As regards that question, Mr. Hoyte told the members at Mustique that he will hold elections this year and there will be an observer team. So said Mr. John Compton, the Prime Minister of St. Lucia. That is all this side is ask-

ing is that there should be an observer team from CARICOM and the Commonwealth. Now we hear you do not want that. You are going back on the words of the President?

Cde. Speaker, I now come to the other sections of the Motion, the new voters' list. My colleague who moved the Motion already made mention of the fact that there has been a continuing quarrel about the voters' list. I do not want to recite where horses were registered as voters and all kinds of things.

He referred to the fact that an extension of time was given. But if a voters' list is to be done properly he should do it as the P.P.P. Government did in 1964 where Parties were allowed...I am coming to that now. I am answering that point directly if you want. The extension was given but even in that extension period, because the original period was very small – the announcement of elections was done very rapidly, unlike many previous elections, even under the P.N.C.

As a result it was not possible to carry out the kind of examination which was done. I wrote the Minister at that time and said we would like to have scrutineers as in 1964 which the P.P.P. allowed. That is, the enumerator goes and the parties are allowed to send...that is what I am talking about, to make the voters' list because the voters' list, according to the President, was made by the Elections Commission. It was never made in the history of the P.N.C. It is done under the National Registration which is under the control of the Minister. That is our argument.

That is what we were saying, it is not a question only of time because the whole machinery is chosen not by the Commission but by the Minister, the people who are doing it, that is why we put forward the demand for scrutineers as the P.P.P. Government allowed in 1964 but they reject it. That is why we are talking about having a new voters' list because Cde. Speaker, you know that the Interior, and far areas in the country, you cannot get there, you cannot even get aeroplanes to go even if you can afford it and therefore if we are to say we want a free and fair elections we must have that kind of facility placed at the disposal of all the parties so nobody can complain.

What we are saying is (1) there must be a voters' list which cannot be questioned. (2) We are not satisfied, the country is not satisfied, world public opinion is not satisfied with the way elections are controlled even general elections. Now we are talking about local elections, the Prime Minister is quoting the law, we know the law, that is that the Minister is in charge of the elections wholly and solely – if you are rigging all these years when the Commission is not doing its job, that is why I wrote to the President, the Prime Minister did not read that part when I said we want a new Chairman. He said to me that he has already appointed a Chairman; we have a Motion before the House that we have no confidence in this Chairman. Clearly the Minister is saying my colleague does not know what is happening in the Party. He was in the Party's Executive Committee which

agreed to the reappointment of Mr. Rohee as a Member of the Commission.

I want to say that if we want to get away from all these charges of rigging and counter charges and so on, why not let us have an election which everybody has confidence about. Why is it we cannot have Local Government elections under an Elections Commission. If we are talking about consultative democracy why didn't the President call me and say '*what about the Chairman*', I would have told him as I did in the letter that I have no confidence in this man, please put up some other name. That is how democracy works, not to hand down a yes-man, what one man called '*a toothless poodle*'. We must come down to realities of our situation, that is why we are saying let us have elections as they are supposed to be held, they were not held since 1970 and by the way they were rigged. Let me read you from this book "*Rigged Elections in Guyana*". This is a P.P.P. publication of June, 1978, and on page 26 it says:

*"In Georgetown a ballot box for one district Kitty, Division No. 2, when opened and counted contained only three hundred and ten votes whereas the ballot box from the counterfoil showed that four hundred and ten votes were cast. In another Georgetown Division four hundred and thirty-seven votes were cast and only four hundred and seven were found in the ballot box and yet in another instance four hundred and sixteen votes were cast but five hundred and seventy three were in the ballot box, an excess of one hundred and fifty-seven. How could these things have happened unless there was tampering with the ballot boxes?"*

Cde Speaker, we are saying why we are calling for an Independent Commission, why we are calling for a new voters' list, why we are calling for an observer team because we are referring to the 1970 elections which were rigged, and if we do not talk about rigging then there would be no justification for having a change. Is that clear Cde. Speaker, am I logical?

I am saying that the voters' list is only one aspect of it, you have tampering with boxes. Let me read out this one about Leguan. In Leguan, the ballot boxes were not taken to the centre for counting, they were taken to the Guest House nearby in which there were P.N.C. activists and the boxes remained there for some two hours before they were removed for counting. Incidentally in that area the P.P.P. had scored big victories in the two previous elections, in the 1964 elections and the 1968 elections. The P.N.C. won the Local Government elections for Leguan and Wakenaam. They won it; let me give you another part of the thieving. In Sheet Anchor Cumberland, the P.N.C. Government declared that the P.P.P. had scored only five hundred and twenty-five votes whereas the P.P.P. got two thousand and forty-five in the 1964/1968 General Elections, also under proportional representation, the figures were 5,331 and 5,306 respectively for the P.P.P. and 1,405 and 1,519 respectively for the P.N.C. – a much larger area and larger electorate. This part is about Leguan, the Essequibo Island in December, 1968 with an electorate of 6,690, the P.N.C. polls only 1,622 votes

but eighteen months later, it is claimed that the Party polled 1,814 votes in an election held only on the island of Leguan. In the two previous elections the P.P.P. polled 4,230 and 4,221 votes, winning easily in both cases. So it was clear there was tampering with the ballot boxes and that is why we are talking about an Independent Commission and not the Minister to have control of the elections machinery, and that is why because of the way the military behaves in this country in elections, we wanted a Commonwealth team or a CARICOM team of observers to be here to observe and I repeat, Mr. Hoyte, when he spoke to the leaders in Mustique because the leaders said many of them are voting at the place of poll, they don't see why it cannot be done in Guyana, many of them said they do not see why we cannot have observers, they do not see anything wrong with that. Eugenia Charles said publicly that she invites observers.

Cde. Speaker that has nothing to do with sovereignty, a sovereign Government can do anything it wants. If a sovereign Government in view of all that is being said, how many times did the State Department in America not write about fraud here and so on. Tell the world that there is no fraud here let there be observers to see. Observers were in the elections in El Salvador, I mentioned that they were in Nicaragua and therefore we see no reason why the Government cannot agree with these things so far as holding elections are concerned. We are told there will be held, well they are certainly long overdue and they should be held but the key question in Guyana is not whether elections are held but whether they are free and fair, that is the key question in Guyana and it has been repeatedly said they are not, not only by the P.P.P. and Opposition. We had a lot of arguments about what the P.P.P. elections were, what the P.P.P. were saying about elections but that has nothing to do with the fact that independent people, even their own friends in the State Department, have written over and over talking about fraud, therefore protect your own good name. You must have elections which are completely free and fair so that people will have confidence in you, not only inside the country, but outside as well.

Cde. Speaker, to conclude, I want to say this and I have repeatedly said it, we have no democracy here at the political level, whether National Government, Regional Government or Local Government, we have no social democracy here. If people want to set up their organizations and the Government does not want that because they cannot control it they do not recognize it and the State does not give it recognition and they set up a parallel one. They use police methods to destroy certain organizations so that the organizations which they control can be ruling the roost over the people. This is not social democracy. Trade unions if they challenge the Guyana Labour Union, police and big stick methods they use, whether at Sapil, whether at the Dutch Company on the West Coast, we are saying at the industrial level there is no democracy, there is no workers control and workers participation. If you do not have democracy at any level, that is one of the big fundamental reasons why this country is going down and down

and down and I want to conclude on that note. You are never...independence become meaningless here, you are not selling away your independence. You talk about independence, you are selling it away. Burnham must be turning in his grave at what Hoyte is doing because of what Burnham did in the last two or three years.

Cde. Speaker, therefore we are issuing a warning to these people- a day of reckoning is coming in this country, people are not going to stand the fraud forever and ever. The people in Haiti showed, the people in the Philippines showed that rigged elections cannot go on forever. A day of reckoning is going to come in this country and it is not going to be far off.



## Importation of Milk 25<sup>th</sup> June, 1986

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, the Minister has given the Assembly the impression that we in the Minority are mere critics and we have nothing positive to offer, and he speaks with the usual bleating about foreign exchange. Foreign external factors. What he does not tell us is that the question of economics and production is a fundamental question. It has nothing to do only with the base, but it has to do with the superstructure also, with the question of politics, of ideology, of culture. There is an interaction, an interlinkage between the two. We are not just buyers and sellers. We are not just traders. If we want to talk of production and of strategy, we have to look at all of this as a whole. The P.P.P. has been saying this – umpteen times. You have been here for a long time, Cde. Speaker and you know that. We talked about the fundamental question of democracy. They rigged every election and they are prepared to rig the local elections coming too.

Cde. Speaker, the Minister is saying that we have limited foreign exchange. This limited foreign exchange has to do with external prices because we are not producing enough to export enough and we are getting low prices. I am dealing with the question of political economy in its inter-relationship. Why is rice production today half as much? Is it because the prices were low? Only this year? What about years before? The farmer who was producing rice was the same farmer, as an integrated farmer, was producing the ...in big quantities at the time of the P.P.P.

Sugar, we have guaranteed markets in the E.E.C. and North America. We are producing very little for the external world market. Let him tell us that. Let him tell us why Cuba, which has a bigger sugar production in relation to its total economy, was able to get a 7.3 percent rate of growth in the last five years, 2.3 percent greater than they targeted and we are hovering around 0 percent. This last year we wrote in the Budget that they are going to now introduce many methods in the sugar industry, for instance, in 1969 the Trinidad Government send a delegation to Cuba, the first delegation from the English-speaking Caribbean, and when Dr. Iton, the Chief Livestock Officer came back to Trinidad, in bold headlines in the *Trinidad Guardian* it was stated that “Cuba has made more progress in 10 years than Trinidad made in 250 years in the livestock industry.” You could have done that too. But you choose to follow the C.I.A. and the Puerto Rican model, the pro-imperialist model and to sever relations with Cuba.

