

**STATE COUNCIL****ANNOUNCEMENTS**


---

MONDAY, 29TH JUNE, 1953

---

The Council met at 10 a.m., His Honour the President, Sir Edwin Frank McDavid, C.M.G., C.B.E., in the Chair.

---

**PRESENT :**

His Honour the President, Sir Edwin Frank McDavid, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Mr. W. J. Raatgever, C.B.E.

Mr. Lionel A. Luckhoo.

Mr. W. A. Macnie, C.M.G., O.B.E.

Mr. R. B. Gajraj.

Mr. P. A. Cummings.

Mr. U. A. Fingall.

His Grace the Archbishop of the West Indies, the Most Reverend Dr. Alan J. Knight.

Mr. G. L. Robertson.

His Grace the Archbishop of the West Indies read prayers.

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Monday, 22nd June, 1953, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

REPLIES TO MESSAGES FROM H.M. THE  
QUEEN AND THE SECRETARY  
OF STATE

**The President :** Hon. Members, I have received two letters from His Excellency the Governor, the first acknowledging the receipt of a copy of the Resolution passed by this Council on the 22nd of June in deep appreciation of Her Majesty the Queen's Message on the occasion of the meeting of the first Legislature under the new Constitution. His Excellency adds that he has transmitted a copy of the Resolution to the Secretary of State for the Colonies with the request that steps may be taken to have it laid before Her Majesty.

In his second letter His Excellency acknowledges the receipt of copies of the Resolution, also passed on June 22, in acknowledgment of the Secretary of State's Message of goodwill to the new Legislature on the occasion of the opening of the new session. His Excellency says that a copy of this Resolution has also been transmitted to the Secretary of State.

**LEAVE**

I would also like to announce for record that His Grace the Archbishop of the West Indies has intimated to me that he had made previous arrangements for visits to Churches and Missions in the North West District, and that he will be away from Georgetown from July 16 to the 31st. I therefore wish to record that he is excused from attendance in this Council during that period.

I have also been granted leave of absence as Minister without Portfolio by His Excellency as from tomorrow until the end of July. I am

[The President]

proceeding to England tomorrow. I do not expect to be away for the whole of that period. I shall probably return about the third week of July. There is no provision in the British Guiana (Constitution) Order in Council for the granting of leave to the President of this Council. I am therefore taking this opportunity to ask hon. Members to permit me to record that I shall be away for that period, and I hope you will excuse my absence. I shall not move a formal resolution as I take it there will be no objection.

### NOTICE OF MOTION

#### REMUNERATION OF MEMBERS OF STATE COUNCIL

The President gave notice of the following motion and of his intention to move, at a later stage of the meeting, the suspension of the Standing Rules and Orders to enable him to move it:—

Whereas it is desirable that Members of the State Council should receive remuneration from public funds for their services;

And Whereas, in paragraph 14 of Sir Charles Woolley's dispatch to the Secretary of State dated 21st June, 1952 (Council Paper No. 2/1952) the view was expressed that amending legislation should be introduced to provide for the remuneration of State Councillors on the same scale as for Members of the House of Assembly;

And Whereas, in paragraph 3(i) of the Secretary of State's despatch dated 5th August, 1952 (Council Paper No. 2/1952) he expressed agreement that Members of the State Council should be paid on the same scale as Members of the House of Assembly;

And Whereas, the Legislative Council has voted provision in the approved estimates for 1953 for the payment of remuneration to the Members of the State Council and to the Members of the House of Assembly and such expenditure has been authorized by the Appropriation Ordinance, 1953 (No. 14).

Be it resolved:—

That this Council recommends that the Government introduce legislation to authorize the payment from public funds of Members of the State Council on the same scale as Members of the House of Assembly.

### ORDER OF THE DAY

#### REPLY TO GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS

Mr. Macnie : Sir, I beg to move the motion of which I gave notice at the last sitting of this Council, and with your permission I will read it. The motion reads as follows:—

Be it resolved:—

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his Address delivered on the occasion of the State opening of the Legislative Session on the 30th of May, 1953:—

#### THE STATE COUNCIL

To

#### HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The State Council has the honour to thank Your Excellency for the speech which you were pleased to deliver at the State Opening of the present Legislative Session.

2. The State Council wishes in the first place to assure Your Excellency that it is and will be ever mindful of the importance of its role under the new Constitution, and that it will exercise its constitutional functions with a due sense of responsibility and service to the whole country and its people. In this connection, the State Council records that it emphatically endorses the view and conclusion of the framers of the Constitution that a Second Chamber endowed with reasonable powers of scrutiny and review is and must remain an essential feature of the Legislative process of this country.

3. The State Council desires to express its concurrence with Your Excellency's assertion that the new constitutional and political advances secured by this country will prove almost worthless unless they are accompanied by further and sustained economic progress and development,

[Mr. Macnie]

4. The State Council notes that a reasonably secure financial position has been handed over by the late administration but that, in Your Excellency's view, the peak of revenues from the present average levels of production has possibly been reached with little likelihood of further budget surpluses from which an expanded programme of capital expenditure on development may be financed. The State Council accordingly agrees that dependence must be placed on the introduction of external capital to provide the means by which future development can be obtained.

5. The State Council agrees with Your Excellency that substantial capital will be needed for new development both in the form of Government loans raised in London, in British Guiana or elsewhere as well as by private investment, and considers that all necessary steps should be taken to attract and encourage the introduction of capital from abroad into the country.

6. Like Your Excellency, the State Council anxiously awaits the report of the World Bank Mission which recently visited British Guiana, and trusts that the report will provide a comprehensive guide as to the directions in which development should proceed and the priorities to be observed with respect thereto, as well as the means by which the programme recommended can appropriately be financed.

7. The State Council has noted with satisfaction Your Excellency's remarks on the encouragement of "self-help" by the people of the country, assisted by Government grants and loans as being one important aspect of development which should be energetically pursued.

8. The State Council warmly endorses Your Excellency's observations on the need for the development of a spirit of co-partnership between "Capital" and "Labour" and your conviction that both the employers and the Trade Unions must play their respective parts in securing a continued improvement in industrial relations.

9. Finally, the State Council joins with Your Excellency in your plea for internal harmony which is indispensable to progress, and assures Your Excellency that all measures conducive to the welfare of the people of the country will receive its full support."

Sir, at this stage I do not propose to say much, if anything, on this motion which I have read, and which I feel is fully explanatory. I would, however, commend the motion to the Council and express the hope that all Members will express their views and not hesitate to do so. For myself I will reserve my remarks until other Members have spoken, when, in accordance with the procedure laid down, I will have the right to make such remarks as I consider necessary in winding up the debate.

**The President :** I beg to second the motion. In speaking on the motion I want in the first place to touch briefly on the State Council itself as being an important element in the legislative structure created by the new Constitution. I do so in order to elaborate somewhat on what is stated in paragraph 2 of the draft Reply which has just been read by the Mover. That paragraph reads as follows (Hon. Members will excuse me for reading it again) :

"The State Council wishes in the first place to assure Your Excellency that it is and will be ever mindful of the importance of its role under the new Constitution, and that it will exercise its constitutional functions with a due sense of responsibility and service to the whole country and its people. In this connection, the State Council records that it emphatically endorses the view and conclusion of the framers of the Constitution that a Second Chamber endowed with reasonable powers of security and review is and must remain an essential feature of the Legislative process of this country."

Now it may be assumed that this paragraph in the draft Reply has been introduced in response to the observations on this subject in His Excellency's Address. His Excellency said:

"I am aware that the party in power have expressed themselves as opposed in principle to the provision in the Constitution for a Second Chamber. They have suggested that it is superfluous, since in

[The President]

any case it has no power effectively to oppose the will of the House of Assembly. But I suggest to you that it is wrong to regard the State Council as an opposition. It is true that its functions is to act as a check—as the two members of the Commission who recommended it pointed out, the check of a bicameral system has been tested and its value proved—but I am confident it will exercise this function with discretion.”

I feel that the contention of the Party in power calls for a rather stronger, more emphatic and more positive rebuttal than that. There is indeed no room for controversy whatsoever that there is an absolute necessity for a Second Chamber endowed with reasonable powers of review and revision in the legislative process. In support of this assertion I cannot do better than quote from the words of the Waddington Commission. In paragraph 78 of the Commission's Report this is said (Please excuse my quoting again, because it is very important) :

“Democratic governments derive ‘their just powers from the consent of the governed.’ This doctrine of consent is distinctive of democracy and fundamental to it. It means, for one thing, that a government elected by a majority of the population should always consult the interests of all. For this reason, and to enable the will of the community to be more perfectly discovered, checks and balances are an integral feature of democratic government as western civilisation understands it. Democratic communities may be unsteady and be led to action by the impulses of the moment. Like individuals, they may be sensible of their own weakness, and may desire the counsels and checks of friends to guard them against the turbulence and weakness of unruly passions.”

In paragraph 79 the Commission went on to add these words:

“We subscribe wholeheartedly to the belief that the preponderant voice in any deliberative assembly should be that of the elected representatives of the people, but we are convinced that a community in which these checks do not exist or are of illusory power, is not truly democratic,

and we dismiss at once from our consideration all proposals for a legislature which does not in some way or other embody these safeguards.”

Those, hon. Members, are strong words but they are true words, and the whole of constitutional history supports them. I said a moment ago that there was no room for controversy as to the absolute necessity for a Second Chamber, but there is undoubtedly room for argument, room for differences of opinion as to how a Second Chamber may be constituted, or on what basis it may be appointed. The choice of course lies between an elected body and a nominated one. Indeed this particular issue was dealt with by the Waddington Commission, although all that appears about it is contained in a footnote to Codicil II where the framers of Codicil II, which of course has been embodied in the present Constitution, said that they had given careful consideration to the possibility of providing a wholly elected State Council but had found the idea impracticable. I do not believe the word used should have been “impracticable,” because the explanation is that they did not wish the Second Chamber to be in any respect a rival to the First Chamber, the House of Assembly, and of course it is conceivable that two bodies deriving their authority from the same source, the same popular source, might become rivals in the sense that each might claim that it had the same right, the same authority flowing from the will of the people.

The Waddington Commission also refer to what they call election, nomination, or appointment on the basis of “fancy franchises.” What they meant there was the suggestion which had been put to the Second Chamber might be representation of special organizations or special interests, and they considered that process to be undesirable on several counts.

[The President]

Let me explain what the counts were. I myself am open to conviction that a Second Chamber appointed on such a basis might not indeed be desirable. Evidence I know was given before the Waddington Commission by a certain body which recommended that the Second Chamber should be constituted by representatives of religious bodies for one, and of certain other specified interests and organizations. Incidentally it is good to note that that particular witness did recommend that His Grace the Archbishop of the West Indies should be sitting around this table, and he also suggested that the Bishop of the Catholic community should be here, with representatives of the Chamber of Commerce, industrial organizations, Village Councils and so forth. I myself do not dismiss that sort of arrangement as undesirable. However, to sum up, what I am trying to say is that there is no controversy whatever, or could be, about the necessity for a Second Chamber, but there may be room for argument as to its composition. For all these reasons I hope you, my colleagues, do agree and fully endorse what is stated in paragraph 2 of this draft Reply.

Before I leave that subject I would like to deal with the question of nominated Members. We do feel that there is still, apparently, some slight criticism of an individual who becomes a legislator by virtue of nomination, and I should like to quote again—this time from the Report of the British Caribbean Standing Closer Association Committee—the Rance Report. They had something to say about it, and hon. Members will excuse me if I read a very short extract from the paragraph in which they were speaking of the short supply of experienced public men in the whole West Indies territory. I quote :—

“We emphasize that we speak of experience and not of ability, as to which we have no qualms.”

