

# LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

(Constituted under the British Guiana  
(Constitution) (Temporary Provisions)  
Order in Council, 1953)

FRIDAY, 18TH MARCH, 1955.

The Council met at 2 p.m.

## PRESENT:

His Honour the Speaker, Sir  
Eustace Gordon Woolford, O.B.E., Q.C.

### *Ex-Officio Members :*

The Hon. the Chief Secretary,  
Mr. F. D. Jakeway, O.B.E.

The Hon. the Attorney General,  
Mr. F. W. Holder, C.M.G., Q.C.

The Hon. the Financial Secretary,  
Mr. W. O. Fraser, O.B.E.

### *Nominated Members of Executive Council :*

The Hon. Sir Frank McDavid,  
C.M.G., C.B.E. (Member for Agriculture,  
Forests, Lands and Mines).

The Hon. P. A. Cummings (Mem-  
ber for Labour, Health and Housing).

The Hon. W. O. R. Kendall (Mem-  
ber for Communications and works).

The Hon. G. A. C. Farnum, O.B.L.  
(Member for Local Government, Social  
Welfare and Co-operative Develop-  
ment),

The Hon. G. H. Smellie.

### *Deputy Speaker :*

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

### *Nominated Officials:*

Mr. W. T. Lord, I.S.O.

Mr. J. I. Ramphal.

### *Nominated Unofficials :*

Mr. W. A. Phang.

Mr. L. A. Luckhoo, Q.C.—on leave

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

Mr. C. A. Carter.

Mr. E. F. Correia.

Rev. D. C. J. Bobb.

Mr. H. Rahaman.

Miss Gertie H. Collins.

Mrs. Esther E. Dey.

Dr. H. A. Fraser.

Lt. Col. E. J. Haywood, M.B.E., T.D.

Mr. R. B. Jailal.

Mr. Sugrim Singh.

### Clerk of the Legislature—

Mr. I. Crum Ewing.

### Assistant Clerk of the Legislature—

Mr. E. V. Viapree (acting).

### *Absent :—*

The Hon. R. B. Gajraj—on leave.

The Hon. R. C. Tello—on leave.

Mr. T. Lee—on leave.

The Speaker read prayers.

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Thursday, the 17th of March, 1955, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### LETTER OF THANKS FROM MR. VAUGHAN-MORGAN, M.P.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have received a letter from Mr. J. K. Vaughan-Morgan, M.P., in which he expresses his thanks for the hospitality extended to him by the Council during his recent visit to the Colony, and the pleasure it gave him to be privileged to be present in our Chamber at a meeting of the Council.

### COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PLYWOOD POSSIBILITIES

With regard to the appointment of a Select Committee of this Council to investigate and report on the possibility of establishing a plywood industry in this Colony, I hope to be able to announce the personnel of the Committee this afternoon. I think I have communicated with every Member of the Council except the hon. Mr. Correia who has just returned from holiday abroad. I should be glad if the hon. Member would indicate whether he would be willing to sit on the Committee.

### MEETING OF FINANCE COMMITTEE DEFERRED

**The Financial Secretary (Mr. W. O. Fraser):** I should like to announce, Sir, that Thursday should be the day of the normal meeting of Finance Committee, but in view of the current debate on Federation I wish hon. Members to know that I do not propose to

summon a meeting of Finance Committee for Thursday.

## UNOFFICIAL NOTICES

### FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

**Rev. Mr. Bobb** gave notice of the following motion:

"Whereas there has been for many years a growing appreciation among all sections of the community of the value of secondary education;

And Whereas it is the duty of Government to provide from public funds for such education;

And Whereas the fully-aided Government schools and partially-aided private secondary schools cannot meet the numerical demands for such education:

Be it resolved:

That this Honourable Council recommends to the Governor in Council that consideration be given to granting financial assistance to private secondary schools of an approved standard not at present receiving any aid from Government, in order to help them to continue their work."