You do not only come and tell us now when you wreck the foundation of the economy and now you are telling us about external factors – ridiculous. We cannot argue a ... situation because if we do that then we will get nowhere; we have to see where you are putting the country. As I said in my May Day speech, why is it that Cuba in six years more of independence were able to achieve and solve a basic human needs problem and we are

wandering in the mud with incompetence.

Cde. Speaker, the Cubans have been able to produce. Fidel Castro himself personally went into the dairy question. As a lawyer, as a politician, as a revolutionary, he decided to specialize personally in the dairy industry. They diversified the sugar industry long before. They are now talking about it in the year 1986 when they have wrecked everything already. They produced yeast from molasses, they took the molasses, yeast and the bagasse and two other chemicals and they mixed it together and they got stock feed. They ... chickens which produced millions of eggs from which they had a barter agreement and they fed the cattle, they got milk, and every child in Cuba gets a pint of milk a day. Where is all this question of foreign exchange? Where is the foreign exchange that they get from the sugar that is sold? They have squandered it, bought a lot of cars. They bartered bauxite for motor cars from Japan. Recently what they are bringing in is not milk for the poor starving children, but they are bringing in helicopters for G.D.F. Which one comes first, you are talking about production? You could have brought other production goods like farmers tools, things to help the agricultural sector instead of buying aeroplanes to go from here to New York.

Cde. Speaker, when they say we must give constructive ideas, we have been talking all along. Politics here is based on fraud and not democracy. Only yesterday I was at Leonora, we went there to discuss the closure of Leonora; they say they believe in consultative democracy. They have announced the closure and they have not yet talked to the sugar workers. When the sugar workers went to the Guysuco chief he told them that Government decides that. They are running the country and they decide without consulting the people.

An old man, a pensioner, came to me and showed me a little piece of paper where Guysuco pound his cattle, trying to exist from the miserable twelve dollars now raised to fifteen dollars per week pension, after serving the industry for several years, trying to raise a few heads of cows he is charged \$200 per head and what do you think they were so gracious to do, to reduce it to \$100 per head when he pleaded and he showed the paper to me yesterday and I told him to write me a letter.

Next Cde. Speaker, two other farmers came to me who are mining cattle. They told me that Guysuco stop them from going to the backdam to cut grass. It is like the days when the sugar planters, the British exploiters cut down all the mango trees, and did not allow them to do into the backdam so they can go and cut again. Cde. Speaker, they do not have democracy, they do not have production, and they do not have cooperation and political discrimination. They have round pegs in square holes.

I am saying Cde. Speaker, the foreign exchange which they had, they squandered it. We gave them good advice in 1982, we said suspend the debt payment or pay only a quarter, but they do not have any political backbone, they are afraid they are going to be thrown out by Uncle Sam

and all the imperialists, so they rob the poor little children. They prefer to pay Bookers, the Bauxite Company, and the World Bank and now they are going to pay the I.M.F. and to pay Britain, USA, Canada, but they do not pay the workers as they did not pay the \$14 a day, and yet they want the workers to produce. Do not pay; do not bring the milk for the children. We heard the other day the Prime Minister giving us a lecture.

What I am saying Cde. Speaker, talking about policies, had they done what we were saying all along we would not be in this mess today. There was a saying in Guyana '*you dig a hole to fill a hole*' and that is what they are doing and their debt problem is getting bigger and bigger, consuming this country. Anyway, I want to say it is not for want of talking, it is because the P.N.C. prefers to put first and foremost self and after that then everything else comes into second consideration. That is why this country is going down and you can never bring it up. All these little manoeuvres that you are making, you made it before with the I.M.F. team in 1978, money came, but where are we today, worse off than we were in 1978. When all of you praised the I.M.F., when the leader of the P.N.C. had to say in 1983 that the new proposals were a recipe for riot. Bring milk for the children, not only little things, stop the black marketing. You can buy anything in the black market, why is it they are allowing that? How is it this is happening?

Cde. Speaker, I say that you have to remove all the obstacles from production. Cde. Speaker, when we were in the Government in those days there was plentiful milk. There were plans then to put a refrigeration centre at Abary and Mahaicony, to have refrigeration trucks and to bring the milk to Georgetown. Twenty-one years have passed and they have not yet done that. Twenty-one years and they tell us that they have no ideas. Those proposals were put twenty-one years ago. We had proposals to set up a cheese factory, a butter factory and so on because we had surplus milk. So the problem is not that you do not have proposals. We had all those proposals and they were working but you have so wrecked the infrastructure of the country, you have so ruined everything that you now have a chicken and egg situation and you want to see the P.P.P. extract you from this situation. You go and tell the workers, and the T.U.C., please tell us where to get the money from when they have wrecked everything and put the country in a vicious tract. For this country to move out of this tract you have to have a revolutionary approach like Castro. Not going back to the imperialists bastards and selling out the independence of the country. All you technocrats do not care but history is proving that it would not work. Latin America is proving that more than anything else, and what you are doing is a dead end. It is not going to bring about any solution.

## Motion - Charges of Discrimination in the Administration: 25<sup>th</sup> June, 1986

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, the black people of America and the United States have a phrase they call tokenism and that is what the Government seem to want in dealing with the last point made first by the Government spokesman. The black people have rejected tokenism and they have fought for what is called affirmative action, that they must have the right to representation and their members in the community, to their importance in the community. The Government spokesman went at great lengths to quote from letters, but what he did not say, he used the word meaningful participation, that his concept of meaningful participation is tokenism, one member, two members and this applies all over to the Government's operations so far as workers participation is concerned, but we will recall that the Government itself used these words meaningful participation - the phrase was used in connection to the bauxite industry where it referred to a fifty one percent control. In 1970 before nationalization and indeed in the colonial period in the Rice Marketing Board when the R.P.A. and the R.M.B. were constituting, the formula with the British Colonial Administration adumbrated and put into practice clauses of 50- 50, eight members for the R.P.A. and eight members for the Government, that one of the Government eight was to be Chairman. That is what the T.U.C. is asking for and up to now the Government has not agreed with that. In other words what even the colonial administration conceded in Guyana, they are not willing, these neo-colonists are not willing to concede, and they want tokenism.

Cde. Speaker, the P.P.P. Government changed that formula of 80 to eleven out of sixteen, with the farmers having eleven in the R.P.A., with one of these eleven being the Chairman of the Rice Board. What is the P.N.C. doing, when they got in they reduced the eleven, first to three and then to none and now they are offering one or two as if they are doing such a great thing. When they reduced it from eleven to three, that helped to wreck the industry. My God, you were not talking like this when you were talking in the time of the P.P.P. Government, you helped to change it and frame the law.

I was going to come to that at the end, Cde. Speaker, and suggest an amendment by withdrawing the Motion or to amend the Motion to delete the words '*the T.U.C.*'. They have deleted the whole Motion recently. I am deleting only a few words so Cde. Speaker let us come back to the last point. I want to tell the spokesman of the Government, do not come here like a sophist and argue...

I respect the Comrade, he knows that, it is not that he is new like this other Minister over here. This Attorney General was at the Attorney General's office at the time of the P.P.P. Government and he helped to draft

these amendments which gave the R.P.A. a majority in the R.M.B. He knows all of that and now he is coming to tell us what a great generosity it is for the P.N.C. to give the R.P.A. one member or in some cases two members and how wonderful it is and now the R.P.A. is so ungrateful they do not even want to reply.

Thousands of delegates and observers to the Congress: workers, farmers, members of the church and cultural organizations and of the joint services, led by members of the Party Central Committee, are marching from two points to the square. Delegates and observers to the conference will move off from the Sophia Convention Centre, while farmers, workers and others will march from Independence Park. Independence Park will be accompanied by the Guyana Defence Force Corps of Drums while the Guyana National Service and the ...Sophia.

There is a big distinction between members from the Defence Force and a member of the police force becoming a member of the P.N.C. Nobody is objecting to that. What we are objecting to is the State institutions marching with the P.N.C., pledging loyalty to the P.N.C. and these people see nothing wrong with that. Therefore, I say this is a ... of the concept of what they call paramountcy. They say it is a legitimate thing in all countries. Some would say this operates in socialist countries.

I did not know that we had a Motion dealing with paramountcy in this Parliament. They brought it in the subject as an extraneous matter. I am saying that if since they have subverted all the state institutions, what is their argument? There is discrimination and if you cry you have remission to whom, to the court, to the Ombudsman? The courts themselves are ... Cde. Speaker, I want to come to the point where the discrimination takes place. We have certain institutions; the Public Service, the Police Service, the Judicial Service and the Teaching Service. I say those are subverted too. Cde. Speaker, I say that there is blatant racial and political discrimination in this country that is why some people are saying this is a miniature South Africa in minority rule and you are afraid to have an examination. There is a group in England called ... They are not P.P.P.; they do not belong to the Opposition. They wrote a paper where they showed East Indians, Amerindians and others have been made into second class citizens in this country through racial discrimination and political discrimination. Let me give you one example. The Guyana Public Service Union has many...

There was a gentleman here heading the Management Training Institute, I forgot his name. He was told to dismiss his secretary because she was seen at a W.P.A. meeting clapping. He refused to dismiss her and he quit the job and went away. He is now heading a similar kind of institution working for the U.N. That is political discrimination. Therefore, we want to see if in actual fact in Guyana there is equal opportunity for every Guyanese citizen. Not only according to the Constitution but in practice, where it works out in practice, where there is affirmative action. I am sure

when the Prime Minister went and talked to the black mayors he must have known and he must have realized that they not only fought for affirmative action but today they are fighting because the conservative Reagan Government backed by the whites want to break down affirmative action and not to embrace this principle that the minority must have a right in order to have a change, to get jobs, and to get promotions and so on. They want to associate with the black mayors and the black politicians in America but they do not want to implement in Guyana what those black people are fighting for in America. They want to set up their own apartheid system in Guyana.