And these are the important words :

“We think it wise, therefore, so to design the Constitution that we do not exclude from this form of public service men who might otherwise be available. We do not hold that only such as can successfully seek election are fitted to make a legislative contribution to the region. With those who hold themselves aloof from politics for fastidious or snobbish reasons, we have no sympathy, but there are many men of good and valuable experience, not by any means confined to one class of society, who are held back by feelings of modesty and genuine diffidence from making their contributions uninvited.”

Hon. Members, I have in my Address to the Council at the opening indicated the calibre of the men around this table and their experience, and I do hope that they fulfil the qualifications for nomination along the lines referred to in the extract which I have just read.

I would like to pass on now to the second topic on which I wish to speak, and for my further remarks I shall take as my main text what is stated in paragraph 3 of the draft reply. Paragraph 3 reads:—

“3. The State Council desires to express its concurrence with Your Excellency's assertion that the new constitutional and political advances secured by this country will prove almost worthless unless they are accompanied by further and sustained economic progress and development.”

It is, of course, inevitable that in speaking on that particular paragraph I should touch on the financial and economic aspects of the situation which are reflected in paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of the draft reply. I have never ceased to be surprised at the extraordinary characteristic of very many people in British Guiana—many of them in high places who should know better—and who continually decry and belittle their

[The President]

own country—and the advance of its peoples and its Government—and unwittingly perhaps, serve to bring it into disrepute in the eyes of our neighbours and even in the eyes of the world. Today, more than ever before, we hear these baneful outcries of self-criticism at a time when I think they are more undeserved than ever. What is the truth of the matter? British Guiana is, perhaps, one of the most difficult countries in the world. Its physical and geographical characteristics make it so. Its population is settled primarily on the coastlands, and the conditions affecting the coastlands are tremendously difficult.

In the first place, the coastlands have been subjected to the ravages of the sea over practically the whole history of settlement in the country. For years, one of the chief objects of the Administration has been to save this country from the affects of aggression by the sea. I remember, even in my short lifetime, when the sea was flowing over the road just past the Carib Hotel. I remember also when the sea broke in and came as far as the railway station at Clonbrook, and it was due to the determination of the Government in the years 1914 to 1920 that this tremendous problem was finally solved. It was solved at vast expense and we are still paying annual loan charges on the cost of the sea defences which were constructed during that period. Apart from the sea defences there is the problem of the water behind the coastlands on which we live. The method by which we corrected our sea defence troubles itself aggravated the drainage problem. The building up of the foreshore made drainage more difficult, and coupled with drainage there is the question of irrigation; so there are we—between the sea on the

one hand and water behind the coastlands on the other, thus causing us to indulge in the most expensive of engineering feats in order to live and get production from these shores. That is the position as regards the coastlands.

The interior presents even greater difficulties. There is the difficulty of access and the difficulty of communication. The great rivers are all blocked by cataracts and, further, we suffer from eccentricities of climate. Often it is pleasant enough, but sometimes it offers great difficulties and many of the problems of our agriculturists are due to this fact. During many years also we have been upset by the ravages of tropical diseases such as malaria. I would like to claim that during the last 30 years the Government and its people have risen triumphant over many of these difficulties. We have seen the sea defence problem almost entirely solved; we have seen the inception of many large-scale drainage and irrigation works. Another notable achievement on which we cannot place too much emphasis is the introduction and expansion of a potable water supply, both in the rural areas and in Georgetown. In Georgetown we have seen a magnificent sewerage system which, I think, is the admiration of all our neighbours. We have also seen what I may call the recapture of the interior which was in danger of slipping off to Brazil—this by the initiation and development of our own very successful internal air transport services; and last but not least, we have seen the complete eradication of that scourge, malaria, and the part which has been played by the last two Administrations in all this has been most remarkable. The vision and initiative shown in the initial stage of the Ten-year Development Plan is, in itself, a magnificent achievement. About this Ten-year Plan I did make some comments in the Budget Statement of 1953; I was then Financial Secretary.

[The President]

I do not wish to weary hon. Members, but I would like to remind this Council briefly of what I then said: I quote:—

" . . . It is difficult, I know, for the Council and the general public to appreciate that in the six years from 1947 to 1952, quite apart from normal budgetary appropriations for the public services, there will have been expended a total of some \$21.3 million on 129 schemes and projects included in or added to the original Development Plan. Of this sum, about \$5.1 million will have been drawn from our own surplus revenue balances, \$8.0 million from appropriations for approved schemes under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act and \$8.2 million met from loan funds. . . ."

It is difficult to exaggerate the tremendous stimulus which was afforded this Colony by that expenditure and from that Plan. At the same time, private investment was proceeding intensively and the people themselves, during this period, rose to the occasion. Their better health, their better morale and their greater energy are quite obvious. There has been a rise in the use of agricultural machinery, for example. Consequently, I maintain that we have nothing to be ashamed of. We in British Guiana have a great deal to be proud of, in that we have overcome so many of the physical difficulties which are attendant on our geographical situation and conditions in this country. I look upon the eradication of malaria which was started during the last two Administrations as perhaps our greatest success. The fact that our population has at last started to increase naturally is something which I had never conceived possible when I first joined the Public Service. The effect in that rise in population is seen in the fact that some 38 per cent. of our population are now under 15 years of age—a very remarkable thing. It is true that this circumstance has given rise to a very great problem indeed—

the problem of schools. This is one problem which we *have* to solve promptly, because education is absolutely essential to development. In fact, it is the foundation of development. I shall not deal in detail with that particular subject now, but I feel it is the one thing which must not only go hand in hand with but should actually precede economic development.

These are two other legacies which have been bequeathed by the last Administration to the present one, but they are of a different character. One is the promise of the report of the International Bank. The last Administration took courage to invite a Mission from that Bank to this Colony, and it was supported in doing so by His Majesty's Government. The fact is that the Mission came and investigated and is now in the course of completing its report which would be the blueprint of our development—and not only for our development, but for the whole of our fiscal and administrative policies. That is why I consider it to be a great legacy indeed. Another one is the statistical material which has been prepared for the World Bank Mission. I have had the privilege of seeing a summary of these statistics which has now been got ready by Mr. Percival Development and Welfare, and I am sure that this particular document which would be styled "The Economic Accounts of British Guiana for the years 1940-51", coupled with the Mission's report, would be a valuable economic guide to the new Administration. I have said that I have seen the advance report, and I am going to venture to give a very short outline of a few of the surprising facts that have emerged from this highly technical and complex document. In the first place, it proves or establishes that the national income of this country rose between the years 1942 and 1951 from \$49.6 million to \$135.9 million. Those are

[The President]

absolute figures, but reducing them to an average price level—because it is unfair to take the price level of 1942 against 1951—on reducing them to that average we find that the increase is from \$94,000,000 in 1942 to \$136,000,000 in 1951; that is to say, an increase of about 50 per cent. That is a very satisfactory rise, but there is one other important feature which this statistical report demonstrates and that is, a good deal of the rise was generated by the large inflow of capital from abroad during this period. I will touch upon that a little later. The next important factor is also surprising. The statistics establish that out of a total capital wealth in this country of about \$640,000,000 non-residents own something in the vicinity of \$200,000,000. Now, these figures are taken from estimates of the assets in this country, the statisticians having gone to the trouble to value the whole of the physical assets we have, including improvements to land in use.

I have said that the total capital wealth of this country is about \$640,000,000 and that non-residents own \$200,000,000 or something like one-third—33½ per cent—but the share of the national income which is appropriated by non-residents after payment of income tax is only 6 per cent. That is a definitely low figure. Other deductions seem to be similar and investments financed by non-residents appear to be something like 10 per cent. of our Colony's expenditure. In 1951 the net capital inflow from non-residents to finance investments was something like 60 per cent of the total investments during the whole period. Another important conclusion is that the cost of Government — the Central Government and the local administrations—is something like 20 per cent of our national income. Now, that figure is not as

high as in some other countries, but it is reasonably high and I mention it because some people think it is possible to take more of the money from our national income and use it up for administrative purposes. We cannot go much higher on the basis of that figure.

Mr. Macnie: To a point of clarification: Are the figures you are giving, Sir, official, or have they been worked out by you personally?

The President: They are from a summary of figures which have been collected for the International Bank and I hope they will be printed. I did say I have seen an advance copy of the summary, and I was trying to draw some deductions from them. Hon. Members will notice that there are some figures in today's *Daily Chronicle* which give us some other conclusions.

The last important matter to which I desire to refer is the fact that the Colony's population is now increasing at the rate of 3 per cent., per annum, so that in order to maintain our present living standards our national income must rise at approximately the same rate—on the basis of 1951 prices, at something like \$4,000,000 per annum. In order to do that we must have an annual capital investment in this country of something like \$20,000,000. I do not mean capital expended by the Government, I mean capital invested by Government and by private interests as well. Therefore, the serious situation which we have is that in order to maintain our living standards—in order to improve them and in order to provide room for our population—we must have new capital coming into this country. That is really the theme of what I am trying to say in wearying you with all these figures. The obvious policy of Government should be to do everything

[The President]

in its power to attract new capital, to encourage new investments and to maintain all the investments we have. I am saying this with a due sense of my responsibility—that unless this is done we cannot maintain our present living standards, much less improve them. I am very glad to have read assurances by our present Ministers that everything will be done to secure further capital investments in this country. I have perhaps been painting a somewhat sombre picture of these matters, but if that is so it was quite unintentional.

When I closed my Budget address in December, 1952, I said that the old Legislature would bequeath to the new, among other things, an abiding faith in this country. I was, although perhaps the members around the table did not realize it, saying a personal farewell. I was also saying that I myself had an abiding faith in this country, and I continue to have it. I feel that there is a very bright future for British Guiana if we choose the right way and go about things correctly. A previous Governor under whom I served used to talk frequently about "turning the corner". He was often criticized for that phrase and jibed at, because whenever we turned one bad corner another one appeared just ahead. I feel that at the present time, however, if we are not at a bad corner we are certainly at the cross-roads and we must make sure that we select the right road on which to travel. There is, undoubtedly, a tremendous interest in British Guiana at the present time. Never before, I suppose, have there been so many experts, engineers, geologists and what not treading around our interior, and recent mineral discoveries have heightened interest in this country abroad. Our agricultural possibilities also are beginning to attract attention outside of this Colony, so I say that there is a bright future in store. There are cross-roads,

but we must choose the right road and act with wisdom and with prudence. If we do these things I am perfectly sure that British Guiana would progress rapidly and that the prosperity of its people would be assured.

**Mr. Raatgever :** Sir, I have listened with great interest to your very interesting and valuable speech which has covered every aspect of the Colony's progress in recent years, in which progress you, Sir, played a very great part. I will now attempt to elaborate, if I may, on the agricultural development of the Colony in recent years. I have prepared some facts and figures which, with your permission, I will read.

"The improved standards of living and the reasonably sound financial and economic position of British Guiana today are due largely to the strenuous efforts of the previous Administration, and as a former member of the Legislative and Executive Councils, I crave the indulgence of the Council to refer to some outstanding achievements.

"The sugar industry, generally acknowledged as the backbone of the Colony's economy, has been rehabilitated and under the stimulus of increased prices and a guaranteed market affording stability to thousands of workers, production in 1952 reached the record figure of 242,692 tons with exports of 234,185 tons valued at \$41,939,255—a peak in the country's history.