### INACCURATE NEWSPAPER REPORT

**Mr. Ramphal:** Mr. Speaker, may I draw attention to a report which appears in today's *Daily Argosy*. I am sorry to have to draw attention to this particular newspaper because it gives the best coverage to our debate on the question of Federation. However, on page 4, column 3, of today's issue the hon. Mr. Lee is reported to have stated:

".....that the Council comprised families, and then referred to Mr. J. I. Ramphal, Labour Commissioner, whom he said had lobbied seats for his various relatives in the Council."

I think that is quite an erroneous statement. As far as I can recall the

hon. Member said that I lobbied votes on the motion, and I took objection to that statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** I had intended to direct the Council's attention to that report myself, and I would like the Council's indulgence to direct its attention to other instances of misreporting which occurred yesterday, and which are, of course, just as vital.

Speaking on the point of the basis on which the proposed allocation of seats in the Federal Legislature was made, the hon. Member for Agriculture (Sir Frank McDavid) dwelt at some length on that particular item. I think he was encouraged to do so by a question I asked on the previous occasion, as to how that allocation was arrived at—whether it was on a population basis or arrived at arbitrarily—and Sir Frank was allowed an opportunity not only to correct that but to read that portion of the Rance Report which deals with it. I think it is a pity that the word "arbitrarily", which Sir Frank used, was omitted from the report. I think everybody agrees that it was arbitrary, and that it was a most important omission in the newspaper report. I shall see that our *Hansard* report contains it.

I am not here to express an opinion but I think the opinion was gaining ground, that if we could come to some agreement on the question of the allocation of seats the question of Federation was one which would not present as much difficulty as if there was not such an agreement. I think it is a very important matter.

There is another matter to which I hope hon. Members will allow me to call attention. My reason for calling

attention to these matters is because of the importance of this debate and the necessity for the newspaper reports to be accurate. Our *Hansard* reports will not be available for some time, and those who are gathering information on the subject are relying very largely on the reports in the newspapers. I should like to point out again, that when Sir Frank was speaking on that particular question he is reported on page 4, column 4 of today's *Daily Argosy*, to have said:

"That examination will take some time. That His Excellency should keep us in touch with what is going on. And then to find out the state of public opinion."

Sir Frank McDavid had previously said:

"I understand that you, Sir, have joined with other Members in criticisms of the motion in some ways. It is quite simple; not ambiguous."

I then said as plainly as possible that I had given a ruling, and that the question of ambiguity had been brought up by an hon. Member. I did not criticise. But at the end of the paragraph this newspaper reports:

"After an intervention by the Speaker Sir Frank continues "I presume I am quite in order in expressing my own opinion."

The nature of the intervention has not been given, but it means that I had made some criticism. I did not criticise. The Speaker's duty is to offer opinion, and I would like to say with reference to my ruling, that there does not appear therein any criticism whatever on my part. I can repeat what I said, but I do not wish to waste the Council's time speaking about it. I have given a ruling on that particular point, but I must be

[Mr. Speaker]

allowed to say what in fact I said about that:

"A further objection to the motion being discussed has been taken by the hon. Mr. Luckhoo on the grounds that the motion may be divided into four parts, and that the wording of the motion is confusing, involved and contradictory."

After dealing with the constitutional question I further said:

"As regards the objections raised by the hon. Mr. Luckhoo, I am of the opinion that they do not in themselves furnish sufficiently substantial grounds for the motion not being discussed in its present form. I am willing to admit that it might have been more happily framed, but any difficulties there may be about the form of the motion itself — whether on the ground of the sub-divisions of the objects aimed at or embodied therein, or the ambiguity of the language employed therein, or any difficulty there may be in construing its terms—can be met by amendment, both at the instance of the Mover or by any other Member and/or by submitting the motion in the form of more resolutions than one — if Members are of the opinion that voting on the motion as it stands would be embarrassing."