Let me come down now to the In-Service Commission because the Minister said it was the same under the P.P.P. I reiterate the difference. In the P.P.P. time ... not the politician, the Governor. While he was not independent in the political sense in Guyana, he was independent in another sense. He was independent in that he appointed the people and ran them. I am not saying he was completely independent in politics because his job here was to defend colonialism.

## Motion - Rights of Dismissed Workers to be Heard: 16th July, 1986

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, I rise to second this Motion and to support it. In the past in this country one used to hear the term '*the right of the employer to hire and fire*'. In other words, he was boss, he was dictator and he was God, judge, and jury, everything combined. That was the kind of rule we had in the colonial era under the plutocracy. But although we have got Independence since 1966 and nationalization has taken place since the 1970s, we find that old colonial mentality is still there.

On many occasions I have had to write letters, to speak by telephone to people, for instance in GUYSUCO, that they are acting arbitrarily and also not in keeping with the times. If we are told that we are building a cooperative socialist Guyana, why is it the bureaucrats must behave in the same way as they behaved in the colonial period? Many cases were brought, as I said, to the attention of the management, workers were arbitrarily dismissed, no heed was paid to the representation of the union in cases involving what was said to be thefts, even in cases where the person was alleged to have moved one piece of wood from one place to another without even taking it out of the place. The police were brought into these matters, the cases were heard, the cases were dismissed and yet GUYSUCO refused to re-employ the person. I drew to the attention of GUYSUCO, even the Chairman himself, that in other sectors, other sections of the public sector, you had different regulations. As far as I was aware, when a worker is charged with some offence he is interdicted from duty, suspended, the case is then brought up for trial, whether interdepartmental enquiry or before the police or the courts, and if in that hearing the person is freed, then automatically the person is then reinstated. This happens I believe in the public sector, in the traditional civil service sector. When I drew this to the attention of the Corporation they were not concerned with that, they were not concerned with the spirit of the time either. They are the boss and they will do what they like, and Cde. Speaker, they can do what they like because we do not have the Labour Code, where these things are set out clearly and precisely. The Labour Code Committee had reported since 1976, ten years ago, and we still have not got it in the statute books; more than that, because we do not have here nationalized enterprises working within a real socialist framework. By that I mean where the workers, through their trade union, exercise control and when a manager cannot arbitrarily dismiss a worker willy-nilly. The Honourable Vice-President when he was speaking today, lectured to us a lot about what happens in socialist countries. Of course, his presentation was all in favour of capitalism.

Cde. Speaker, I was saying I think the Government should look into these things and not allow certain people to rule arbitrarily and against the

interest of the workers. If we are supposed to be building a humane society, then there must be rules and regulations. And as I said in a section of the public sector, this is how I understand the practice is (I understand it is also operated in that way in GUYMINE) but in sugar the bosses do not want to apply it. Therefore I would like the Government to look into this and see that there is some standard practice so that the workers can be protected and that the bosses must not have absolute power to do what they like, not only in dismissing people, but also running amok. That is why many enterprises are losing money. Talk was made about profitability. Profitability does not have to do with jacking up the prices to make it profitable. Profitability has to do with increasing productivity of the worker by using more modern techniques, not to do as we are doing. It also has to do with wise buying and so on. I do not want to enter into that debate now because I have a lot to say.

The point I am making is yes, we want these places to be run profitably and if they are to be run profitably then they must be run efficiently and one way to have efficient management, not only management but decision-making and to see about the accounts and everything else, workers through their trade unions must have a view of everything and they must have a right to protection so they are not dismissed or victimized at will and at pleasure; where some Government official can get up and tell him, as they did with one Chairman of a management corporation here, tell him to dismiss his employee because she was seen clapping at an Opposition meeting. That is the days of barbaric practice. That is the days when the Kings used to rule without any limit to their power, and I think we have come a long way from that. And therefore, I want to suggest to the Minister to look into this question. To the Prime Minister – he is a man of action, please speak to GUYSUICO Chairman and tell him he came from the colonial era but now he is living in a new era, let him change his ways and I would support this measure wholeheartedly.



## **Motion for Adjournment - Definite Matter of Urgent Public Importance: Acute Shortage of Rice Bags: 3<sup>rd</sup> November, 1986**

**Dr. Jagan:** Mr. Speaker, I think this is the worst year for the rice industry. Not too long ago I wrote the Prime Minister, spoke to the then Minister of Agriculture about the situation which faced the farmers, namely an acute shortage of water. Fortunately a couple of weeks after I wrote them, rains came. But with that came another problem and that is a shortage of rice bags. This has been a problem but this year it has become more acute. Bags which are owed to farmers, hundreds of thousands have not been returned. This is even an illegal act. Apart from that there are not enough bags to satisfy the needs of the people. Consequently, the industry faces a severe loss. Because of the shortage of bags some of the paddy will not be reaped at all because of the rains, the condition of the fields and the fact that the combines cannot properly reap the paddy any longer. We know that in a very wet condition especially after heavy rains paddy falls, the stalks are broken and it is difficult for the combine to reap the paddy. So there will be loss on that count. But there is also the fact that the paddy cannot be reaped because there is nothing to put them into. We fail to understand why this should be so when the Government is claiming that agriculture is so important to the economy of this country, when the Government is fully apprised of the needs of the country so far as this input is concerned.

Yet we find a situation in this very bad state. I was told that farmers are now resorting to carrying the rice to the silos without bags. They are putting them in trailers. If there was quick delivery at the silos maybe this could suffice at least to meet the situation partly, but what happened? They too have a perennial problem for farmers having to line up for days, sometimes for weeks, in front of the silos. The silos are not working properly. It is a fact. They are not working properly. As a result of that and administrative inefficiency the paddy is not taken in as fast as it is brought to the silos. As a result of this paddy is being destroyed. I was told this by the Rice Producers Association staff only this morning. I went to Riumzigt silo and there I found that it is so slow, that large quantities of the paddy in these containers which the people are using are substitutes, have been destroyed. They are becoming discoloured and once the grain is discoloured the farmers will lose because it is graded on the basis of moisture content, colour and so on. Not only will the farmer lose but the country will lose. Cde. Speaker, we are in a serious situation. Imagine with all the money the Government has been spending on this venture with all the new varieties, many improved yields, yet rice production is falling. Since last year or in recent times we are producing less rice than was produced twenty years ago. In 1964, 101 tons of rice was shipped out of this country, last year it

was about 60 tons. Your figures are not accurate but that is the sum projected for last year. The year before it was 47,000 tons and they said last year it was 60,000 tons. Cde. Speaker, why is it when we have so much land now drained and irrigated, for instance in the Mahaica, Mahaicony, Abary Scheme, when we have such improved varieties, when yields per acre have increased we are finding a decrease in production and we are finding that we cannot get our export market requirements. Last year this country did not supply contractual arrangements for bauxite and rice. Why is it? The problem in the world today is to find markets. Unfortunately for us today, that is not the problem. Our problem is production and productivity. Cde. Speaker, if agriculture is going to be the basis on which the economy is going to be revived, why is it there is this shortfall of inputs? Fertilizers are not coming on time. Insecticides are not coming on time. When the farmers want water they cannot get it because they have antiquated pumps and they do not have them serviced properly, like the Maramarabise pump in the Canje River. Why is it that these pumps are not being serviced? We are going to be told that it is a foreign exchange problem. Then the priorities of the Government must be so set that the rice sectors of the economy, on this occasion rice and agriculture, must have priority for the foreign exchange needs of the industry. I fail to see why we cannot have rice bags in time and as I said, not only that, there are also other forms of dissatisfaction. The Rice Producers Association which used to be managing and controlling the Rice Board with 11 out of 16 members today only has 2. They have no say. The farmers have no say in the administration of their industry. This is why we are not producing. Mr. Speaker, is it right that the farmers' organization which used to service the industry today has been denied the grant which it used to get in colonial times, not just the time of the P.P.P. Government, when the R.P.A. was set up? Those measures helped to keep the industry in a viable state, in a profitable state since then. With the dismantling of that democratic structure, imposing on that democratic structure bureaucratic structures run from the top, we have a parlous situation today in the rice industry.

How are we going to solve the problem? A concession which was granted sometime ago to the Rice Producers Association that they can have a representative at each silo so that when the farmers bring their paddy to the silo they can have their representative there to see that they get a proper grade, has been taken away from them. Farmers cannot even see through their own representative what they should get according to the standards which are laid down by the Government and the Rice Marketing Board. There are so many of them now, I do not remember all their names. One bureaucracy after another is set up. These are serious times and we must not only talk if we want to take this country out of the grave economic situation in which it finds itself.

Now we are going to stabilize the sugar industry at half its projected production by this Government. Maybe soon we will hear that we are go-

ing to stabilize the rice industry to half its potential production capacity. The farmers cannot plant rice but GUYSSUCO now will leave sugar which it knows and go to produce rice. Cde. Speaker, ask the gentlemen around this table...

You should be practising law instead of being the Speaker. I am saying there are many things wrecking the rice industry and the most urgent one now is the question of rice bags. You are clapping, do not clap, bring the bags and give them to the people. Cde. Speaker, I want to know from the Government how many bags they ordered this year. When was the order put in? Was it paid for? If it was anticipated that so many bags were needed and so much foreign exchange was necessary to be spent, why is it we have this serious shortage? Do you think this is the reason why the previous Minister resigned? Or, is it that we are going to have a better Minister now to do the job? I am glad to see we have somebody who is also dealing with this matter from the point of supplying. Cde. Speaker, we would be happy to hear not only that the bags are here but that there will be no shortage in the future so that this industry will be able to prosper. The people in it who are suffering gravely will be able to run their affairs properly and the country can get out of the economic ruin into which it has found itself.