"Perhaps I may be allowed to review the history of these negotiations. In 1948 the United Kingdom Government had undertaken to purchase all exportable Commonwealth sugar from 1948 to 1952 inclusive. In 1949, however, negotiations for a long term sugar Agreement began between representatives of the U.K. Government and of the Commonwealth sugar producers and the Agreement which was finally signed at the end of 1951 covered the period from 1950 to 1959 with provision for annual extension. The Agreement is designed to encourage a high and stable level of Commonwealth sugar exports in order to establish secure conditions for the sugar exporting industries of the Commonwealth

[Mr. Raatgever]

or more precisely, to the words of the Agreement — "to develop the production of sugar in the Commonwealth countries and the orderly marketing of that sugar." During the negotiations it was assumed that the internal consumption of the United Kingdom without rationing would be at the rate of 2,550,000 tons a year and that Canada would continue to import 550,000 tons of Commonwealth sugar annually. Under the Agreement Her Majesty's Government undertook to purchase 1,568,000 tons plus 75,000 tons for the Government of New Zealand until the end of 1958, at negotiated prices. The West Indies and British Guiana share of this quota was 670,000 tons. The Commonwealth countries participating in the Agreement were to plan for the present for aggregate exports not exceeding 2,375,000 tons a year, the West Indies and British Guiana quota being 900,000 tons, this Colony's share being 225,000 tons—about  $\frac{2}{3}$  of which would be purchased at the guaranteed price. The difference between the total production which Commonwealth countries were to plan for and the total amount which the U.K. Government undertook to buy at annually negotiated prices was expected to find a market either in the U.K. or in Canada at current market prices plus preference.

"This country was represented at the conferences in London in 1950 and 1951 when agreement was reached which ensured the stability of the industry in the years to come. At the time the Caribbean delegation left these shores in 1950 the prospects seemed gloomy but as a result of 10 weeks of strenuous negotiation a basis of agreement was reached which gives the sugar industry that reasonable stability to which all colonial industries aspire. Too much emphasis cannot be placed on the successful outcome of the talks in London because under present conditions and in the foreseeable future, sugar is, and will remain, the sheet anchor of the country's economy—and this economy we all agree is the only recognised foundation for political advancement. The long-term Agreement for the United Kingdom to purchase the greater portion of the sugar we produce affords security to thousands of Guianese workers engaged in this industry because of the stipulation that a

portion of any increase in price must be passed on to the workers.

"Although sugar production figures give great cause for satisfaction, the increase in rice production and the benefits which have accrued to producers are even more gratifying. Whereas in 1939 there were 60,810 acres under rice cultivation with an approximate value of crop in terms of milled rice of \$1,736,000, at the end of the war in 1945 the acreage had increased to 79,214 acres with an approximate crop value of \$4,264,000.

"In order to get a true picture of the expansion of the rice industry the latest figures for 1952 must be taken into account. The acreage planted in the autumn of 1952 totalled 133,301—an increase of 119 per cent over 1939—and the approximate value of the crop in terms of milled rice was \$11,718,000, representing an increase of 575 per cent over 1939. Again the higher price obtained reflects very favourably, for the average value per bag of rice rose from \$3.00 in 1939 to \$13.82 in 1952. It is gratifying to note that a certain part of the financial returns from our increased rice production has been steered into capital improvement.

"The Rice Marketing Board has made available to rice producers, machinery and equipment on easy hire purchase terms, from machinery imported from abroad on the Board's account, in addition to guaranteeing purchases of machinery from local firms by other rice producers and also making available on hire its own tractors for clearing lands from allowing for the acknowledged drop in the value of money. These figures illustrate more clearly than any words can the monetary benefits which producers of the country received in recent years as a result of the efforts of the previous Administration to improve the lot of the working man so far as it lay in their power.

Nor must we forget that the United Kingdom assisted in the development of the Colony with free grants and interest free loans. Much of the money was used in schemes for irrigating and draining lands, thus making available thousands of acres for the cultivation of food-stuffs.

"With the help of this money the acreage under rice cultivation alone increased to 133,301, and will be further increased in the years to come.

[Mr. Raatgever]

"It is obvious that this Colony has not stood still in the post-war period but rather, by hard work and consistent effort, the level of production has been raised to the benefit of the Colony in general and the producers in particular.

"Sugar and rice are the main agricultural industries of the Colony and as such they deserve, and have been given special mention. In passing, however, I would like to point out that other local producers have received sympathetic consideration by the previous Government during the war and since. Guaranteed prices have been maintained and efforts made to stabilize production. Farmers and workers on the whole have benefited substantially and today enjoy security such as never existed before. It is no exaggeration to say that the whole picture in regard to production and producers has altered basically in favour of the producers in recent years.

Now, hon. Members, those are facts and figures which I have obtained from documents in my possession, as I was this Colony's delegate to many of the Conferences held in the United Kingdom, and elsewhere, and I am, as you know, this Colony's representative on the Regional Economic Committee where my fellow-members did me the honour of electing me to the Executive Committee of that Organization. The Regional Economic Committee speaks economically for the entire West Indies, British Honduras and this Colony and, I am not only on the Executive Committee but I have also had the honour of being put on every delegation that has left these shores for the United Kingdom or Canada to interest Her Majesty's Government in the development of this Colony and the West Indies as a whole. I would like to say here that the Ministers of Her Majesty's Government have never turned a deaf ear to the requests made by those delegations. There may have been times when they attempted to make us get disgusted and return home, but the members stuck it out. We spent ten weeks on one occasion and

it resulted in the favourable negotiation in which this Colony shared to a very large extent and—if I may say so—a larger extent than most of the West Indian territories.

Enough of the past. Let us look forward to the future with confidence and hope. Confidence in our ability to build on the sound foundation laid by our predecessors, and hope, that, with God's Blessing, we and our fellow countrymen will by united effort, hard work and perseverance make this dear land of ours the Magnificent Province it should be — the Eldorado of Raleigh's dreams and a fit heritage for future generations of our people. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. Cummings : Your Honour, Your Grace and hon. Members of the State Council! I wish to begin by saying how gratified I am to have had the privilege of listening to Your Honour and the hon. Member, Mr. Raatgever. It has been said that we ought not to look back. There is much in that. We ought not to allow our vision to be clouded by backward glances, but no one can deny after listening to you gentlemen this morning that an occasional glance into the past is a guide for the future. I think it was Bacon who said that history made men wise. Your Honour has dealt so fully with the question of national income that it will be idle for me to dwell much longer on it, but I must say how gratified I am that we are all thinking along the same lines. It is useless for people to make airy promises about the re-orientation of social services without getting down to fundamentals. How are these things to be done? Will you permit me, Sir, to refer to an extract from Colonel Spencer's Report? Colonel Spencer in a review of the economic situation of the Colony — I think it was between the years 1926 and 1941;

[Mr. Cummings]

I am not certain of the period — said this:

“The taxable capacity of the Colony and its ability to maintain Social Services depend in the long run entirely upon the National Income and output. The vital necessity for slum clearance, better health service, improved education and social betterment is all too evident: the urgency of the need is, however, no criterion of the capacity of the Colony or its Government to meet and maintain it. The cause of the trouble is not individual poverty per se, but lack of productivity and the low value of the annual output per head.”

You have told us, Sir, this morning that there has been a substantial increase in that —

“Funds spent on properly conceived economic development can raise the National Income and gradually relieve the cause of poverty for time to come. Both development and welfare are necessary, but priority and proportions must be carefully weighed and consciously decided, for that limited slice of the all-too-small “cake” of National Income which the State is able to appropriate by taxation, may either be “eaten” today in the form of “Social Service”, or set aside in the form of “development” in order to increase the “cake” of tomorrow and the day after; it cannot be both ways.”

Your Honour, I feel that any attempt at a detailed programme while we are awaiting this important blueprint from the World Bank would be premature. I think that we must first look at that programme and after consideration adopt it, modify it, or reject it when the time comes, I do, however, wish at this stage to commend to this Council and the Government the early implementation of some of the schemes proposed in the Ten-Year Development programme. As Your Honour has said, some have been already implemented.

In particular I wish to commend to the consideration of this Council and the Government an increase in the staff

of the Geological Survey Department in order that maps and information can be more readily available to those abroad who are interested in mining in this Colony. It is important that some measure of priority ought to be given to this. We should have a proper office in the city for the testing or assaying of mineral samples. Much time is wasted in having to send samples of minerals and even samples with indication of oil to the U.S.A. to be tested. Interest both at home and abroad would be stimulated if we provide the Director of Geological Surveys with an adequate staff and the necessary scientific apparatus to carry on those tests.

Although emphasis is on the introduction of capital from abroad in order to increase the National Income, we must at all times remember that this is a means to an end. The end is the raising of the standard of living of the people of this country. The time has come when the various licences under which foreign companies, or all companies, operate in this Colony should have embodied in them fair wage clauses. There should be conditions as to the employment in administrative positions in all these companies of local personnel, and there should be, as in other countries, conditions for the training of suitable local persons to take up technical positions in these companies. As I have said, Your Honour, I do not propose to go into details about these things, but I feel at this stage certain of these measures which come within the scope of the finances of Government should receive consideration.

I wish to endorse very heartily Your Honour's very sound and logical views with regard to the existence of this State Council, and to associate myself with the motion as tabled, that aspect of it. There is one other thing I wish to commend to this Council, but

[Mr. Cummings]

before doing so — I speak now on the question of the relationship between Capital and Labour — I wish to say this:—and here I take a backward glance —I feel that great strides have been made in that field. I remember the days when I was a Labour Officer a joint conference between Capital and Labour was an achievement, but today it is the accepted procedure. There is a Department of the Civil Service which, to my mind, has not received the degree of commendation that it ought to have received during the past thirteen years. I refer to the Department of Labour. That Department has carried out industrial surveys. I know of the services of the Department rendered in the City of Georgetown— Inspectors and assistants visiting employers and persuading them to adopt measures which, I see, we are now trying to do by way of legislation. Much has been done by the Department by way of peaceful persuasion. Greater consideration should therefore be given to the part that Department is playing in the relationship between Labour and Capital. There is need for an increase of staff in that Department, as it does a tremendous amount of educational work. I remember in the early days Trade Union classes were conducted by the Deputy Commissioner and Inspectors and Assistants spent hours during the nights endeavouring to educate the workers in the principles of collective bargaining. Much more can be done if the Department has the sympathetic ear of the Government.

There is one aspect of the relationship between Labour and Capital that I wish also to commend to the consideration of this Council and the Government, and that is the establishment of an Industrial Court. We have

adequate legislation for collective bargaining, adequate legislation for the setting up of advisory committees, but I feel the presence of an Industrial Court, similar to that set up in England under the Industrial Courts Act of 1911, would go a long way towards establishing confidence of the workers in an independent body such as that. In England that Court is constituted by independent persons and representatives of the employers and the workers. We can well emulate that here in the interest of the Colony. In my view, Sir, as I have said before, we need not dilate on details at this stage, but I do wish to associate myself with the entire motion. The spirit of the motion reflects not only the feelings of this Council but of all right-thinking Guianese.

**The President :** May I take this opportunity to enquire about the time of adjournment. I presume we will go on at least until 12 or even later if it would suit hon. Members.

**Mr. Macnie :** With the object of resuming when ?

**The President :** With the object of resuming two hours later.

**Mr. Luckhoo :** The occasion of the first meeting of the Legislature of British Guiana under the New Constitution was an historic event, and in harmony with that occasion was the Address delivered by His Excellency the Governor. I think, Sir, it was outstanding for its excellence, for the presentation of a formula which will make for the progress and prosperity of British Guiana. It presented a realistic and comforting approach to the complexities, uncertainties and mistrust of the future. It was heartening and encouraging, and it inspired hope in the future. I quote the words His Excellency used "And tend to make this

[Mr. Luckhoo]

country a happier and more progressive partner in the British Commonwealth.”

It should be remarked upon, although one does not wish to harp upon it, that our State Council has been the subject of carping criticisms. Your Honour has, I think, admirably advocated and justified the presence of a second Chamber, and one would wish to observe that in the democracies second chambers are very much present and a part of the legislative structure. But where I feel, even though criticisms may be levelled, it is unfair and unjust, is when the State Council is regarded as a body hostile to the Representatives' House or House of Assembly. That is untrue and, I think, Sir, unfair. To the contrary—I have no doubt I speak for each and every Member of this Council—it is our desire to co-operate as far as possible and to work along with the House of Assembly as partners working towards a better Guiana. Naturally, Sir, if we do not approve of measures that are being taken, then we must necessarily express our disapproval. As one of the most bitter opponents of the Party now in power, I am prepared—and I say so with every sincerity—to give them a fair and even chance of proving my prognostications wrong. I sincerely hope I was wrong. However, if they do not measure up to expectation and their administration does not aim at the advancement of the country, they would find me as adamant as ever and at least one small voice raised in protest.