That is what actually took place. Questioning the accuracy of these newspaper reports is a very important matter indeed, because if the Editors of the newspapers are to base their opinions on them so as to encourage public opinion in what way they like, they are inclined to rely on the accuracy of the reports they receive. Something has to be done about it. I would like to invite attention to the Standing Rules of this Council and to emphasize Rule 5 which says:

- (a) The Clerk may grant to the accredited representatives of any newspaper permission to attend the sittings of the Council.
- (b) If there should be published in any newspaper an unfair or misleading report of anything which has trans-

pired at a meeting of the Council, the Council may direct that no representative of that newspaper may be permitted to attend the sitting of the Council for such period as the Council may determine."

These are matters to which the reporters pay no attention. Apparently there is very good reason for saying that. It is denying the Editors of newspapers an opportunity of making correct comment.

In the matter of Mr. Ramphal's complaint I do not know what to say. I quite agree that it is a serious matter. If I did hear it, it would have been my duty to say that the Member was out of order in making use of such remarks. I did not hear it and I think it was never said. I hope there will be no repetition of it. Reporting of that kind is actionable.

**Mr. Ramphal:** I will not take any action in the matter.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am glad the hon. Member does not intend to take any further notice of it. What is said here is privileged, but that is not.

## ORDER OF THE DAY

### ITEMS DEFERRED

With the consent of the Council consideration of items 1 to 5 on the Order Paper was deferred.

### BRITISH CARIBBEAN FEDERATION

The Council resumed the debate on the following motion by the Rev. Mr Bobb:

That this Council, having noted the steps which are being taken by other

Caribbean Governments and by Her Majesty's Government towards the creation of a British Caribbean Federation and the statement of the Secretary of State for the Colonies in Parliament to the effect that the constitutional instruments will provide that British Guiana and other territories which might care to do so will be quite free to join the Federation, is of the opinion that British Guiana should join the Federation, and that the question of this country's participation therein should be re-examined.

This Council further prays His Excellency the Governor to take such steps as he may deem fit to keep British Guiana in close touch with the action now proceeding towards the setting up of the Federation, and to ascertain the state of public opinion in this country towards participation in the Federation."

**Mr. Luckhoo:** Your Honour, I have listened during the past days with very careful attention to the excellent exposition made by the hon. Mover of the motion, and I have no doubt that he has succeeded in winning converts to the particular cause. I have also listened to the hon. the Chief Secretary who, in a businesslike manner and advancing cold reason, stated Government's point of view. In addition I have listened to the rather erudite and historical summary given by the hon. Member, Mr. Smellie, and then, Sir, to the hon. Member for Agriculture, Sir Frank McDavid, who is most dangerous when he apologises for his lack of eloquence. He made some very telling points and, skilled debater as he is, he certainly furthered the cause he was supporting.

One must not forget the hon. Member, Mr. Sugrim Singh, who, if I may say so, personally earned my admiration for his very fighting stand, and for his very lasting speech which commenced with fire, stood sure to the course, and finished

full of running. I think Sir, he deserves to be congratulated for his work and the very genuine effort he made to bring before this Council points which normally may have escaped one's attention.

The time has come, Sir, for me to make what is, comparatively, a short contribution to what has been a very lengthy debate—necessarily so. I had the opportunity of speaking on a similar motion some three years ago in this very Council Chamber, and on that occasion there were three schools of thought—those who were blindly strong pro-Federationists, those who were equally vehement in their voice against Federation, and there was the third body, a body which was rather hesitant and counselled that we should stay out of Federation but not close the door; we should leave the door ajar because we were not satisfied with what was commonly termed the Rance Report. And among the several who took that particular stand when the debate took place three years ago, I was one. My own views have not changed materially since then, but I still feel that this motion presents a useful opportunity for reconsideration of the question and for expressing our own points of view, so that they may stimulate interest within the country and cause the people, who are the ones to decide eventually, to consider whether they wish to have Federation, or whether they are against it.