## Bill - Second Reading: Local Government Enactment (Amendment) Bill: 7<sup>th</sup> November, 1986

**Dr. Jagan:** Mr. Speaker, I tried to follow the speech of the Attorney General on the debate. My concern was in relation to the question of the validation. My colleague in speaking made the observation that the last time there was a Bill before the Assembly was in 1979. What seems to be on board now is to validate six years from 1979 to the present time and I am asking for a matter of information whether the present councils have been holding office without legal authority for over six years? The original law indicated that there should be a period of three years. The second point is about the flexibility in changing the procedure from the present time where you have the fixed dates or a fixed period from November to December when elections are held. The Attorney General is trying to justify the change that is being proposed. That is to give the Minister of the Government the right to determine when they should hold it within this three year period and that is in conformity with what exists at the national and regional levels. The other point is that the votes should be counted at the place of poll. What was the experience in 1970? In places like Leguan where the Opposition traditionally won the Local Government Elections. The votes were put in the rest house where the P.N.C. boys were staying and next morning they were taken to the counting place to be counted. That is how you rigged the elections and that is why there has been this call for all times that there should be counting of the ballots at the place of poll. You know that Prime Minister Euginia Charles said when this controversy arose when Mr. Hoyte went to Mustique. She gave some press interviews. She said "*I do not see why you do not want independent observers*". The only reason you would not want it is if you have something to hide. Barrow went all the way to the Philippines.

Yes, Cde. Speaker, what I am saying is that Prime Minister Euginia Charles said if you have anything to hide then you would not want observers and you would not want to count the ballots at the place of poll. There are a lot of things in the country to hide. I want to end on that note because you are going to rig the election. But the time is coming in this country when you cannot have any election at all because that is what it is tantamount to. You are only going through the motions. Other forces in the country are coming together now and they are saying let us boycott, let us have nothing to do with fraud, it is morally incorrect. The people in South Africa do not go along with all the constitutional manipulations with the South African fascist regime. The time has come to fight. If that is what the Government wants in this country, they are sowing the seeds because they are using violence on the people of this country by rigging election after election and not only that now there is the law that they have in place to

confiscate every single thing a person may have. That is not....

I am saying that we have the Local Authorities which are there illegally and they are squandering the people's money. They are not accountable to anybody. Nobody knows what is going on with these Local Authorities. There are a lot of rackets going on and now they have wrecked everything. They are not only levying the people's property and selling them at auctions but if you have a bank account, they move on to your capital. Okay go ahead and grab. You have already grabbed and grabbed so much that the people are just either going away or either not producing, those who are here, and that is why our economy is in a parlous state. Even your manoeuvres. It is not Jagan along who is giving the country a bad name. Lord .... he is not a communist, he is not a Marxist.

Cde. Speaker, a leading Senator the other day referring to South Africa said that it is untenable that ten percent of the population must hold down ninety percent of the population and that is the issue in Guyana. That is really the issue in Guyana; ask this gentleman over here if he never used to say that. It is a minority regime, the previous Bill which they did not discuss, number eight; they are now going to impose penalties. I am only showing where we are going. We will set up a set of informers in this country now, to inform on every neighbour to see how to catch him to pay his rates and taxes, that is if he has not run out of the country long before. Cde. Speaker, first of all we start out with the voters' list, we have to see an independent organization to be in charge of the voters' list, this was the position of Mr. Hoyte when he was a member of the Elections Commission in 1968, that the Elections Commission will be in charge, that is its function, to be in charge of the compilation of the voters' list. He is not doing that now, what happens at the last election. The Elections Commission said to us, and the Opposition Parties that it had nothing to do with the appointment of all the officers dealing with the elections. We showed him the Constitution Report for the 1964 elections when the Elections Commission appointed all the agents, the Chief Elections Agent and all the other officers. He did not do that, the Minister of Home Affairs did it in Guyana, that is why we had the practice in the last election, when a lot of agents behaved like P.N.C. thugs, brutalised people, pushed them out of the polling station, agents who had a legal right to be there. One British journalist said he went to many countries, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, he was involved in many guerilla wars as a journalist but this is the first time he was near to being lynched. I made a point two nights ago at a meeting when Nixon in 1971 made a big grand stand, laid down your arms communists in Vietnam, we are giving you elections. The Vietnamese were not agreeing and everybody could not understand why they were not agreeing to elections when they have the eighty percent support of the people behind them, so everybody was flabbergasted why the Vietnamese were not going to elections. Nixon says you can have elections, the Vietnamese said yes we want elections, we will vote at elections but let the Government

resign first and appoint an interim Government with an interim agency which will be in charge of elections. I went to the conference in Paris and I told them of the machinery and the change of the laws in 1967 and the elections in 1968, how it was rigged because the machinery and everything was changed, the laws and everything compared to what existed in 1964 with an independent Elections Commission. So that is the first question we have to reconcile ourselves with in this country, if you want to proclaim to the world that you have a free and fair elections then have an independent Elections Commission. Why cannot we have one from CARICOM of which Mr. Hoyte is Chairman, why cannot this Government agree to ask CARICOM to appoint an Elections Chairman? The first point we want as regards the rules of procedure is that the independent commission must be established and ask your friend Sonny Ramphal to help you, he is your boy, the Secretary General of the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth sent a team of observers here in 1964, ask Sonny Ramphal to send, appoint somebody, let us have an independent commission in which the whole world will have confidence. CARICOM and the Commonwealth, the P.P.P. and W.P.A. do not control the Commonwealth and CARICOM, let us have, at least, these institutions...

I am talking about an independent person, we want an independent commission. The second point is we want an independent commission to be in charge of the conduct of elections, including the compilation of the voters' list and the appointment of all the personnel.

## Consumption Tax (Amendment) Order 1986: 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 1986

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde Speaker, the Hon. Minister referred to rationalization in this exercise of raising consumption taxes by 5 percent on the rates which are listed in the Consumption Tax Act of 1984. The amount of 5 percent means that 25 percent will increase to 30 percent and 45 percent will go to 50 percent. In looking through this previous Order No. 68 of 1984, one sees all kinds of things being imported in the country, and I do not know whether this has to do with the goods produced in this country. We know when the CARICOM came into being, because of its duty free provisions the Government thought up a new device of consumption tax in order to compensate for the loss it would have made by giving duty free concessions to CARICOM produced goods. What alarms me is I would have thought that taxation, be it customs duties or consumption tax, should be linked to the question of production and the national objective of import substitution and so on, also to keep in mind the question of the cost of living and to ensure that certain things do not rise. We have in socialist countries, for instance, where for basic things the price remains virtually constant for many years and if there is an increase, then maybe a small increase over a long period of time. That is the basic necessities of life but here we have a five percent blanket increase on everything. Medicine for instance, we know what a difficult time people have in getting medicine in this country, the public medical hospital cannot provide adequate prescription drugs to be bought outside of the dispensary. We should be trying now to keep down the cost of living for people, people who cannot meet the very high cost of living, the Government is constantly saying we cannot afford to pay no more, please tell us where to get the money from. They refuse to index wages to the cost of living, there is constant refusal on this question, the T.U.C. again is asking for this and yet the Government keeps trying to alleviate the cost of living by putting on further taxation. Why tax basic essentials like medicine for instance, poor people have to get fuel for cooking for instance, prices have gone up, they have leaped, okay maybe due to the hike from the people who are selling the goods, that is one problem, but why should the Government add to the misery and burden of the poor people of this country? Those are essential basic things of life, why increase them by another five percent? Take agriculture, our agriculture is in a parlous state, there is no doubt about that, why increase agricultural implements by another five percent?

Housing, the Ministry of Forestry, not so long ago mentioned Mr. Speaker, the very high cost of building materials. The Government has removed price controls; on top of that there is a consumption tax on building materials which all saw millers have to pay and that is passed on to the poor

house builders. Imagine in Trinidad you can buy imported timber from Canada at \$2.50 per square foot and here you have to pay as much as five dollars per square foot. You are exploiting the poor people. Canadians at least are subsidizing their exports, what are you doing, you are putting on a five percent consumption tax already on the very high consumption tax which the saw millers have to pay and which is then passed on to the consumers. Cde. Speaker, we are taking up cases right now for house lots for sugar workers for instance. In some cases house lots are not available, in other cases house lots have been given but the workers cannot build because all that they get from the Sugar Industry Welfare Fund is \$15,000 and that figure was alleviated quite recently to reach \$15,000. For \$15,000 you cannot build a chicken coop now and you expect the workers to build and yet the Government is putting on 5 percent consumption tax. They know the perilous state of the housing situation in Georgetown; you cannot find a place to rent in Georgetown. One of our Comrades is living in a hurdle in Vreed-en-hoop. He tried to get a place but he could not get it so now he has to go and live in L.B.I. and everyday he has to fetch water, he jumped from the frying pan into the fire. What are we coming to? Diplomats came to Guyana and they have to live in the Pegasus, they cannot find houses in Georgetown and if they do, the cost is \$4,000 or 5,000 and they are expected to pay in foreign currency.

The Yugoslav Ambassador cannot find a house. Have you found a house for him, how many of them are living in the Pegasus? I am saying, in the agricultural policy, what could be the agricultural policy? I just heard on the BBC a report on this question of hunger in the world. They said in the developed countries, you have the whole situation today where they are producing more than they can consume and they do not know what to do with the surplus because they pay the people a higher price than they can sell it for either internally, they subsidise the internal consumers and they try to dump it outside. In the Third World countries, we do not have, we cannot produce enough food to eat, the opposite, why, because they have political elite living parasitically on the poor producers in the country side and we tax them on top of that with files, cutlasses and all these things, not only are they not available but go and find out what the prices are. Little implements, soon one would have thought that the tax mechanism should be used in such a way as to achieve your development policy, if you want to build houses, I am sure the Minister of Forestry will agree with me, take out the consumption tax so that you can encourage the people who have houses to get an opportunity to buy lumber at a lower price. That is one way if you want to solve the housing problem otherwise, you are only talking and making noise. A few weeks ago I made a statement and the *Chronicle* said that the Ministry of Housing is considering a housing policy. Imagine after twenty-one years in Government, when they said in 1972 they would feed, house and clothe the nation.