It is not possible to comment in detail on His Excellency's Address, but I would wish, however, to deal with one feature of it—Trade Unions, Workers and Employers. His Excellency, I feel, made an appeal which surely

reached the hearts of all groups. His Excellency's advice is sound and there is one phrase which is worthy of being quoted and requoted in which he summarised the position:

“If labour will give of its best and if capital will deal justly with its employees, the partnership of interests will be more apparent and the general industrial health of this country will be assured.

If I may presume to comment, this end can be achieved by joint consultation in industry. The foundation of the success of joint consultation is willingness on the part of the management to treat their employees collectively as an intelligent, reasonable and responsible force able to play their part in the more efficient performance of the work and to make their contribution to the solution of the problems of common interest which arise. Where this attitude is sincerely adopted by the management, it calls forth a corresponding spirit of interest and co-operation from the workers. The hon. Member, Mr. Cummings, has stated that it is within his memory where a joint conference was something rare but today it is an established fact which one assumes will take place in the event of any difficulty arising or problems confronting any industry. But, Sir, even though these joint consultations are based on agreements—I will make one observation, an observation which is based on experience of a limited period of 13 years in the Trade Union field—however carefully drafted agreements are they cannot provide for all eventualities, and it is left to the *bona fides* and good faith of workers and employers to meet situations which are not contemplated in agreements. That is why it is held that in preference to legislation is the getting together and establishment of good faith between workers and employers to work out difficulties which they must necessarily encounter in any industry.

[Mr. Luckhoo]

Sir, His Excellency's concern for the worker is very real. In the old days people regarded unemployment as something inevitable, but today, with the modern approach, we do not view it in the same light as if it were an Act of God. It is realized today that if correct steps are taken unemployment can be avoided. You, Sir, have just given us an informative and highly valuable presentation of a quick survey of the colony's finances with its implications. Allow me very humbly to congratulate you on it. You concluded on a note something after this style—if I remember correctly—that in order to maintain living standards we must have new capital coming into the country. I would go one step further and say that in order to have full employment it is also very necessary that we have new capital coming into the country.

Let us look at this problem, which is always very much with us, on first principles. Spending creates employment, and there are two types of spending — consumption and investment. When consumers spend money on their personal requirements and personal needs, whether it be eggs, meat or furniture, they keep other people busy producing those goods, and when people spend on investment goods they also in like manner keep other people engaged in occupation and employment. When people spend enough on consumer goods as well as investment goods then we have the first semblance of a solution of the problem of unemployment and the procuring of full employment. And it is this aspect of investment in His Excellency's Address which particularly appealed to me—capital coming into this country. Capital must be attracted to the country, and it is this particular aspect in which I join with

you in saying that I noted with pleasure the fact that the new Government has said, and we are saying, that they are prepared to encourage capital into this country.

There is another aspect of this particular problem. There is a fundamental psychological law on which we are entitled to depend with great confidence, both *a priori* from our own knowledge and the knowledge of human nature obtained from the facts of experience. I refer to the axiom or the principle that men are disposed to increase their consumption as their incomes increase, but not by as much as the increase of their incomes. As one's income increases the spending power of that individual grows, and he does spend more money, but not in proportion to the rise in his income. The result is reflected in your bank balances, whether in the Post Office Savings Bank, where we have \$16 million, or in a commercial Bank in which a savings account may be opened. The point I am making is that not only must Government aim at inducing and attracting foreign capital to come into this country for investment, but they should also encourage those who have capital in the country to invest it in local concerns. I feel that that would assist and could produce a state of affairs in which one would be able to have full employment. Unemployment is not an Act of God; it is a horrible fact which one must face, but which can be overcome. It is something which can be cured if a proper perspective were taken of it, and if reasonable means were taken to provide and to ensure employment.

Instead of decrying the work of the past Administration let us look at the opportunity which this country offers to its youth. Each of us is free to create for himself the career he chooses. There is no office in the State,

[Mr. Luckhoo]

no prize in the professional life, no achievement of scholarship which does not lie open to the assault of his talents and application. There are no barriers except those imposed by limitation of ability, by the lack of character or industry, or by the caprice of fortune. At the last meeting of this Council we paid tribute to Your Honour for the signal honour which Her Majesty the Queen has bestowed on you. We paid it, Sir, not to you as an individual but I think in the way you preferred it—to you as a Guianese. It is an example—one which should make you feel proud and not embarrass you, that a Guianese should climb to the very highest of offices, and, like yourself, Sir, fulfil with distinction the calling of those offices. No barriers are there save those imposed by limitation of ability and by lack of character or industry. The opportunities presented to the individual in this Colony, to our youths, are almost limitless. This country has an inviting present and an ambitious future. Like clay in the potter's hands so is this Colony in the hands of the new Government. Let us hope that they may fashion of it a thing of beauty—a country desirable to live in, and in which peace, prosperity, progress and contentment are shared by all. (Applause).

**Mr. Fingall :** Sir, it is with some interest that I have read and listened to the Address to be presented by this Council to His Excellency the Governor. As for myself and the Majority Party in the House of Assembly, I cannot share the belief or conviction that this Upper House, the nominated system, "must remain an essential feature of the legislative process of this country." Its Members have not been democratically chosen. Whom do they represent? The interests they ostensibly represent had votes at the polls. Why has New

Zealand disbanded her Upper House? Nomination is contrary to democracy. Furthermore, an Upper House which agrees with the Lower House is superfluous, and one which disagrees flouts the popular will. For this observation I claim no originality, but borrow an opinion from the late Harold Laski, with whom I agree on this point.

Reference has been made to the constitutional and political advancement inherent in this Constitution. I should be remiss, however, if I did not note that our new Constitution is not the be-all and end-all of democracy, for in it the trammels of the Crown Colony system still remain. There is the anomaly of three civil servants in an elected House of Assembly; they hold no mandate from the people. If they want to be politicians and take part in the deliberations of our Legislature they must forsake the protection of the Civil Service and face the polls. To whom is their responsibility? Certainly not to the masses of this country. Not content with that the almighty framers of our Constitution have thought it fit to place those individuals in the Executive Council and place at their disposal three key Ministries. What democracy? How great is the constitutional advance when the Governor retains his wide reserve powers and that of the veto? The masses of British Guiana will not rest until we can write our own Constitution, and all the power rests indisputably in the hands of the people through their elected representatives chosen on adult suffrage.

The necessity for further and sustained economic development is admitted. External capital for such development is welcome. That capital, however, must not be allowed to run riot. Reasonable profits must be permitted but at the same time Guianese workers and employers must get their just share of what they produce by way of

[Mr. Fingall]

decent wages and conditions. Let there be no discrimination against Guianese workers, and let them be employed at all levels in industry in posts for which they are suited by qualification. We need and should encourage capital, but as loyal Guianese it is our duty to see that the workers of the country as a whole get the full benefit. We must not in any case place our dependence on foreign capital exclusively. There are many sources which can and must be tapped, and bodies like the insurance companies must be encouraged to make investments locally whence they derive their money. Further, since we are building Guiana, wherever possible local investors and businessmen must be given preference.

I am looking forward to the Report of the World Bank Mission and hope that their recommendations will be such as to make available reasonable sums of money for the development plans which Government has under consideration. That self-help and community co-operation should be encouraged I readily agree, and I can assure this Council that the Majority Party, which has the confidence of the people, will be able to enlist the support of the broad masses in this respect.

His Excellency has spoken on the need for partnership between capital and labour, and this sentiment has been re-echoed in the draft Address now before this Council. In the first place this partnership must not be fostered in an air of suspicion. In the second place it must be a true partnership and not, as in the past, a domination of labour by capital—when victimization of workers was the order of the day and practice; the worker was not allowed the freedom to choose his own union and its leaders. The partnership envisaged, if it is to be real, must allow in theory and practice the worker to join a union

of his choice and to have the last word as to which of his colleagues should represent him. The worker's wage and working conditions must be a first charge on the industry in which he is employed. Production must be primarily to satisfy the national needs, and workers should be given a share in the management of industry, as happens in other parts of the world, including the United Kingdom and the countries of Eastern Europe. That, indeed, is partnership which will contribute to the prosperity of industry and the good of our country. In conclusion I wish to state that for us to acquire anything beneficial for this country will require a great amount of co-operation from all sections of the community. Only in that way can we hope to build a Guiana that would be worthy of Guianese, for ourselves and for our future generation. (Applause).

**Mr. Gajraj :** Sir, I feel certain that there is no one in this Council, or for that matter, no thinking person in British Guiana, who would query in the slightest degree the genuine interest of His Excellency the Governor in the progress and prosperity of this country of ours, and the freedom and happiness of its six peoples. We find that inherent in all the speeches which His Excellency has delivered since his advent into British Guiana, but more especially do we find that theme running through the very excellent Address which His Excellency delivered at the State opening of the Legislature, and to which we have the honour of being invited today to approve of a draft Reply.

I feel that I can say that none desires more than the Members of this State Council to remove from the people of our country the spectre of poverty and want; to make them happy and healthy; to provide them with bet-

[Mr. Gajraj]

ter homes; to equip them with a practical and useful education, and open wide the opportunities for employment and the creation of productive wealth in this country. If we do these things, as we do hope that in partnership the two Chambers of the Legislature will seek the means to provide them, then there is bound to be an improvement in the standard of living of our people. There is no question whatever that the desire to improve the standard of living of the people of this country is one which both Chambers accept, and one which I feel sure must be the ultimate aim of all parties. But, Sir, great as is our desire to see the accomplishment of all these things we, as practical people, must appreciate that they cannot all be done at one stroke. They cannot all be accomplished within one short period of time. It is for us, therefore, to go carefully into all the problems and decide after we have got the facts before us, to which we should give priority, and which could be permitted to remain behind for a little longer period.

You, Sir, I am sure would be the first to agree and perhaps to advise us that the problem is mainly financial, but in this Colony as elsewhere our problems are inter-related. For example you have mentioned the great improvement in the health of the people of this country from 1946 to the present day, due principally to the excellent results of the D.D.T. campaign which eliminated that scourge of malaria from this fair land of ours. That, however, has had two effects. One has been the severe pressure on school accommodation. We do not have to go very far to the Nicol Report to know that, because those of us who are parents or have talks with parents of children, realize the difficulty of getting accommodation in schools for all our children. In addition to that there

is the growing proportion of the population in the under 18 age group who are unable to contribute labour to the production which is necessary for the good of the community. We are faced with these things, and we have read, and I daresay we will continue to read for some time to come, of the inadequacy of the sum voted in each year for education. We learn of the hundreds and perhaps thousands of children who cannot be accommodated in our school buildings. We realize that there is insufficiency of teaching staff to give proper attention to all the children attending school, and we must bear in mind and impress upon those who have the responsibility of making decision for the Government of this country, that our children are the citizens of the future, and we cannot therefore leave them out of our plans. They must be one of our main interests.

Similarly we have before us our social services. We know that we have spent in the years past a growing percentage of our total revenue on social services, and as we continue to spend money on social services we realize all the more the growing necessity for greater expenditure. But although we have these opportunities for enlarging the scope and making more effective the work of our social services, we come back every time to that most necessary evil—money. For much as we might have a great desire to do these many essential things we must appreciate and we must realize that they cannot be done unless additional funds are provided. In His Excellency's Address to the Legislature he pointed out that it is hardly possible for us to increase revenue based on our present capital outlays, and he has made it clear—and I think it is something which we all accept, because we have heard from the hon. Mr. Fingall that the Majority Party also accepts

[Mr. Gajraj]

the proposition that the introduction of fresh capital into the country is an urgent necessity. In dealing with another subject the hon. Member (Mr. Fingall) also said that suspicion must be removed, and I do hope that not only will we hear pleas being made for the introduction of capital into this country to develop its resources, to increase its production and to eliminate unemployment, but that the action of our Government will justify the removal of any fear or any doubt or suspicion. Those are things which are intangible, and unless we so conduct ourselves as to remove every vestige of doubt, fear or suspicion we might find that our pleas and our cries might not be answered to the same extent as we hope for.