Since then, many points of view have been brought to my attention which previously I had not an opportunity of considering, and those are points of view which are very worthy of consideration. But the Legislature, although rejecting the principle of Federation because of the basic bias of the Rance Report, on a subsequent occasion voted that

[Mr. Luckhoo]

a representative should be sent to England, and the hon. Capt. Smellie was sent. That is very important, because it shows the trend of opinion. There was not a firm closing of the door but a willingness to treat. As one who voted in favour of the hon. Member going to the Conference in London, I felt that we should still explore the possibility of entering into the Federal body and, as such, we should participate even as observers from the very start.

I approved of the sending of the hon. Member as an observer, and I approve also, for what it is worth, of His Excellency or the Governor in Council sending a Member of this Council to sit in at the talks in Trinidad. I approve that all necessary steps should be taken to investigate and to commence re-examination of this question. But, Sir, I do not feel that we should express an opinion that we are in favour of joining the Federation at this stage. Let us analyse the question. The first point that arises is this: Are we capable of expressing an opinion? And the answer is: "Of course we are capable. Do we not pass laws and amend laws? Are we not expressing an opinion at all stages of our functions? Surely we are capable of expressing an opinion."

The second proposition that arises is: what is the value or force of that opinion when expressed? To hon. Members around this table I say that the value of that is that that opinion is one of no consequence. We have no mandate from the people, and whatever expression of opinion we give here, we cannot really bind the country. In the same way we cannot move here to alter our Constitution. We had a wonderful Constitution a few years ago, and we cannot say that we can bring that back at our will. We have not got the power so to do.

Then comes the third point. If we have a right to express an opinion, but that opinion is of little or no consequence, are we to express an opinion here now, at this stage of our progress, of our history, and with the facts which are before us? My answer is "No". I would say, Sir, that if we had the relevant facts, if we had before us the details and the information, then we would be well within our rights to express an opinion on those facts which are before us. What is the most important factor in this federal set-up? If one were to ask any Member of this Council, or any member of the public, that question I feel sure the answer would come back. "What representation are we going to have in the federal body or the Federal House of Representatives? How many representatives are we going to have?" That, to my mind, is perhaps the most important single factor which should first be determined, and which will, in my humble view, influence our decision of acceptance or rejection of our joining in Federation.

The point I make is that we do not know at this stage how many members we are likely to have in the Federal Parliament. Why then should we express an opinion, not on the principle, but that we should join the Federation? Do we know all the terms and conditions of our entry in the Federation? Do we know whether we would be accepted as an original member joining the federal structure, or whether we are going to be a body subsequently taken into the fold? Sir, I can well hear a Member saying that we want to go in to find out those things. I agree with him that we should pursue these enquiries forthwith, but it is not necessary for us to go to the extent of expressing this positive and firm opinion that British Guiana should join the Federation. It is not necessary to express that opinion in order to obtain the required information, because that in-

formation can be obtained without the consideration of that part of this motion.

Your Honour, when the hon. Member, Capt. Smellie, went to England, it was done by means of this Council deciding that we should send an observer to the London Conference. When the hon. Member, Mr. Gajraj, as an observer, and an adviser to the observer were sent to Trinidad to the last Conference, it did not come before this Council. His Excellency or the Governor in Council acting well within their powers—I do not doubt or question that authority—sent those individuals to Trinidad. The mere *ipse dixit* of an expression of opinion that we should join the Federation is not clothing those gentlemen with more authority than they have at this moment. It is the Governor, or the Governor-in-Council who started the ball a-rolling by sending observers. I agree with that approach. I see no harm in sending observers and pursuing the fullest possible enquiries and investigation to see what can be brought forward to set before the people of British Guiana. I say, Sir, that is important. If we can get the same results without expressing an opinion, then why should we unnecessarily express an opinion, without having all the facts which are so very relevant, and which affect vital issues, such as the number of elected members from British Guiana in the House of Representatives?

If the motion were put this way: "That this country's participation therein should be examined", we would have had, I venture to suggest, almost universal acceptance of it—that the matter should be re-examined and all the information and details obtained before we express an opinion. The point then arises, if that is so: is the motion necessary at all? I would suggest with all deference, that we could have done with-

out this motion, and the enquiries and investigation could have been proceeded with, as they had been initiated by the Governor-in-Council, and the full information brought before this Council.