I am talking of the policy of the Government with certain aids to solve



the housing crisis. This is not the time to talk about formulating a housing policy. Sixty-five houses were built from 1972 to 1976. Just imagine how ridiculous those people are. They are talking about housing policy now. Lower the prices of the consumer items. Go in Guyana Stores and find out how much building materials cost. The P.P.P. had to buy toilet fittings the other day for the guest house and one toilet set cost \$2,500. Can you imagine that? This is ridiculous and therefore I am saying use your tax mechanism more selectively to attain your goals in housing, in agriculture and whatever else. Do not come to this Assembly and make a blanket of 25 percent going up to 30 percent and 45 percent going up to 50 percent. That is what is done here. Most of the items listed in the previous order are 25 percent, some in different places are higher. Okay, the Government wants to raise money; we understand that therefore they put a 5 percent hike on everything. The Minister called them semi-luxury and luxury items.

The point I want to make is that some of the things I mentioned are not considered luxury items. So it is wrong to say that they are luxury items. Fuel for the ordinary person is not a luxury item and so on. I would say, Cde. Speaker that the Minister should think again and withdraw this Bill and then come back. Revoke the order and come back with selected items that are items that are nonessential, but we have to keep the goals set by the Government. In that way you must discriminate and leave out certain things. In fact, you must leave out certain things. In the Soviet Union certain things were reduced. Certain things were raised and some were very small and some higher. So that was done, I might say, wisely in keeping with your objective but we cannot support this order the way it was done. It is not done properly and it is not done in keeping with the aspirations of the Guyanese people who are suffering today with the very high cost of living. Only a few people can live today to get the essentials of life and so we cannot give our support to this Motion.

## Christmas Greetings

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, I too would like to join in expressing our good wishes to you and your staff in this House, also to the people in this section of work, the parliamentary section who have to do the donkey work in the back rooms. We at this time obviously would like to join in the merry making which is traditional in Guyana at Christmas time. I do hope that the Government will change its mind and not only we in this House will be celebrating, but this will pay the people the five percent which they promise to pay early this year and did not pay so that they too can enjoy a little bit because you cannot enjoy Christmas unless you have some material things. The spirit does not work very well when the material things are not there to grease it, and the material things are very essential especially when you have to buy and the five percent will go a long way to help. It is not much but it was promised and the people are expecting it and I will urge the Prime Minister, he is a charming fellow too but unfortunately he does not implement that smile when it comes to certain policies and so I would like to make an appeal to the Government, also to urge that this House functions a little better. They started out well this year and they slipped again and I do not know what the reason is for this. Cde. Speaker, I am afraid about two dozen Motions and Questions have not yet found themselves on the Notice Paper, over two dozen and, as usual, we have been complaining about the House not meeting on Wednesdays. Since the recess we only met I think twice and we did not meet on a Wednesday as we are supposed to meet. I would suggest that the Government and the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House should look into the staffing of the House. The Speaker, does not even have a secretary, how do you expect the Speaker, to work properly? The Clerk of the National Assembly needs more help, please look into the budget of the Parliament so he can function more efficiently with a lot of cheer and happiness in this House. Anyway Happy Christmas.

## Supplementary Estimates: 29<sup>th</sup> December, 1986

**Dr. Jagan:** The international financial institutions are quite correct. Why should they keep bailing out money to this country when it is being spent in a way which helps to infuse the deficit and that in turn causes big problems in the country, especially with debt payment, because when we have a deficit like that we have to borrow from the local banking system and this means paying about eighteen million dollars interest per year, eighteen million dollars in interest alone, therefore this country needs financial stringency. Every now and then you read that the President has this Adviser and that Adviser and we do not even know how much they are being paid. So many Advisers, so many Ministers, so many Vice-Presidents. Why do we need more people here when we have so many Ministers, so many Vice-Presidents and Deputy Prime Ministers, then that applies also to the whole question of the Guyana Natural Resources Agency. Government has not come here before, even as a matter of courtesy to the House, to say that for so and so reasons we want such an Agency. What is the role of this Agency, what will it do that a Ministry cannot do if the Ministry was functioning properly, so I do not know if this is one of the means of giving one of our boys who are returning a job. We have the same thing on the next page where my colleague asked for information relating to what was spent for publication as against security. This country spends a lot of money here. Here too we see a supplementary estimate almost equal to what was sought at the beginning of the year, \$290,000 sought at the beginning of the year and now there is a supplementary of \$225,000. What do we need so many publications for; reams and reams of publications are being put out all the time, what for? Do we have the need to sell Guyana so much? Does the Government see the need to do that, that is why we are spending so much money for this Head? I do not know, we should be told exactly what the printed publications are, is this distinct from what the Ministry of Information is doing or is this printing referring only to what is done at the Presidential Office? Then there is this item 11, overtime to pay Guyana Management Institute for services rendered. I would like to know Cde. Speaker, what is Guyana Management Institute and what are the services they are talking about here? These are the questions I would like to ask.

Cde. Speaker, I would like to ask, what we are inspecting. I know that we are exchanging bauxite for oil, is it that we are calling for the inspection to see what is coming into the country, whether the grades of oil we are buying, whether those are the ones being supplied or whether the bauxite which we are sending is of the quality and grade etc. that we have committed ourselves to supply? I do not know what this inspection is all about and we certainly would like to know what this inspection is all about and we certainly would like to know a little bit more especially since we do not

have the benefit of the agreement. I would like to look a little ahead on this question too in relation to the Trinidad situation. I know that we did not pay our debts to Trinidad and as a result oil supplies were cut off. Are we making any improvements in that area? Being a member of CARICOM obviously we have to think in terms of inter-regional trade and oil is very important for the Trinidad Government and Trinidad's economy and so we would like to hear whether something has been done on that score. I raise this not only by way of any divulgence but to point out that we may be faced - although I hope not - with similar situation in Venezuela, maybe not in the far distant future. I do not mean that we would not be paying Venezuela because it is a barter arrangement but we understand that more large findings have been made of bauxite in Venezuela, and Venezuela from the reports which have been publicized can become self sufficient in bauxite requirements for its alumina factory. The plan to build an alumina factory is already operating in Venezuela so in the near future we may very well find ourselves, I hope not as I said before, where we can be cut off from fuel because they may not need our bauxite any longer.

I would like the Minister to tell us to whether there are any problems with respect to the bauxite we are sending to Venezuela, whether the Venezuelans are happy with the quality and quantity of the ore which we send to them so we can continue to get the oil supplies which are so essential to the consumer public and also to industry and commerce in this country.

## Supplementary Estimates Continued

**Dr. Jagan:** I would like to ask a question on Item 14, dealing with increased subscriptions to the overseas news agency. I mentioned this because I think the Minister should look into this. When you read the *Chronicle* you see a lot of items from A.P. and sometimes from U.P.I. These are the imperialist agencies that the Minister of Foreign Affairs will complain about. Mr. Nascimento the Communications Advisor to the President will also complain about this. We complain about them and then we talk about a new information order, where we must use our own agencies in the Third World, agencies from the socialist countries and so on. You look through the papers, even the *New Nation*, and you will see a lot of imperialist news. Why is it we are not using C.A.N.A.? It is a regional entity and we are not using that. We are using that rarely, why is that so? Here is an institution which was developed in the Caribbean as an attempt to bring about more information and give more publicity to the region as a whole. I would have thought that the Government not only should not pay more subscriptions to these people, I am speaking specifically about those agencies which are originating in the capitalist world. We must shift, or if we want to use them downgrade them. Do as you do with C.A.N.A. Shift the emphasis around as you do with C.A.N.A. and other progressive socialist agencies. Why are you not using the progressive socialist agencies? You are using mainly capitalist agencies in the imperialist states and you have to pay a lot of money too. I wish to ask the Minister to look at this and give it some attention because it is in the interest of the country.

## Trade with South Africa: 14th January, 1987

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, I would like to join with the Mover of the Motion and also the Government in expressing our abhorrence to this vicious apartheid system in South Africa. Mr. Kwayana was quite right to put the record of this country straight and clear. This Parliament took the lead when the foundations of apartheid were being built with the suppression of the Communism Act, with the Pass Laws and the Group Areas Act, where under which any criticism of the apartheid system was deemed as communist for which fines and imprisonment could be tendered and executed. Pass Laws was a means by which people could be caught in a dragnet to be sent to work in mines and plantations which prevented people from living where they wanted to live. The Group Areas Act did the same, segregating and dividing the communities which make up South Africa and the different apartheid areas. We were in the forefront of that struggle and it is good that Guyana continues to play this role both at home and internationally.

In that very good research done by the Mover of the Motion he forgot to mention one fact and that is during the independence talks in 1960 in London, we adjourned the meeting when we heard of the Sharpville Massacre and went into the streets to join with the others in protesting and some of us were arrested. The Colonial Office had to intervene to get us released. We in the People's Progressive Party are proud of this record. That is why we were very critical at one stage when the Government appointed Philips Brothers as agents for GUYBAU. The Philips Brothers had definite connection with South Africa. We tried and tried to have this connection broken but the Government did not do so. I believe Philips Brothers is still the agent of GUYMINE. I understand the Government to be saying that Philips Brothers is still the agent of GUYMINE. I understand the Government to be saying that Philips Brothers has no longer South African connections.