I suggested just now that in order to provide more schools and more teachers, and to expand and enlarge our social services we need more money. It is not my purpose to take from those who are responsible for it the credit for seeking the large sums of additional revenue so necessary to accelerate the development of our country and the improvement of the standard of living of our people, but I feel that as a Member of this honourable Council I should suggest to the body charged with framing our tax policy that they might consider granting freedom from income tax of such sums as are donated or spent by private individuals as well as commercial interests in support of the Colony's educational and charitable institutions. Such a concession, I feel sure, would induce a form of self-help by the community, and result in the provision of additional primary school buildings and much needed equipment for both the primary school and our Technical Institute; on which, (the Technical Institute) we have spent so much

money on the erection of that fine and lovely building and in respect of which we need a very great deal of expensive equipment. The Technical Institute provides a form of education which I hope to see playing an increasingly important part in fitting our youths for their future responsibilities.

I think that His Excellency's reference to the development which can be accomplished by self-help was most timely, and from the remarks which have been made by you, Sir, and by other hon. Members, it is clear that this Council wholeheartedly supports His Excellency in the hope he has expressed in this connection. I would like to take the memories of Members of this Council back over a considerable period of time, and to say that the spirit of self-help is not new to this Council or to the people of this Colony.

**The President :** Would the hon. Member like to continue his speech now or after the adjournment?

**Mr. Gajraj :** I think we had better adjourn now, Sir.

The President then adjourned the Council until 2 p.m.

\* \* \* \*

2 p.m.: COUNCIL RESUMED

**The President:** When we adjourned, the hon. Member, Mr. Gajraj, was addressing the Council.

**Mr. Gajraj :** When the Council adjourned I was speaking on the spirit of self-help on the part of the people of this Colony. I remember having made the statement that the spirit of self-help is not new to the people of this country, and I think I should refer back to that period in the history of the Colony—about 100 years or so ago—

[Mr Gajraj]

when those persons who had then for the first time received full freedom to move about as they wished and to participate in the affairs of the country, got together and pooled their resources and, as we know, purchased abandoned sugar plantations. They not only purchased them, but in a spirit of co-operation and self-help they worked on those estates and shared the fruits of their joint labour. These were the early pioneers who laid the foundations of our village communities of today, and they worked with a determination and with an overwhelming desire to make this country a better place for their children and their children's children. They may have had very little, if any, schooling, but they certainly had clear vision and foresight and, best of all, they had faith in this country and faith in their fellowmen. In those days a man's word was his bond—not merely a statement—and among themselves they all felt that if any man gave his word to do a particular thing it was as good as done. Because of the lack of schooling, agreements in most cases, were not reduced to writing but were regarded as solemn and binding between man and man, and they were always carried out as arranged. Unfortunately, as time went by, the people of this Colony seem to have lost faith in the honesty and integrity of their fellowmen, and I seem to feel that it is because of this lost faith that a great deal of that happy community spirit which at the time augured so well for the proper development of this country has been lost.

I should like to think that the liberty which we now enjoy of having the people of this Colony freely elected to positions of responsibility would create a revival of the faith which man had in man, because no matter how we might try and however much money we might spend, unless we can hold in ourselves re-

spect for the word of our neighbours and a genuine sincerity to carry out our pledges, then I can see nothing but a lot of turmoil in the future of this Colony. We must not forget that the mainspring of our progress is the acceptance of the word and the goodwill of others. That, I think, should be the basis on which we should consider and pore over the problems of our country, for unless we have that faith we cannot hope to bring about that degree of happiness and prosperity which is so necessary for a progressive and virile community. The spirit of self-help is the foundation of the economic independence of all people. It should lead, in my opinion, to a fuller life—a life full of activity—a life of planning and aspiring and dreaming—and finally, in making those dreams come true. Such people are those whose eyes are not glued to the hands of the clock, but who are prepared to do some little extra work—to show initiative and enterprise. Those, I humbly submit, are the people who are bound to be successful in life and who would always be the backbone of their country.

In addition to that particular aspect of self-help to which His Excellency so wisely referred, there is one other part of His Excellency's address to which I would like to call the attention of this Council, and that is in the final paragraph where he has made it clear that, in his opinion, internal harmony among the six peoples of this country is a vital necessity. I do not think it is necessary for me to delve into any details as regards this subject, for we have seen in our own lifetime what disharmony or disunity within a country can bring about. It is true that British Guiana, in the course of its history has been populated by people of various races, but I think we have reached the full realisation that this country is ours. It belongs to everyone who lives here and who makes this country his or her home, whether born here or not. But, while

[Mr. Gajraj]

we should feel interested in the cultural background and the historical associations of the various peoples who live here, the one important point we should never forget is that we are Guianese in the same sense as the divers races who inhabit the United States of America are Americans. They look upon themselves first and foremost as American citizens, and their racial origins come after. Similarly, if we want to develop this country—and I hope we will—into a strong and progressive nation, we have got to maintain this Guianese outlook and think of a Guianese nation. We want to inject into our people—and I hope the new Government will do everything possible to assist in bringing it about—a new faith—a faith in their country—a faith in its prosperity—and a great desire that we should live and work together in peace, love and harmony. We should let our love for our country transcend all other considerations, whether of race or colour or creed. Finally, let us place our hands into the hand of God and tread boldly into the future for the benefit of the people of this country of ours.

**Mr. Robertson:** Your Honour, I would like to make a few remarks with regard to this reply by the State Council to His Excellency's address. I note with interest the speeches made by the President and other Members of this Council this morning in lauding this reply which I cannot wholly endorse, especially the reference made in paragraph 2. My reason is because our politics is something new to these parts — something removed from the traditional and orthodox form of politics which those who do not believe in the laws of social evolution and refuse to move along with the trend of time will never be able to understand. It is due to the newness of our politics that so much criti-

cism was hurled at the Majority Party over recent weeks and months. I and my colleague, the hon. Mr. Fingall, represent the Majority Party in the House of Assembly and we are here, I may say, to give sincere representation to the peoples of this country. We are placed today, Sir, in a similar position to that in which the Great Master was placed 2,000 years ago. He was bringing something new to the world, but the people then did not understand it. It is for that reason—due to His love for humanity—that, while paying the supreme sacrifice. He said these words:—

“Father forgive them, they know not what they do”.

The people did not understand His policy then. We are experiencing today, Sir, the same thing all over again. We find that all kinds of criticisms are being hurled at this Party, and we have also seen during the last few weeks or so what is taking place in the Press. What is it all?—just misunderstanding—just that traditional form of understanding politics.

I would like to deal here, Sir, with the second paragraph in the reply to His Excellency's address which the President dealt with this morning. The President stated the reasons why he thought this second Chamber was useful why it is needed and why it must be here. He also stressed that this Council is not an opposition, the same thing having been stated in His Excellency's address. I can, however, see the situation in another way, and only time will tell whether this Council is an opposition or not. I remember that during the regime of the Labour Government in England—when the Labour Government was last in power—they had to reduce the power of the House of Lords and, I think, subject to abolition, it was threatened with aboli-

[Mr. Robertson]

tion. Why? It is because the Members were opposing the voice of the people through their elected representatives.

As stated in this reply, we find it stated by the framers of the Constitution—and time was taken by the President to stress this part of his speech—that:—

“The State Council or the Second Chamber must remain an essential feature in the legislative process of this country.”

In my opinion, Sir, this is very undemocratic. Such things may look quite in order in the eyes of those who can only see that way. The House of Lords came into existence because of the people. When the people began to assert their powers certain elements were determined to have a voice in the affairs of the people. That is one of the things that was responsible for the creation of that Chamber and it has been extended to many other countries, but the one thing I am against—and my party is against it—is the question of a nominated second Chamber. We are not so much against a second Chamber, but we are always asking a question on this point. While myself and the hon. Mr. Fingall can claim to be representatives of the people—being appointees of the elected representatives of this Upper Chamber—may I ask: “Whom do the other Nominated Members represent?” Until we can get a reply to this question we would not be able to understand it. As is stated here, “the second Chamber must remain an essential feature in the legislative process of this country”. Why “must”? I will say it is because this is a Colonial territory—a Colonial Legislature. I am sure that one would not find nominated elements forced on the people in Eng-

land. That has been abolished in several other parts of the world. As stated by my colleague, the hon. Mr. Fingall, it was abolished in New Zealand, among other places. Just across the border—in Surinam—we find that the people there are progressing. Why should there be a block or check against the people's interest in British Guiana? I think that our Constitution, as drafted by the Commission, contains enough checks and balances in the power of His Excellency's veto and Her Majesty's signature. Why should there be a further check in the form of a second Chamber? I may say, Sir, that when such a Constitution is forced upon Colonial peoples it is very very undemocratic. That is our opinion. When I say “our”, I am speaking for myself and my party. So much, Sir, for that paragraph.

I shall now refer to paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Address. I think that the President, this morning, gave us a clear glimpse into the financial position of this country and into conditions in certain other respects. While it all sounds well, Sir, as we can see it, we find that the wealth of which so much has been spoken is not equally distributed. One cannot say that macadamized streets or roads, or beautiful wall buildings set up in a country are necessarily an improvement of the bad living conditions of the people. We are of the people and we know the conditions under which the people are living. In other words, to use a vulgar saying, we know where the shoe pinches.

Your address this morning, Sir, was fairly good. (Laughter). In paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6 great stress has been laid on the economic progress and development in this country, and I find them very interesting. As regards paragraph 3, my party realizes and

[Mr. Robertson]

understands very clearly what are the wants of the people in this country, and the aim of the party is to increase production and eliminate poverty, hunger, malnutrition and illiteracy. We are aware, Sir, that there is only one way in which these things can be done, and that is by encouraging capital to come into the country. I note that some misapprehensions concerning our party have created a wrong impression in the outside world and you, Sir, made some reference to them this morning. Those misapprehensions were created by the Press and by a few very unscrupulous individuals in this Colony who never thought at the time of the great harm that would be done to their homeland in the eyes of the outside world. It reminds me of a story of a man who, in endeavouring to clean a bag of feathers, left them open to the wind. When he returned they were all gone. I know that recently the newspapers had been trying to recover those feathers in an editorial styled "Clearing the Air". It is my view that the air can be cleared quite easily.

One statement from His Excellency that British Guiana is or is not a Communist country and has or has not a Communist Government can clear it. We are not here to stop capital from coming into this country. I do know it was once the vogue of former legislators of this country in years gone by, in collusion—of course—with certain vested interests, to tolerate no form of competitive industries here; but we today believe in having industries of all kinds. This morning, the hon. Member, Mr. Raatgever, made the statement that sugar will always remain the backbone of this country. Sir, that is something very poor for this country—to depend on sugar as the backbone of the economy of this coun-

try—because sugar like our minerals is solely dependent on the outside market. What happens to us whenever there is a slump in world trade? We suffer. What we believe in is to have several other industries—things that can always keep the country alive. We do not want to kill sugar. We want the production of sugar to increase, but we must not be solely dependent on one industry. (Applause). Likewise we have no right to be dependent in this country on bauxite alone. When the slump in world trade came, I remember what happened to the people of Nigeria who were solely dependent on the copper mines for their existence. There was a small slump in the copper market and they starved. This Party that has today a majority in the House of Assembly will be able, I am certain—and I think I can give this Council the assurance—to bring into this country allied industries on which the people of this country could depend and which would not be dependent on the outside market.