We have been told time and again by the Secretary of State for the Colonies and other individuals making pronouncements relative to Federation, that Federation must come from within—not without; that there must be a spontaneous turning to Federation—not a propulsion to drive one into Federation. And that is the happier course. I feel we could have proceeded along the way, and continued along the lines of making the necessary investigations, and attending all these meetings and conferences and then, having obtained the general feeling and a positive idea of the terms, conditions, obligations and benefits, pursue by way of bargaining our right to have more than six seats. If ever there was cause for righteous indignation it is when one sees six seats allotted to British Guiana in the Rance Report, as against 16 for Jamaica, and nine for Trinidad! On what basis? An arbitrary determination. And yet, as the hon. Member, Mr. Lee, puts it, they seem to feel it is more than we should get.

There is a peculiar sentence which, to my mind, does not reflect the passage read by the hon. Member, Sir Frank McDavid, and that is in paragraph 63 of the Report of the British Caribbean Standing Closer Association Committee. They made it quite clear that this thing was just chosen as an arbitrary determination; yet they say:

"Taking first the House of Assembly, we had great difficulty in devising a system of distribution of seats which at the same time adequately reflects the relative populations of the respective territories...."

[Mr. Luckhoo]

Then at paragraph 68:

"Turning to the Senate, we found that the question of the distribution of seats presented little difficulty, since one of the functions of a Second Chamber in a federal constitution is to reflect the position of the territories as equal partners, population differences being reflected in the other House."

They say the determination of seats was arbitrary, yet they infer that population differences are reflected in the allocation of seats. This does not make sense. Let me say this: We in British Guiana are not suffering from any complex. I say so categorically, and without any fear of denial. We do not want a generous deal, we do not want favours outside of our rights, but we do want a square deal. I think we have a right so to demand, because although we may not be a very rich country presently, although there may not be oil coming from the ground up to the present, yet we have got land, we have got our potentials and our potentialities. We have a right to say that Federation is a question of a higher form of partnership, the basis being the utmost good faith, and we have a right in order to federate to say, 'Yes, we require a straight deal and a square deal'. How can we be inspired to join the Federation with an allocation of six seats only?

Adroit debater as he is, the hon. Member, Sir Frank McDavid, saw that there should be a reply to this type of argument. It is not coming up for the first time—it is the most common and powerful argument being used — the small number of seats for British Guiana—and he countered and said that we are only thinking in terms of the number of representatives, but that it was not a question of individual groups getting together in little corners, but a ques-

tion of proceeding along party lines; not regional groups, but party groups.

Sir Frank McDavid: I did of course, throw that suggestion out, but the hon. Member will remember that I was nearly as firm as he is in my criticism of the disproportionate allocation of seats, and I went to some pains to say that, one way or another, we should take into account the whole picture.

Mr. Luckhoo: That is true, but I was endeavouring to counter the point with respect to proceeding along party lines. Maybe that will come one day, but I do not foresee, in my limited vision, that this body will be dominated with a generalised party structure, because if that were so it would be in order for each region to get the same number of representatives and equal prestige. Again, if that were so, why should there be the necessity for Jamaica to have its 16 seats or Trinidad its nine?

What has happened — and to my mind it is very important — is that we in this Colony are left to conjure in our minds a picture of what Federation is; and that is why you have two schools of thought, more or less, emerging. On the one hand those for Federation say, "Look here, this will mean the birth of our country. We will have limitless opportunities for expansion. We cannot exist as a small agricultural country, for we will have no future, and our present will be jeopardised. And what is going to happen? You will be like Cinderella in the kitchen with your poor clothes, and bereft of your elegance and finery." Then, on the other hand, we have the other point of view being put forward: "Yes, federate, and you will find it is the end. You will bring British Guiana to be the garbage

bin of the Caribbean, where the 'un-wanted' will simply flood our country". Both views, in my humble opinion, are the creations of a certain amount of guess-work—Maybe intelligent guess-work, but, I feel, guess-work springing from the absence of the full facts, which, because of their absence, different opinions are created in different minds. In order to be able carefully to evaluate the position, I say we must know the terms, conditions, obligations and the most important thing—if I can put it in one word—what representation are we going to have in the House of Representatives?