We would like that point to be cleared. I do not know whether it is the Second Resolve Clause which says that the public sector should cease and the Government should prohibit business relations with firms which participate in the apartheid economy in South Africa and Namibia. Is the Mover referring to this transaction dealing with Philips Brothers? Maybe the Government has more information now about Philips Brothers divesting in South African connections. But that has not been made explicit to us or to this Assembly.

I would like, however, to broaden this scope of the debate. For who are the enemies of South Africa today? The whole Third World, the Non-Aligned Movement, and many progressive countries in the developed capitalist world are, not to speak of the socialist world because they have been traditionally supporting the liberation movement in Africa, including Southern Africa, like Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau, etc. The traditional

enemy of the South Africa Movement has been imperialism and we see today in the various forums of the world, the Non- Aligned Movement, the United Nations, where the imperialists are saying that this is not the time for mandatory sanctions, that mandatory sanctions will not work, etc. if we are to fight against the apartheid system we have to link our fight against imperialism because imperialism is the backbone of the South African fascist regime.

Imperialism has a global reach, what they call their vital interests all over the world. In Central America it is to harass Nicaragua through Honduras. In the Middle East they harass the progressive revolutionary states like Syria, whichever country in the Middle East takes an anti-imperialist position, to harass them especially using the clannish state of Israel and in Southern Africa, where through Liberation Movements we have seen the establishment of revolutionary democratic regimes in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau, etc. imperialism is determined to stop the march of progress. Imperialism does not want a socialist-oriented course in these countries, no less than in the Middle East or in Central America or in the Far East. Consequently, imperialism is concerned to maintain South Africa as a bastion of reaction and imperialism in the same way they maintain Israel as a bastion of Zionism and racism in the Middle East. We do not only want the wealth and the riches, the raw materials of Southern Africa, because some of those materials are strategic, not only to the economy but to the so-called miniaturization programme, things like chromium and other very precious metals which come particularly from South Africa and particularly from Namibia. That is why the fascists' regime, the apartheid racist regime does not want to give independence to Namibia, linking it with the withdrawal of troops from Angola when we know that they want the Cuban troops withdrawn from Angola. They link the independence of Namibia with the removal of Cuban Troops. The British Government, unfortunately, is also in this exercise in collaboration with the Reagan administration.

Cde. Speaker, fortunately for the people of Southern Africa and particularly South Africa, history moves on and the imperialists can no longer stop the tide of history. The A.N.C. was regarded by them as a terrorist organization but they are forced to talk to the leaders of the A.N.C. today when before they refused to do so. History is marching forward because imperialism cannot find a solution to the deep crises which it is faced with and the business people today have decided that they are not going along. Some years ago we saw where Barclays Bank, for instance, was not willing to withdraw from South Africa and a boycott movement developed against Barclays Bank. Today Barclays Bank joins with many others because as the O.P.E.C. countries once decided to boycott certain multinationals which were operating and working with Israel, similarly the mass boycott movement in the world was getting so strong that these companies, transnational monopolies which were not only extracting valuable raw materials but making fantastic profits from slave labour in South Africa, they are now

feeling the heat of the burden, the heat of the pressure of the boycott.

I remember speaking not too long ago with the General Secretary of the A.N.C. when he mentioned then that the turning point was being reached because the business community was moving against the regime, the business community which in previous times when the crisis of world imperialism was not so acute, was not prepared to go against the fascist regime. Cde. Speaker, we in Guyana have a creditable record. The Government also has this record but we cannot do very much because we are not a big trading nation, we do not have anything to sell and we stopped whatever was coming here.



## Budget Debate for 1987: 26<sup>th</sup> January, 1987

**Dr. Jagan:** Mr. Speaker, the President used three words: bold, radical and innovative, to describe the 1987 Budget. Three other words – betrayal, sell-out and sleight-of-hand- are more appropriate. Its so called boldness is a betrayal, because the Budget will impose hardships never before experienced by our people. That is why the Government did not agree to the T.U.C.'s call for indexation. Its radicalism is not progressive and revolutionary. Instead, it is a sellout to the I.M.F. and foreign vested interests which will undermine our independence and sovereignty. Its innovation is merely a sleight-of-hand three-cards trick and statistical juggling to paper over the decaying carcasses of a dependent, bureaucratic state and parasitic capitalist system which its practitioners do not even pretend to call socialism. The course this Budget has charted is not new. It was tried in Puerto Rico and here in Guyana in the 60s and 70s, and more recently in Jamaica and other countries. The result has not been progress but further stagnant economic decline, penetration of foreign capitalist interests and greater poverty and misery of the people.

The centrepiece of this anti-working class Budget is devaluation, a word which the Minister of Finance tried to avoid. A great deal of propaganda has been on used to embellish this plague and to dupe the working people into a false sense of security. Highlighted are a few crumbs. But the sledgehammer blows to come are hidden. This P.N.C. administration has yet again betrayed the people; it is going back, as in the 1976-1978 period, into the arms of those who want to dominate our nation and to exploit our people, who will wring harsher terms from the Government and bring untold hardships in the daily lives of the people.

In 1977, after the P.P.P.'s call for a National Patriotic Front Government had been rejected by the P.N.C., the Government then led by L.F.S. Burnham as Prime Minister and Desmond Hoyte as Minister of Economic Development and Planning made a deal with foreign vested interests - interests which earlier had been engaged in subversive activities. This deal resulted in a release of foreign aid which had been previously blocked in the 1975 - 1976 period. The payoff was a secret deal in June 1978 with the International Monetary Fund. We in the P.P.P. warned about the so-called "*economic adjustment*" policies of the I.M.F. We appealed to the Government *ad nauseum* to sever links with the I.M.F. We exposed the anti-national and anti-people role of this imperialist-controlled international financial institution. In and out of this Assembly, we campaigned against the I.M.F. prescriptions, pointing out that they would prove bitter for the working people. We were attacked relentlessly for our advice. Renegades, turned economists overnight, joined the wolf-pack. They said Jagan and the P.P.P. don't know what they are talking about. They not only embraced the I.M.F.; they

sang its praise. Now they are lauding the benefits which will be gained from devaluation.

Time and experience proved that we were right. I.M.F. medicine proved bitter; removal of subsidies on stock feed and consumer essentials, enormous hikes of N.I.S. and Widows and Orphans Fund contributions, non-payment in 1979 of an agreed fourteen-dollars a day minimum wage, the cancellation of increments in the same year, increases in taxation, cuts in social services, dismissals, restrictions in importation of essential commodities including flour, devaluation and an increase in inflation and the cost of living.

The bitter consequences were not merely economic and social. They were also political, ideological and cultural. What is behind all the statements, statistics and financial juggling in the Budget Speech? A real political drama is unfolding. Various interests are jockeying to come out on top. There is a love/hate cooperative confrontational relationship between the P.N.C. bourgeoisie and the foreign and local big bourgeoisie. And contradictions are sharpening between the P.N.C. bourgeoisie and the working class.

Independence and nationalisation were essential for the advancement of the ruling party's bureaucratic stratum and the emergence of a large state sector for the purpose of accumulation, enrichment and political patronage. Simultaneously, it needed an expansive security apparatus to maintain itself in power. The whole coercive state apparatus including the military, paramilitary, police and the House of Israel was unleashed against sugar workers in 1977. A year later, it was the bauxite workers' turn. They were harassed, locked-up and tear gassed in a cell. In 1979, Georgetown urban workers of the Clerical and Commercial Workers Union were beaten up by police, threatened with dismissal on the second day of their strike at Guyana Stores, and 82 of them mainly activists and shop-stewards, were arbitrarily dismissed after their return to work. In 1980 the courageous militant Dr. Walter Rodney was assassinated.

At the end of 1980, elections were massively rigged with the help of the military, after they had been postponed in 1978. It has truly been said that the I.M.F. structural adjustment policies lead to a mere severe economic and social crisis and greater hardships on the people and ultimately to the death of democracy.

Cde. Speaker, the system of bureaucratic state parasitic capitalism, linked in a dependent status to the crisis-ridden world capitalist system has served the ruling party well, but it has wrecked the economy and sacrificed the working people. Guyana is in a worst crisis ever. The nature and the depth of the crisis was brought out clearly by the Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech. On page 35, we read:

*"Economic growth since 1980 has been very sluggish. In fact, since the turn of the decade, apart from the last three years, the economy has experienced negative economic growth. But, with the exception of 1984, that growth has been relatively small."*

So small, we may add, that on the basis of per capita national income, Guyana stands lowest in Latin America and the Caribbean, with the exception of Bolivia and Haiti. Guyana's per capita G.D.P. declined from US\$876 in 1960 to US\$719 in 1984. This was way below Barbados at \$2,818, Jamaica at \$1,793 and Trinidad and Tobago at \$2,862. And the decline continues. That is why Orlando Patterson, Jamaican Professor of Sociology at Harvard University said that "*Guyana is a complete and total disaster*". A disaster, because Budget projections for economic growth are never achieved. Production of sugar, bauxite and other products were below target in 1986. Stated figures for rice production seem like a guesstimates, when rice exports are taken into consideration, and industry in the private sector is hopping along, operating around 30 percent to 40 percent of capacity.

By the early 1980s, the P.N.C. Government was caught in a trap of its own making. Unable to pay its debts, Guyana was declared "*ineligible*" by the I.M.F. for further credits. The screws were tightened. The imperialist states cut off aid. We will not talk until you come to terms with the I.M.F., they said. The application for a soft window I.D.B. loan to develop the agricultural sector, with special emphasis on the rice industry, was vetoed by the USA and US credit for wheat was refused. What were they demanding? The late P.N.C. Leader, in a speech to his Party's Fifth Biennial Congress in August 1985, said that the United States Government was pressing for the privatisation of the rice industry and the Guyana Rice Board to bring the position back to what it was in the colonial era when the farmers had been exploited by the big landlords and rice merchants/exporters. "*Unofficially*", he continued, the US Government had also "*contended that the bauxite industry and all the nationalised industries in Guyana should be handed back to the foreign private sector*".