One last remark I would like to make, and that is in respect of self-help. The hon. Member, Mr. Gajraj, touched on it just now. I think, Sir, the statement made by His Excellency is a very good one and one which, if adopted, can do a lot by way of improving the living conditions of our people. I have seen in my time of travels around the world and also in this country what self-help can do. I have read quite a lot on it and I happen to know, Sir, that it was through that system the Soviet Union and the great peoples' democracies were able so speedily to rehabilitate themselves after the last Great War, though their country was so wantonly destroyed. We know, Sir, the people will always work voluntarily as long as they know they are helping themselves. As the hon. Member, Mr. Gajraj said, the people

[Mr. Robertson]

have lost that communal spirit, but I want to think he did not go far enough. I know, they have lost that spirit, but it was the system which was introduced that caused it. We find, for example, if we go into the Interior the Aboriginal Indians there are living in a communal form. They clear the lands together, plough, plant and reap together. As soon as our system, the capitalist system, is introduced people forget that form of living and turn to work for someone else. It is exactly what the system keeps looking for—someone to work, but not for himself.

That brings me to the point which was stressed by His Excellency and also by the hon. Member, Mr. Luckhoo, this morning — co-operation between Capital and Labour. I will say, Sir, in my opinion the new thesis will have to be written. I would say, Sir, the only thing that can bring that form of co-operation is to legislate, and to get that form of legislation you must have a form of Government that is prepared to give honest and sincere representation to the people. It must not be one-sided. But as we know, Sir, the Capitalist will do everything in life to have Labour working for less than they deserve. I would like it to be understood quite clearly that I am talking about the system, because I know and I have the experience that there are good capitalists but they cannot do as they would like to due to the system under which they exist. Therefore in saying that there should be co-operation or perfect understanding between Capital and Labour, I think it would have to be a new system, because under the present system Labour only eat when they work and they can only find work when that work puts profit into someone else's pocket. Therefore I do know—it may

sound strange — that the time is not far distant when there will be that real understanding between Capital and Labour, and that day would be ushered in by the abolition of the "profits motive". That is the thing that is causing lust and greed in man's heart. With that clear understanding, then and then only would we have the desired co-operation between Capital and Labour.

I would like to make special reference, with your permission, Sir, to a paragraph in His Excellency's address where he said:

"British Guiana has been described as, 'the land of six peoples' and a most heartening feature of the recent elections was the absence of racialism. If I may quote the Constitution report I would remind you that—if the overriding loyalty is given to the community as a whole, racial distinctions, expressed in a pride in culture, tradition and history, can be a source of enrichment and strength."

I would say the People's Progressive Party has been able to achieve something in this country which no other organisation has been able to achieve, and that is, the welding together of the six people of this land into a single entity is not for a policy which anyone can doubt. That has been achieved by our constant and insistent education of the people of the country over a period of three to four years. We shall continue that education in the interest of the people of this country. We shall continue to serve the people of this country sincerely without let or hindrance, and I do hope that due to our educational policy which we shall extend to the people, this country will become a source of enrichment and strength against racial bias, which has so long kept our people divided. In closing I must say that I do hope that the people at large and cer-

[Mr. Robertson]

tain sections of this community that cannot see our plan and cannot understand it today will in time do so. The day is surely here when it will happen as in the days of ancient Rome, when after the Romans found they could not resist the forces of the Nazarenes with all their persecutions they thought it best to turn and swim with the tide. All we have to do is to look around and see that not in British Guiana alone, but the world over today, every individual is seeking to be under his own vine and fig tree. The world is moving forward. The people's right is asserting itself. The people are tired of building for others to live in, tired of planting vineyards for others to reap. This Party of mine will continue along those lines in the interest of the people of this country until we achieve the goal which we have set for ourselves—self-determination.

**His Grace the Archbishop:** Mr. President, I rise to support the motion that the hon. Member, Mr. Macnie, has proposed—that an address be presented to His Excellency in reply to his address delivered on the 30th May at the opening of the Legislature—and to endorse the terms of that address as circulated. Like the Governor, Sir, I feel the solemnity of the occasion. Under our new Constitution I feel that we stand in the midway of our political history, superior to that form of government under which we have so long lived but inferior to that full self-determination and self-government which, we hope, we shall one day attain. But I still feel, Sir, that although it may be only midway, we have with the grant of this Constitution taken the longest stride forward that it will ever be possible to take at any one time in our political progress and development; namely by the introduction of adult suffrage univer-

sally and by the appointment for the first time of responsible Ministers from the Elected House. It opens wonderful opportunities before us, and may we make the most of those opportunities! May we use them as we ought and with a due sense of our responsibility.

Sir, already much has been said in the debate today about the place and value of a Second Chamber in the Legislature. I do not wish to repeat what has already been said, but I do wish to contribute one or two remarks on that subject because I feel it necessary. There has been a good deal of misunderstanding in the Colony as a whole, and perhaps in political circles in particular, with regard to the place and functions of this State Council. As we, as hon. Members of this State Council, take up our task is it not well for us to remind ourselves what our position is, what is expected of us, and what responsibilities are placed upon our shoulders? I agree with you, Sir, that there may be a great deal of difference of opinion as regards both the constitution of the Second Chamber and the method of its appointment. I go so far as to say that the perfect formula which can be applied to every case is yet to be found. But I make bold to say that political science teaches us quite definitely the value of a bicameral legislature, the value of a second chamber in any democratic legislature in any circumstances whatsoever; and the lessons of constitutional history also point to the value of this form of constitution. What then, we may ask, is this Second Chamber to do? What is its proper place in the machinery of Government? After all we ought to be ready to give an answer to those who ask us concerning the faith that is in us—and I can hardly believe that any hon. Member of this Council would have allowed himself to be appointed if he did not have faith in the State Council and in its ability to

[His Grace the Archbishop]

make a useful contribution to the Government of this country.

We are told, if I may quote the words, "*No power effectively to oppose the will of the House of Assembly resides in the State Council.*" Certainly not, nor would it be desirable if such a power existed. Our place is described as that of performing a certain kind of function—the function of providing a check and a balance in the best interests of the country. Shall we put it this way? This Upper Chamber provides an opportunity for a second thought upon any matter of great importance and an opportunity for discussion on a different level from that which is possible in the House of Assembly, in order that all facts may be marshalled and every point of view that can be expressed shall be made available to those who are responsible for taking the decision. In "*The Life of Dr. Westcott*" there is a very telling little anecdote.—Someone who did not agree with him said "I suppose that there must be always two opinions on any question", The Doctor replied "No, my friend, not two opinions; there must be at least six, for I cannot conceive of truth being less than a cube." May it not be then that one facet of that cube may from time to time be seen and presented by a Member of this Council to the great benefit of all who are seeking the truth which is at least a cube? The purpose of this Council, Sir, can never be to curb the will of the people. As I see it, its purpose is to ensure so far as it can that the will of the people—the whole people—shall prevail. On that point I would like to make one or two observations by way of illustration as to how this Council can make the will of the people prevail.

It is true the Members of the House of Assembly are representatives

of the people duly elected by ballot. May it not be true that Members of the State Council are no less truly representative of the people although very differently selected? First of all, Sir, we are chosen by His Excellency the Governor with that intention and for that purpose—to represent the best interests of all the people in this country. Secondly, Sir, we ourselves are ordinary citizens. All of us are charged, I am sure, with a great faith in this country and a great love for it. His late Majesty King George V was proud to describe himself as an ordinary man, and we ought not to be at least as proud to describe ourselves as ordinary men? Just as the man in the street or the woman in the market-place can truly be a representative of the people, so we, if we maintain our status as ordinary people, and if we are faithful to our trust, can indeed in a very real sense still be representatives of the people, though not in the same sense as the Members of the Lower House. Our duty is to keep the balance.

Members of an Elected House—and I speak, Sir, not of our present House of Assembly but hypothetically of any Elected House—are returned by the will of the people, but they do not inevitably keep the confidence of the people. If they did democratic governments would never fall, as we see them falling in different countries every day. There are great pressures put upon Members of any Elected House, pressures from without and from within. We see over and over again Members of an Elected House becoming virtually an oligarchy. That is more likely to happen when there is strong party discipline and strong party laws enforced so that the individual point of view can hardly be expressed. This Council, Sir, is to keep the balance; but not to put itself in the way of what the House of Assembly wants to do. May we never merely ob-

[His Grace the Archbishop] struct, but try to represent the point of view, as we see it, of the whole of the people and in the best interests of the country. As friends we sit behind those upon whom rests the responsibility of the Government in order to give them the very best counsel of which we are capable.

Then again it is necessary in the process of democratic government that all sections of a community should be adequately represented. Although the system by which Members are elected by ballot is the fairest yet devised, no one can claim that it is perfect, and there are many people in the most democratic countries in the world belonging to small but often important minorities which are never directly represented through the polls. There are others who have the misfortune to be living in the wrong constituency and can never be represented politically, because they will always be out-voted in that particular constituency. There are small groups—sometimes important groups from the point of view of the national economy—who again can never be represented because they are not sufficiently numerous ever to command a majority in an open election. Then again there are persons who possess specialized knowledge and experience, to which reference has already been made today, whose knowledge and experience should be of service to the Government and the country, but who might never find a place in a wholly elected House, so that their invaluable contribution might thus be lost if they could not be appointed by nomination.

I agree that there are many ways of electing or appointing a second Chamber. I do not claim that the present method devised by the Constitution is perfect. At least I submit—and here I have the whole of political science

behind me—that a second Chamber is in itself an essential part of the democratic set-up, an essential part of the representative Government of the people in any modern country. What then is our duty in approaching matters which will come before us either through our own initiative, or referred to us by the Lower House? Surely it is our duty to debate those matters at the highest possible level dispassionately, (and I almost said academically); certainly on the basis of principle rather than from the point of view of expediency. Members of the House of Assembly are inevitably placed in a restricted position from which they cannot escape. First of all, through the daily process of Government and Administration the pressure of work upon the Members of the Lower House is likely to become such that they cannot possibly, however much they may wish to do so, give to every subject the amount of research, study and attention they would wish. Can we not then in this Council, where the pressure is not so great, deem it our duty to undertake that study and research—to give the Lower House the benefit of our findings and conclusions in order that they may have them in their minds when forming their own policy?

The State Council is not superior to the House of Assembly because it is called the Upper House. There may be some misunderstanding even about that. It is not superior but necessary, invaluable and, I believe, complementary. If we go about things the right way and the House of Assembly and the State Council try to work together for the good of this country I believe it will be for both the present and future benefit of British Guiana. In the realm of law the jurist has his place as much as the practising barrister. One deals with the principles of jurisprudence on which the whole system of law depends. The other applies those principles to the daily prac-

[His Grace the Archbishop]

tice of the Courts. Neither is superior to the other; each is necessary to the other. In fact they are complementary in the process of law. Similarly I suggest that the functions of the House of Assembly and those of the State Council are complimentary, and both are necessary and proper in the process of democratic government.

All I say about those who wish to abolish the second Chamber is that I cannot imagine that they are quite so progressive as they think. There was a great deal of talk about the abolition of the second Chamber in England somewhere about 1911, and at that time with very good reason; but political science today is reverting to the earlier view. Its more considered judgment is very different from that of 1911; and I make bold to say that anyone, including the late Professor Laski (if I may say so without irreverence!), who thinks of abolishing the second Chamber is living in the wrong half of the century.

Quite apart from the theory of bicameral government and the importance of the second Chamber which I have tried to illustrate very simply by one or two examples of what it can do, we have to be realistic. We are faced with the fact of the Constitution as it has been granted to us. Perhaps if all the people in this country, numbering tens of thousands, had been asked to frame a Constitution there might have been as many Constitutions drawn as there are units of the population. Years ago, my fellow students and I had the drafting of Constitutions as a subject at the University, and we spent many interesting hours drawing up what were supposed to be model Constitutions. It is quite a good game to play, —exceedingly interesting; but it does not lead to any good conclusions, because no two people ever agree on those con-

clusions. We have been granted a new Constitution. We all hope for something better for the future. But this is our present Constitution, and therefore it seems to me idle for us to waste our time criticising it now. It is far better, surely, that we should make it work; make up our minds that it *must* work, (for even the worst system can be made to work if there is enough goodwill but even the best system can be ruined if there is lack of goodwill) and so show ourselves, to be responsible people to whom greater privileges and a greater measure of independence may one day be granted.