The P.N.C. Leader also said that the I.M.F. was also calling for a reduction in public spending, an end to all subsidies especially those on food, holding down of wages, abolition of price controls and what he referred to as a *coup de grace* - the devaluation of the national currency substantially by 66 percent to 100 percent.

The P.N.C. was faced with a real dilemma. To denationalise would mean undermining the P.N.C.'s hold on economic and political power and undercut its privileges; to cut public spending would affect not only the workers but the bureaucracy and the military; and to devalue further the national currency would revive the 1978-1979 labour upheavals. So the P.N.C. balked. And with the political opposition and the trade union movement coming out strongly against the I.M.F./World Bank proposals, the late President on May Day 1982 said that these proposals were a "*recipe for riot*". At that time there had been serious disturbances in Brazil and the Dominican Republic, arising out of I.M.F.-dictated devaluation. This was followed a year later when the P.N.C. Leader told the Congress that US pressure was "*not more meddling in our internal affairs, it is dictation. We must conform or else*".

With the financial crisis more severe in 1985 than in 1982 and the P.P.P./P.N.C talks for a National Patriotic Front - P.P.P./P.N.C./W.P.A. - the socialist-oriented Government was shunted aside, and the Hoyte administration clearly made the choice to conform. The 127 percent devaluation implicates the Hoyte administration for not only conforming but bending over backwards to please the US and the I.M.F. This conformance is being camouflaged with rhetoric such as *"purposeful economic adjustment"*. The basis for the devaluation had already been laid last year when in this Budget Speech, the Finance Minister said that *"every effort is being made to return to eligibility with the Fund"*, meaning the I.M.F. It is building a foundation to deliver the nation into the hands of the I.M.F. and its *"conditionality"* - the so-called *"freedom of the market place"* and the bankrupt dependent free enterprise capitalist system.

The steep devaluation will temporarily serve P.N.C. interests, but will strike a belly blow to the nation and the working people. Through it and financial/statistical juggling, the ailing and loss-making state corporations GUYSUCO and GUYMINE will artificially become profit-making and thus for the time being will not be *"forced to the wall"*. This exercise will only protect the positions and preserve the privileges of the P.N.C, bureaucratic elite.

The devaluation will, however, have far reaching consequences - a leap in the national public debt and debt payments; a sharp increase in the Budget deficit; increased prices for imported inputs for consumption and production; a steep rise in taxation; deterioration in the current account balance of the Balance of Payments; and a skyrocketing cost of living.

In his Budget Speech of 1986, the Minister of Finance told us that most of the foreign financial institutions like the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank (I.D.B), the European Investment Bank (E.I.B.) and the European Development Fund (E.D.F) *"seem to be increasingly preoccupied with the size of our fiscal deficit"*.

The deficit has jumped from 30.2 percent of total revenue in 1985 to 68.6 percent in 1987. It has resulted from an over-bloated bureaucratic and security apparatus and large debt payments. Now it is being compounded by devaluation. The deficit is being financed not by increased production and productivity, but by runaway borrowing, which in turn has resulted in a huge national debt, one of the biggest, if not the biggest, per capita debt in the world. The deficit in the Consolidated Current Account Fund increased from \$2,889.8 million in 1985 to \$4,546.2 million in 1987. For the capital account, the deficit increased from \$1,027.3 million in 1985 to \$2,012.5 million. This makes a staggering grand total deficit in the Consolidated Fund of \$6,558.7 million in 1987 compared with \$3,927 million in 1985, an increase of 67 percent.

After making payments in 1987, the outstanding public debt at the end of this year will be \$3,063.4 million. This means a debt of \$4,085 for every Guyanese, adult and child. The fantastic national debt means huge debt

payments. These increased from \$10 million in 1964 to \$654.8 million in 1986 and lo and behold to \$1,516 million in 1987. The latter represents 44 percent of current and capital expenditure. Imagine that debt payments alone are equivalent to 44 percent of total expenditure and exceed revenue by \$247.2 million. There will be also deterioration in the Balance of Payments.

What a bankrupt state! No amount of financial juggling will extricate our nation from this mess under this regime. We are borrowing not for development and welfare, but simply to pay debts. In order to satisfy the I.M.F. and thus qualify for more overseas credits and loans, external debt payments will increase from \$121 million in 1986 to \$1,161 million in 1987. With exports estimated at \$2,923 million in 1987, which is unlikely to be achieved, it means a debt service ratio of about 30 percent, which is 10 percent higher than what is deemed, by the United Nations and development agencies, to be a maximum limit if economic and social development/agencies are not to be adversely affected.

That is why Peru took a decision not to make debt payments in excess of 10 percent of its export income. We have been calling since 1982 for a suspension of debt payments. But now the Government is going to hand us over lock, stock and barrel and that is why Peru took a decision not to make debt payments in excess of 10 percent of its export income. No amount of P.N.C. rhetoric can hide the fact that the present devaluation is an act of compliance with the dictates of the I.M.F.

All that a new I.M.F. Agreement will do will be to provide credits to meet foreign debt payments and to liquidate huge foreign commercial arrears. But only more hardships will come out of it. Internal and external interest alone amounted to \$364 million in 1987. Meanwhile the principal payable, amounting to \$152.6 million, continues to grow. More foreign loans and credits will compound our problems and increase our dependence. More borrowing will also increase credit expansion, Note the Finance Minister's observation on credit.

On pages 35 and 36 he pointed out:

*"The very large overall deficit of the public sector to which we have referred in previous years has fostered an undesirable expansion in the money supply, The net domestic credit of the banking system moved from G\$1.4b in 1980 to G\$5.5b in June 1986. In other words in a matter of 6 years net domestic credit has expanded almost four fold".*

After referring to the sluggish economic growth since 1980, he continued:

*"Consequently, the expansion of money supply has not been undertaken to accommodate increased real growth."*

The nation is told that devaluation will help to stimulate industrial and agricultural development, and the new foreign exchange window in commercial banks will stop foreign exchange dealings in America Street, the Wall Street of Guyana, and the parallel market will be curbed.

This is a pipe dream, the financial and particularly the foreign exchange crisis is too deep-seated. Instead of destroying the parallel market, some local industries will be destroyed. With higher-priced inputs as a result of devaluation, manufacturers will not be able to compete with smuggled goods. Without economic progress and stability, smuggling will not be curbed in this country.

What will be developing with big salaries and allowances, corruption, illicit trading and high 18 percent to 20 percent rates of interest on 3-year and 10-year state loans is a financial bourgeoisie and coupon clippers; entrepreneurship will be restricted to real estate speculation, conspicuous consumption and overseas bank accounts. The flight of capital will be stepped up not curbed. With this calamitous situation, the I.M.F./World Bank will dictate terms, moving step by step from purely economic and social to the ideological/ political and cultural spheres. And recent trends indicate an accommodation with anti-national interest.

The Guyana Rice Board has not been democratized as the P.P.P. wants, but partially privatised as the Reagan administration wants. The big pro-imperialist agricultural capitalist/landlords, like Kayman Sankar, are being allowed to export rice and reap other economic plums.

In the nationalised enterprises, under a new form of colonialism, scarce financial resources are being creamed off by a stream of advisers, consultants, sales and purchase agents, managers and contractors from the imperialist states. Foreign policy is veering from Non-Alignment towards neutrality; equidistance from the great powers. A US State Department official noted a shift in Guyana's position at the United Nations. No doubt this was seen when no firm position was taken on US aggression against Libya.

At the ideological level, there is a retreat. In the 74-page Budget Speech, there is not a single mention of the word "*Imperialism*". Socialist rhetoric is down-played. And there is not a word about Marxism, so prevalent in the P.N.C. vocabulary in the 1975-1976 periods.

"*Cultural Imperialism*" in the form of dish satellite TV, and state-media journalists resuming visits to imperialist states for training is gaining momentum.

At the political level, the essential difference between the Burnham and Hoyte administrations is that the former was toying with the idea of a left unity; the latter, taking a bourgeois managerial/technocratic approach, is moving towards a right unity, *de facto* if not *de jure*. It is not accidental that President Hoyte has chosen "*Economic Dynamism*", the slogan of the United Force. The imperialists to whom the Hoyte administration has turned for money, are also exerting pressure for a clear-cut rightist, pro-capitalist and pro-imperialist course, as in the 1964-1968 period.



Simultaneously, the persons close to the Burnham anti-I.M.F. line have been removed, demoted and transferred overseas. Mr. Burnham had come to realise the mistake he had made in jettisoning the Soviet Agreement of April 1978 for the I.M.F. Agreement of June the same year. The debate with the ruling circles and in the country was taken to more serious dimensions when in 1982 he attacked the I.M.F. The indirect method now of submission to the I.M.F. in itself expresses the divisions within the Government and ruling party, with an I.M.F. course plunging the country into hotter waters. Submission to the I.M.F. also explains, apart from the reduction or removal of subsidies on essential commodities, a virtual wage freeze policy coupled with company unionism that has been imposed, and price controls on the majority of goods have been removed. The *Guyana Chronicle* on January 19 pointed out that prices cannot be increased except for new imports. But a few days later, the Government announced new prices for 7 controlled items! One can imagine what is happening to uncontrolled items! I call on the Government to rescind the devaluation and the recent increases in prices. I also call on the Government to meet the reasonable demands of the Trade Union Movement. The few handouts given by the Government were merely a smoke screen for the drastic devaluation of our currency. The \$20 million in tax concessions is chicken feed, compared with increased revenue from taxes alone of \$231 million. Mainly through devaluation, taxes will grow from \$868 million in 1986 to 31,099 million in 1987.

A great deal of propaganda has been made about the reduction of the Travel Voucher Tax from 50 percent to 23 percent. But even with this reduction, the Government's revenue on each ticket will be over that collected in 1986, and a 21-days round-trip ticket to Trinidad will increase from \$905 to \$1,636 and New York from \$4,092 to \$7,626. The Travel Voucher Tax should be abolished. The T.U.C. Economic and Research Committee in 1986, before devaluation, had called for a reduction of the tax on airline tickets, which it said made *"the purchase of an airline ticket a once-for-all investment in a life overseas"*. It went on to say that the *"time had also long past for the removal of the restrictions placed on public officers, in respect of utilising their leave passage entitlement for travelling overseas."*

Increased benefits will come from the N.I.S, but at a very heavy cost to most contributors. These should have come since 1978 when N.I.S contributors have been astronomically increased and led to a gold mine of \$702M at the end of 1984. N.I.S robbery must cease. The workers are entitled to additional benefits without an increase in contributions. The T.U.C's reasonable demand of \$30 per a day minimum wage must be met. This is only about half of what the workers are entitled to in keeping with the rise in the cost of living.

In 1981, the T.U.C. General Secretary, Joseph Pollydore, had said that life had become unbearable for the worker and that he was eating only one meal a day and his child was going to school with bare tea in the morning. Now, the working people will experience real hell - a direct result of au-

thoritarian methods, maladministration and I.M.F. so-called adjustment and stabilisation programme, including devaluation. *"The real wage of the workers"*, according to the 1986 Report of the T.U.C.'s Economic and Research Committee, *"now stands at approximately \$4.37, showing a decline of 48 per cent since 1977"*.

The Committee further rejected *"any proposal to devalue the Guyana dollar, as a means of stabilising the economy ... as ... devaluation will accelerate the rise in the C.P.I. (Consumer Price Index) over the next two years, as industry and commerce adjust to the rising cost of inputs"*.

Before the Budget, prices were exorbitant and generally beyond the reach of workers: chicken and beef - \$15 per pound; eggs - \$1 each; edible oil - \$15 per pint; milk - over \$2 per pint; soap - \$4 per cake. In 1986, the price of rice increased by 19 percent to \$6.25 per gallon. The prices even in state stores recently jumped significantly.

The T.U.C.'s Research Committee estimated in 1986 that electricity charges and transportation account for 15 percent of the family income of those in the medium income bracket, and 25 percent of the lower bracket. Electricity rates must not be increased.

The Government has said that in order to cushion the impact on transport costs, the consumption tax on fuel used by the Guyana Transport Services Limited (G.T.S.L.) would be remitted to the Corporation, but what about the private transport service - hire cars, mini buses, and the likes? Gasolene prices should not go up, it must be withdrawn immediately. They have increased it steeply from \$8 to over \$12 a gallon.

Cde. Speaker, the Finance Minister told this Assembly that *"the primary intention of the Budget is to place ourselves on a path of self-sufficient growth"*.

This is a tune we had heard many times before. And every year the country sinks deeper and deeper in a morass of unthinkable depths. The Minister also spoke about the need for balances of all kinds, and laid the blame for the ills of Guyana and the countries in the region because they were motivated by the immediacy of the concern for social well being and defence. He called for medium-term planning. For years, we have been talking about imbalance, about a correct economic planning strategy and about planned proportional development of the economy with an emphasis on industry and agriculture. We criticised the pro-capitalist, Puerto Rican Model, and heavily weighted on infrastructure. In the first 10 years of the P.N.C. rule, agriculture was downgraded and agricultural infrastructure was neglected. Consequently, the contribution of agriculture to G.D.P. declined from 27.2 percent in 1964 to 22 percent in 1983. We had been critical of the massive amount spent on the military and paramilitary forces based on an exaggerated danger from so called external threats to our security. In actual fact, the huge security force was constituted to keep the P.N.C. in power and the workers in check. We were critical of the I.M.F. Course.

The nation is now told by President Hoyte that the Budget is intended to come to grips with economic reality. This is a reality which has come



about not for want of advice and warning from the Opposition. The Minister of Finance says that the present mess has been brought about by an absence of an appropriate information system, a monitoring mechanism and a review mechanism militated against success. No! It has come about through police/military methods of rule, regimentation from above and lack of democratic involvement and accountability, brought about through successive rigged elections. How can this Budget devaluation and an I.M.F. course make us come to grips with reality and lead the nation to salvation? They will lead to more gripes and eventually to total collapse. How can an ailing patient be cured by a second dose of the same medicine which caused his illness in the first place? This will lead him only to his grave. The I.M.F. course in Jamaica was intended to lead to deliverance. Instead it has led to starvation and violence and a disastrous defeat of Prime Minister Seaga's party at the local parish elections in 1986. The I.M.F. course and a dependant free enterprise capitalist course with a deformed industrialisation has led to disaster in Latin America. It failed in Guyana in the 1978-81 periods and proved a fiasco in Jamaica in the 1980-86 periods.

To go there from our existing bankrupt dependent bureaucratic state capitalist system is like jumping from the frying pan into the fire. The world capitalist system is in a deep and prolonged general, structural, monetary and cyclical crisis. In 1985, the annual growth of industrial output in 1985 in the USA was 1 percent; in Britain, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy - nearly 2 percent, and Japan experienced a drop of .05 percent for the first time in 10 years. And the world capitalist centres are torn by contradictions among which are protectionism and a trade war.

In contrast under real socialism in the Soviet Union, national income grew by 4.1 percent and industrial output by 4.9 percent in 1985. In the first 8 months of 1986, labour productivity in industry grew by 4.8 percent (against the planned 4.1 percent) and the volume of industrial production grew by 5.2 percent (against the target of 4.3 percent). Mr. Speaker, what is needed is a political solution, not financial juggling and propaganda. Only a people's revolutionary-democratic Government and a socialist-oriented course of development can save Guyana. I wish this Assembly to heed the words the President uttered a few days ago about the situation in South Africa. He said: "*Oppression however, breeds resistance and the determined will of the masses cannot, for all time, be thwarted.*"

Down with the anti-working class Budget!

Down with the P.N.C.-I.M.F. deal!

Down with Devaluation!

Ten to one is Murder!

Remember! Our people will be the Judge!

## Transportation in the Rupununi: 18<sup>th</sup> March, 1987

**Dr. Jagan;** Cde. Speaker, the Hon. Minister when speaking on the Motion and rejecting it, based his arguments on the fact that what is done for this area has to be considered in relation to the whole national plan, national Budget, etc. From what we have heard this afternoon, it seems that the Government has abdicated its responsibility to the people of the Rupununi,

At one time, the people of Guyana were told of the great things that this Government had in store for the people in the Interior, all the airstrips they were building and so on. We have just heard an account of how many airstrips have been closed, and the atrocious air services. Surely we have a responsibility to the people, especially the Amerindians in the Rupununi, because they are the main settlers of that area and they are the people who need to be helped. What are we doing? We are saying we do not have any money. That is virtually what we understand the Minister to be saying. The work there cannot fit in with our plans.

It is very simple. At one time this Government agreed on the expansion of the Defence Force of this country to defend our territory from aggression, at one time from Brazil, at another time from Venezuela. Well, what are you doing by total neglect of these areas? You are virtually integrating these parts of our country with neighbouring countries. The Rupununi is now virtually integrated with Brazil because this Government has failed to satisfy the needs of the people by way of communications, by way of services, by way of inputs like materials and so on. They have to integrate their economy virtually with Brazil and similarly in the North West District with Venezuela. We hear now that relations with these countries have improved a great deal. Then, why don't we, having spent so much money on the military and the paramilitary, cut down, cut it by half and use the money to service these areas instead of having military jeeps, buses, trucks and all that all over the Rupununi and the Interior, Why not take some of them and give to the residents? Why not put them in the transport services? We hear now that relations with neighbouring countries are very good. We do not need such large defence forces and especially since we do not want to lose part of our territory, not physically, but in this method in which I refer to the virtual integration of these areas with neighbouring countries. What are we doing? I think if this thing goes on, then the Opposition will be forced to go to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations and say that the Guyana Government is failing in its responsibility, its duty, to the people of the Rupununi.

## Sympathy on Death of Cde. Edgar Lealand Ambrose: 13<sup>th</sup> May, 1987

**Dr. Jagan:** Cde. Speaker, I too would like on behalf of the People's Progressive Party to join in expressing our sympathy on the death of Cde. Ambrose. It is said that good health and long life are dependent not only on a good physical and mental position, but also one's attitude to life and also the respect which man and the community has for individuals. Edgar Ambrose as was pointed out was a farmer. He served in many capacities to help the farmers both in the Rice Producers' Association and in the Parliament. He held a high position in the Rice Producers' Association, was a member of the Rice Marketing Board, and as we heard he held a position in the People's Progressive Party Government.

But this was not the only thing. He was loved by the people, by the farmers whom he served well. He was respected by them. They elected him over and over in the R.P.A, But what happened? I do not want to go into the reasons why, as we heard, he left the P.P.P. and went over to the P.N.C. There is one thing I know and that is that after that act took place Ambrose had to be nominated to the Rice Action Committee. They could no longer hold elections to the R.P.A. District Committees. More than that, Ambrose could hardly walk around Leguan. He had to go and live in Bel Air. People were cursing him all the time and no doubt a man who was cherished and loved by the people to be finding himself in that position must have contributed to his early death. I have no doubt about it.

A man, especially in his older years not only must do something which is tangible and be active, but he must have a claim in his community, he must be respected. Otherwise he will vegetate and disappear I do not know what happened when he was in the P.N.C. but in the later years he was actually vegetating, riding around in the streets. Here again is a sad example of what happens to renegades, they eventually reach a premature death. However, we sympathise with his family and we express our condolences.