The Constitution cannot work if the State Council operates merely as an echo of the House of Assembly, and I think it was the same Professor Laski who remarked that if the Upper House merely echoes the opinions of the Lower House it serves no useful purpose. It is a waste of time to come here merely to echo what is said in the House of Assembly. Similarly the Constitution cannot work if the State Council permits itself to become in any sense a second Opposition. The Opposition is, of course, an integral part of democratic government. We see that demonstrated, perhaps more clearly in the English Constitution than elsewhere. Her Majesty's Government and Her Majesty's loyal Opposition do not just look upon one another across the House, but by their interplay they carry on the Government for the benefit of all. It was rather wittily said by someone that "the interplay between the Government and the Opposition is an exercise which keeps the whole body politic in good health". At any rate an Opposition is necessary and essential, and the stronger the Opposition the better government a country always has. It is the duty of the Minority Party in any House to put up the strongest and most intelligent and persistent opposi-

[His Grace the Archbishop] tion of which it is capable; and the Government, if it is a true Government, is all the more thankful for its effectiveness. But this Council cannot be a second Opposition. If we, hon. Members, come here to answer points which have been raised in the House of Assembly, but which we are not asked to answer, we shall be prostituting our whole position. We are not and cannot and must not be, or allow ourselves to become in any sense, an Official Opposition.

What then is left? Professor Laski says "nothing"; I say "much." There are times when we shall have to caution against undue haste in the Lower House by slowing down certain processes of legislation. There may be times when we shall have to disagree with and reject measures brought before us, and there may be many more times (and I hope there will be) when we can heartily endorse what comes up from the Lower House. But at all times surely we can give to all matters brought before us that degree of study which they deserve, and try to discuss them and debate them on the highest possible plane. If we can work in that spirit of co-operation and friendship with the House of Assembly, no matter what difficulties there may be in the present Constitution we can make it work and work for the good of all. That, Sir, is what I hope all hon. Members of this Council have set themselves to do.

I will touch, with your permission, Sir, on two other points rather more briefly. Much has been said already on the subject of self-help. I would like to add a word to that. I would like to stress two aspects of the principle of self-help—one the financial aspect and the other the moral aspect. The financial aspect is obvious enough. There is not enough money to go round for all that needs to be done, but there are

many good things that the Government could do with some degree of self-help. But I am more interested in the moral aspect of self-help. When a community begins to help itself it stiffens its whole moral fibre. I was once Head of a school and we were looking forward to having new buildings because the ones we occupied were falling down about our heads. Then one of those slumps came to which my hon. friend on my left referred a few moments ago. There was no money in the Colony, but the boys of that school set to work to build the new school themselves. They built it in their own time, and they did so well knowing that not one of them would be there to enjoy the comforts of the new building. It took nine years to build the school and those boys who built and left before the work was done, did so in the finest spirit of self-sacrifice and self-help.

I once had the privilege to be on a visit to one of the great Paramount Chiefs in the Akim District of the Gold Coast at the time when the District Commissioner came and put before him certain proposals for the improvement of his country. The District Commissioner said to the Chief: "You know that many of your people are sick because of malaria caused by the swamps. The Government has voted money to drain the swamps so that the people can enjoy better health, and I have come to ask your permission to carry out the work." The great Chief asked the District Commissioner to return in a week's time; and in a week's time I was there to hear his answer, which was this: "I know that my people are sick and I want their sickness to be removed. I know it can only be removed if the swamps are drained. I know it will cost a lot of money. But if I allow the Government to drain these swamps for me I and my people would be beholden to the Government. We would be putting ourselves in

[His Grace the Archbishop]

the position of dependents on the Government. That is not our way of thinking. Tell us how much it will cost. We will give free labour and tax ourselves. We will do the work under the supervision of the Government engineers." So the work was done. People with a spirit like that can go anywhere. Of such a temper are the people who make the great nations of the world. I know well enough that there are some who would scorn such an attitude, who would dismiss any admiration for the Chief's action as foolishness. To those who would ardently believe in the Welfare State such a policy must be the basest heresy. But to me it was grand. And I repeat that of such stuff the greatest nations are fashioned.

We have already heard of examples of self-help in this country, and I know many of them too. I only hope they will increase. I want to see self-help in all forms and engendering of a great pioneering spirit. I want to see some of our young men, instead of loitering about on the streets of the City, going out to face hardship and danger, and doing for themselves as the pioneers have done in Australia and other well-known countries in the world which awaited development. I want to see that spirit, and I am thankful that His Excellency in his Address has laid stress upon it. I want also to make an appeal in this Council this afternoon, and from this Council to all voluntary workers in the Colony. I have been very distressed—and no doubt other hon. Members of this Council have been very distressed—to hear in certain quarters that there are voluntary workers in this Colony who have chosen this critical time to say they will now give up the voluntary work they have been doing, some of them for years. There has been a noticeable slacking off in the ranks

of voluntary workers, for one reason or another. I do know that the number of voluntary workers who have given valuable service to the community are at present not so energetic about it as they were up to a few weeks ago. Surely, there never was a time when the public-spiritedness of these people was more necessary, and I do hope that they will move forward again full of confidence in the future. We want this particular kind of self-help especially—voluntary workers to serve the young and the aged and for many kinds of public service—and I hope that as many people who can afford to come forward would do so. It would be a magnificent thing for this country if we could have more Club Leaders, more Scout Masters and, more Guide Captains—more people who would give of their time to help to establish the social services and serve the youth of the nation.

Finally, Sir, I would like to stress the point that the wealth of this country, as in any other country, is its people. It is very easy to talk about the great mineral resources of British Guiana. No doubt, they are great—and I hope they will be found to be even greater than we imagine. It is all very well to make plans for the development of agriculture—I hope these plans will come to rich and early fruition. It is all very well to talk about political and economic development—and may we continue to develop in both of those vital directions. But I submit that no development is possible unless you have the right kind of people to bring it about. You cannot get increased production unless you have the right kind of people to produce; you cannot get increased or accelerated development unless you have people with the right spirit to carry out that development. This Constitution or any other Constitution, can make no political or economic progress whatever

[His Grace the Archbishop]

unless you have the right kind of people to operate it. It is the people who are the life of the country. The future of British Guiana or of any other country depends upon the kind of people to be found in it. Therefore, as we look forward to this brighter future which we all believe to be coming to our land and for which we all fervently hope and pray, let us see to it that there is a real moral re-armament among our people. If we are going to have devils it is far better to have stupid devils; and if we are going to have clever people we do not want devils, we want clever people of character. The emphasis today is upon character—upon reliable dealing between one man and another. Mr. Gajraj has reminded us that there was a time when a man's word was his bond, and we still need that spirit among us today. These are the qualities which, at this time, we ought to stress and which we must stress. We also need a great deal more education — better education—in this Colony.

I hope the time will come when opportunity will be given to this House to address itself to that subject and, perhaps, to put the last nails in the coffin of that miserable and defeatist Nicol Report which has been in circulation already far too long. What we need is improved and better education, including schools that we must insist upon equal opportunities for all boys and girls in our community. We must have the right sort of education. We must have the right moral and spiritual emphasis in education. As we enter upon our task I have been trying to find some appropriate words that would act as an inspiration to me myself and to the other hon. Members of this Council as we undertake our new responsibility. May I have your permission, Sir, to quote a short

paragraph from a "Statement on Education" published by the British Guiana Christian Social Council, which is as follows:

"Political or economic systems, whether based upon intellectual theory or humanitarian practice, have failed in the past and we feel assured will fail in the future to secure a way of life consistent with human happiness and progress unless a new recognition of the brotherhood of man springs not from devotion to any political or economic theory, but from a prior recognition of the Fatherhood of God. It is upon belief in this basic truth that we wish to see the social fabric of the community planned and built."

I could not find better words to sum up what I want to urge upon this House today. Before I sit down, Sir, I ask you to convey the gratitude of this Council to His Excellency for the inspiring lead he has given us. I feel that what His Excellency has said has been amply demonstrated in his own actions ever since he came here. I also wish to endorse very heartily the terms of the motion which the hon. Member, Mr. Macnie, has proposed and which is now before the House.

**Mr. Macnie:** If ever there has been a demonstration of the disadvantages of having to speak last it has been given today, even moreso when I have to follow the brilliance and dignity of the hon. Member His Grace the Archbishop who has just taken his seat. In all sincerity, however, I feel that the motion which I have had the honour to move this morning has provided occasion for a most valuable debate during which we have had some valuable contributions from Members of this State Council. I feel sure I am right in saying that the main note has been honesty and sincerity of purpose in the service we have undertaken in this Council. I shall never fail to take opportunity whenever I speak on these matters to let it be known that I do so as a true "mudhead" Guianese. I am a countryman and I have the full confidence in the people of this

[Mr. Macnie]

Colony, and I am proud that I belong to this Colony. There are times when, naturally, Members of the Legislature and other bodies refer to me as one associated with a particular industry—the sugar industry which has been described as the mainstay of the people of this Colony. On the rare occasions when I speak for that industry I am always very conscious of my responsibilities.

I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the words used by the Hon. Member, Mr. Robertson, with respect to the sugar industry and the question of unemployment. Let me assure him that those responsible for the sugar industry are feeling the burden of over-population in certain areas very greatly and that they are most anxious to encourage the development of other industries, because it would be a sorry state of affairs if the burden of finding employment for too large a section of the community should devolve on the sugar industry. I entirely agree with the Hon. Mr. Robertson that we should not have all our eggs in one basket. I have great hope in the rice industry. It was most encouraging to hear of the progress of the rice industry, as given by the Hon. Mr. Raatgever during this morning session. The rice industry is very very important to the economy of this Colony but still more important to the neighbouring Colonies and the world as a whole, in that rice still remains the highest priority of the grain requirements of the world. I think I am correct in saying that. Therefore, anything which I can do in my capacity as a Member of this Council to foster the rice industry I will be only too glad to have the honour to do it. I hope also that other agricultural industries would be developed. I do not know how many times investigations have not been carried out regarding the possibility of bananas and other products and an ex-

periment in respect of jute is now being investigated.

With respect to the interior, one is encouraged by the report of the discovery of new minerals. I have served in the interior during my service in this Colony and I am glad to see that it is vastly improved from what it was when I served there some 26 years ago. Then we did not have the aeroplane and other improved communications that we have today. While we hope for wealth from the interior and for the development of wealth which we believe is there, it is on the coastland and on our agriculture that the welfare of the people and their very existence depends in the meantime. Therefore, I hope, it would be possible to develop agricultural industries on the coastland, whether it be rice or anything else. I heartily agree that we should have our eggs in more than one basket.

Sir, I would refer to the remarks in His Excellency's Address at paragraph 8, relative to the need for the development of a spirit of good partnership between Capital and Labour. It has been touched on by the hon. Member on my left (Mr Luckhoo) and, I think, by the hon. Member, Mr. Cummings. I would like to say this: There is evidence before the people of this Colony of the desire of Capital to work with the Government of this country, a Government elected by the people of this country. There is evidence which was furnished within a few days of the recent election—on the 27th April—when the Chairman in London of Messrs. Booker Bros. Mc Connell & Co. Ltd., Mr. Campbell said this:

“British Guiana is at the cross-roads. As in the past, so in the future, it would be the policy of this Company in British Guiana to work constructively and with goodwill with the Government of the Colony for the interest of the people.”

Those words were cabled to this country and published three days after

[Mr. Macnie]

the day of polling and immediately after the declaration of the results of the polls and the success of the People's Progressive Party, the present Majority Party of the House of Assembly. I suggest that those words, uttered spontaneously as they were then, are ample assurance of the attitude of that section of Capital. Right here on the first of May we find these words published in this Colony as coming from the head of the largest section of that very important industry, the bauxite industry, in the person of Mr. Echols, the Managing Director of the Demerara Bauxite Company, Ltd.—with your permission, Sir, I quote:

"We feel that they are going to be all right, as we know there are good, sound people in the People's Progressive Party who are interested in seeing British Guiana prosper. Those people are out to raise the living standard of the workers, but the only way that can be accomplished is to create more employment, and in order to do so the Government must encourage those industries already established to expand their activities and to add more capital."

To those assurances which I have quoted I will add this: I myself—it is my personal knowledge that others in what may be called the employer category too—have assured the Elected Ministers of Government individually of our desire to co-operate with them and to assist them in every way possible in measures intended for the good of the people of this country. Naturally one does not need to add the word "sound" to "measures". Therefore, Sir, I was a little concerned—and I hope my concern would be removed at a later stage in the form of a discussion—when the hon. Member, Mr. Robertson, suggested that co-operation between Capital and Labour can only be achieved by legislation. I think I have noted correctly what the hon. Member said. To me the thought of legislation, hav-

ing regard to the fact that there are two parties to co-operate with each other—is necessary for them to co-operate—is absolutely appalling, especially in British Guiana where we have, as the hon. Member on my right (Mr. Gajraj) has said, six peoples living so many years in amity and co-operation. Despite what others may think, there has been co-operation between all categories, — races or anything else. Therefore, to say that co-operation can only be achieved by legislation is to me quite appalling and a bad sign.

I am sorry to continue but I must reply to some of the points made. The hon. Member, Mr. Robertson, went on to suggest that it is only by the abolition of the profits motive would the aims of Government, led by the Party to which he belongs, be achieved.

**Mr. Robertson:** To a point of correction! Not by the Party, but when the day comes which is not too far distant, then we shall achieve its abolition.

**Mr. Macnie:** I am glad the hon. Member has replied because, Sir, I submit with absolute confidence that if we remove the profit motive every man in this country would become a dolt and worse than a sloth. Those of us who had the privilege of seeing a sloth in action knows that it moves slowly and hardly at all. The hon. Member's closing words contradict the idea because he said they look forward to the day when a man would reap the fruits of his labour. What does a man in the country plant potatoes or bananas or rice or anything else on his land for? He does so in order to obtain profit from his labour. It is that motive—the hope of profit—that encourages him to work and encourages him to work hard. If you remove that motive, I submit, we would all become dolts.

[Mr. Macnie]

I cannot understand the idea, and I hope it is not seriously meant, that the idea of profit should be removed. The man who obtains a prospecting licence, buys rations and goes into the interior to look for gold or diamonds—if he does not hope to make profit, what is the good of his going there? The hon. Member on my right (Mr. Gajraj) has reminded me of the old saying "The hope of reward sweetens labour."

During your very excellent speech, Sir, in seconding this motion, a speech which I feel sure all hon. Members of this Council are grateful for in view of its clarity and the valuable information it contained, you referred to a Governor who frequently remarked about "turning the corner". There is something to be said for these corners, and I suggest that there is an analogy to be found in the rivers of this Colony, of which we have many, but none of them runs straight for very long. Those who have travelled up or down our rivers know that they have bends; and those who have travelled in the "bush" know that distance there is measured by points. Boat captains speak of "one long point and two short points." I feel that this Colony is rounding the point; but there are other points ahead and we must progress in an orderly manner, and up river, because it is better to travel towards the goal against the current of the river than to be carried out on the tide into the ocean.

I would like to refer to some of the difficulties we will meet. One of the great problems of this country has been touched on in this debate. Reference has been made to the increase in our population, with special reference to children of school age. It is an ac-

cruing or repeating problem. In spite of what the critics of the last Administration may say; it is a natural growth of the population as the result of improved health conditions largely due to the practical elimination of the malaria mosquito through the D.D.T. campaign. It is also due, in my opinion, to something which is often forgotten — the vastly improved water supply in the rural areas. I have always wanted an opportunity to pay tribute to those who had the foresight to embark upon the pure water supply schemes as the result of which there is practically no section of our sparsely populated coastlands along which one can drive or walk, where one cannot stop and get from a tap a drink of absolutely pure water. I think that the importance of that to the health of the community has been overlooked on account of the fact that some people's memory is short. If some people would throw their minds back to what used to happen on the coastlands when people had to travel miles to get water, and when such water as they got was hardly fit for animals, I think we should always remember that that difference has contributed greatly to the improved health of the people, and I hope that the new Government will press on with it and improve that system of water distribution. As one who has lived and served in the country I am very confident of the improvement of our drinking water supply.

With the increase in population there is added need for additional avenues of employment. That I hope is the direction in which the new Government will apply themselves especially, with the assistance of the World Bank Mission's Report which I gather and hope will soon be released. The importance of new avenues of employment for the people, especially those in the country districts, cannot be over-stressed. It

[Mr. Macnie]

is to my mind one of the biggest tasks facing the new Government, and one to which they should pay very early attention.

I would like to share the views expressed by the hon. Member, Mr. Cummings, with regard to the progress which has been made in the relationship between capital and labour. I am sorry my hon. friend, the Minister of Labour, Industry and Commerce (Mr. Ashton Chase), who was present in this Chamber during our morning session, has had to leave us. I am sure he would not mind my referring to the fact that during a conversation with him I expressed the view, which I will repeat here, that one of the greatest needs in industry is an active campaign of education in trade unionism and its basic principles. On the employers' side there is also need for educating those who have to deal with industrial relations in that particular subject. There is very great need for education throughout all industries in this country. The only way trade unionism will succeed, as I hope it will, is by increased activity in the field of education of the workers in sound trade unionism and its basic principles.

Finally, to the main subject on which we have had some difference of opinion around our table during the day. I refer to the question of the usefulness of this State Council. The hon. Member who spoke last dealt with the matter very exhaustively, but there are one or two points to which I would like to refer. To those hon. Members who have spoken somewhat against the idea of a State Council may I say I hope they will support the Council. I hope that although they expressed some views against the terms of the Address they will see their way to support

the motion. In connection with this body I would remind those who are opposed to it, whether around this table or not, of what no less a person than the then Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Griffiths, of the Labour Government—the same Labour Government which the hon. Member, Mr. Robertson, said nearly abolished the House of Lords in England—said in his despatch immediately after the release of the Report of the Constitutional Commission. The despatch is reproduced at the end of the Commission's Report on page 73, and when dealing with the question of whether there should be a unicameral or bicameral Legislature Mr. Griffiths said :

“On the other hand, there can be little doubt that a Second Chamber provides a valuable opportunity for revision and for further reflection on contentious legislation. On the whole I consider that the bicameral system, with a Second Chamber as an integral and enduring part of the constitution, should be adopted in British Guiana, and I therefore accept, in principle, the proposal for such a legislature in Codicil II to the Report.”

He went on to say :

“I feel that very careful consideration will have to be given to the precise powers and functions of the Second Chamber in order to ensure that they do in fact effectively provide those checks and balances which the Commission consider essential and rightly point out are integral features of democratic Government as western civilisation understands it.”

With your permission, Sir, I would also refer to and read paragraph 78 of the Constitutional Commission's Report. This is what the Commission (which included that great socialist and believer in democracy, Dr. Rita Hinden) said :

“Democratic governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. This doctrine of consent is distinctive of democracy and fundamental to it. It means, for one thing, that a

[Mr. Macnie]

government elected by a majority of the population should always consult the interests of all. For this reason, and to enable the will of the community to be more perfectly discovered, checks and balances are an integral feature of democratic government as western civilisation understands it."

I would only add that the two great countries of North America the U.S.A. and Canada—have both got a second Chamber.

**The President:** May I state that in the Canadian Legislature the Upper House is a nominated one.

**Mr. Macnie:** Yes, that is so; the great self-governing Dominion of Canada has got an elected second Chamber. I do not think that any British Guianese, no matter what his party politics might be, would aspire at this stage to a greater form of self-government than that being enjoyed by that progressive country—the Dominion of Canada.

I would just digress for a moment to refer to the opposition expressed by Mr. Fingall against the presence of three Official Members in the House of Assembly. Let it not be thought that I speak on this because I was once an Official Member of the late Government, or of any other. I have been one of the strongest critics of Government Officials especially since I left the Service, and I am sure the hon. President will soon acquire that facility also. The Constitutional Commission's report, in paragraph 102—and and I would commend a study of this report by all hon. Members—says this:—

"102. We should perhaps indicate the reasons which have led us while stressing the importance of this principle of an elected majority, to recommend the retention of the three official members. First, they will be needed to handle cer-

tain portfolios—Law and Order, Finance—which cannot be transferred with confidence to elected ministers. We say this with no reflection upon the integrity of prospective, but from an appreciation of the degree of specialized knowledge required to direct the work of these departments. There can be no guarantee that the small population of British Guiana will be able regularly to throw up persons possessed of this wealth of knowledge and experience. Moreover, there can be no certainty that, were such persons available, they would be successful candidates at an election, or even if they were, that they would be chosen to be members of the Court of Policy. Secondly, we must not lose sight of the fact that the elected representatives of the people of British Guiana have not hitherto been given the opportunities to become experienced in affairs of state. The officials will be invaluable members of the Court of Policy for the guidance which their expert knowledge can give to its discussions..."

I feel sure, Sir, that the majority of our Ministers—and especially because I have been associated with some of them in the past—feel in their hearts that it is an advantage to have these three Official Members among them, and I hope that the elected members would not hesitate to use the services and experience and knowledge which these three Official Members have acquired from concentration on these matters. Finally, I would like to point out as regards these much-abused Officials that they can do little of themselves because they would be bound by the decision of the majority in the Executive Council. These stipulations should allay any fears that they would seek to act against the will of the majority. The Executive Council is the policy-making body—that is where decisions are taken as regards Government at the highest possible level—and these much-abused Officials can do very little if the majority are determined to do a thing. One should realize, therefore, that these Officials are needed and should be used.

[Mr. Macnie]

The Ministers themselves already know from experience what their burden of office means; therefore, I suggest to those Members who are opposed to the appointment of these Official Members to let them stay and to use them. My appeal to those who are opposed to the State Council as at present constituted is that they should accept the Constitution as it has been given. The last speaker—His Grace the Archbishop—has urged that we should accept the Constitution as being a very great stride by the Colony, and I endorse that view wholeheartedly. I, as a Guianese, feel that it is right for every Guianese to aspire for self-government. It is a right and proper aspiration, but let us accept the Constitution that we have been given and under which we, the Members around this table have been invited to serve. We have accepted that invitation, and I for one intend to do everything possible to make the Constitution work as it is and to dispel any idea that we are an opposition to it. It is an absolutely fantastic suggestion that because we are on the State Council we are in opposition to the Government. The Leader of the House of Assembly and I have been known to each other for some time: I had the pleasure of being associated with him in the last Legislature. I have had some great clashes with him, but sometimes we have been able to see

eye to eye with each other and supported one another. This idea on the part of certain people that we are going to oppose for the sake of opposition is certainly not true. Let us accept the situation and let us go forward; let us put aside mistrust and replace it with goodwill, and let us go forward with confidence in the future.

**The President:** We have had a very interesting and lively debate, and I propose to put the motion at once.

Motion put and agreed to, unanimously.

**The President:** I indicated when giving notice of a motion this morning, that I might move the suspension of the Standing Rules and Orders to enable us to take it today but, on further consideration, I think it should take its course in the ordinary way. Consequently, I should adjourn this Council *sine die*.

**Dr. Knight:** Before the Council is adjourned, I am sure all hon. Members wish to express to you, Sir, our hope for a very pleasant journey to the United Kingdom and a safe return to your native land.

**The President:** Thank you, very much. Council stands adjourned *sine die*.