A moment ago I said we do not suffer from any complex in this country. Now, let me say this: if we do not go into Federation, Federation will go on and will still continue. I do not attempt to say that if we keep out of the Federation it will fall to the ground, but I do say it will not be the success that it can and will be if and when British Guiana goes in as a member of the Federal group. This is not a highly industrialized country like Trinidad. Limited in size, Trinidad has its oil, but how long will the presence of oil continue? Your guess may be as good as mine.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is considered to have an expectation of life for a period of 12 years.

**Mr. Luckhoo:** I was ignorant of that, and I am thankful to Your Honour. I do not know who expressed that opinion, but I take it that it is expert opinion, and experts are sometimes right. It is, to my mind, an important point. Now, oil contributes what percentage of the revenue of Trinidad?

**Mr. Speaker :** Thirty-five per cent.

**Mr. Luckhoo :** I am again grateful to Your Honour. I was going to venture one-third, but I see you give me a nearer percentage. We are fortunate in having Your Honour there, because of your profound knowledge, from which we benefit from time to time.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think the debate needs that kind of assistance, and I may add that oil forms 75 per cent of the total value of their exports.

**Mr. Luckhoo:** With those figures in front of us, we can say, of course, that Trinidad has a present. Has it got a future? Well, it depends. And has it got a future which can compare in any way with that of our Guiana? I say, "No". We have a hinterland and we need capital and population to burst it open. We need capital, surely. We need capital, to carry out the Hutchinson schemes, which the hon. Member, Lt. Colonel Haywood, keeps pointing out to us. What are the best chances of getting this capital, perhaps from the federal body? Let me bear this in mind.

But then — again we return to the most vital consideration—should we not have a greater voice within the federal body? The point is: should we, first of all, put our heads into the noose and express an opinion which is unnecessary now, and say that British Guiana should join the federation? Or should we make representations, obtain all the conditions and then express an opinion? That is the point. A little later I shall move an amendment of those words in the motion which rancour in my mind, and which I cannot accept. We must wait until the cards are before us, and then express an opinion which will reflect mature judgment upon factors which we know about.

[Mr. Luckhoo]

Sir, I follow the example of my good friend (Mr. Sugrim Singh) who went to the Oxford Dictionary for his definitions. The Oxford Dictionary defines "opinion" as "judgment or belief based on grounds short of proof." It is a good definition. To express an opinion without the full, relevant facts would be to come to a judgment which was not firmly and properly grounded. That is, to come to a judgment without having the essential prerequisite for arriving at such a judgment.

I was very interested in the hon. Mr. Lee's account of what happened when he attended the conference in Jamaica, and to hear him say that he had to threaten—I hope I am not misquoting him — to leave, he and the other representative, if British Guiana was not given an extra seat, and after much straining at the leash he succeeded in obtaining another one. Judgment of the future is dependent upon experience in the past, and if that is the type of experience British Guiana has suffered whereby we were presented, after much persuasion by Mr. Lee, with a sixth seat and reluctantly so, then have we cause to be over-optimistic about our chances of being allocated more seats to bring us, on an equal basis with a place like Trinidad or Jamaica in order that we might be able to stand on equal footing with them?

We are the three most important territories. Let us move together with Jamaica and Trinidad instead of groveling for the crumbs that fall from the table, or having to threaten, maybe, to leave a conference and to be thrown a bit of bread—a sixth seat. That, to my mind, is not giving us a square deal—by no stretch of the imagination. That is the reason why I say, "No!" We are

not to express an opinion here and now. Even though that expression of opinion would be one coming from a nominated body, nevertheless it would reflect a particular thought which is coming from the country of British Guiana at the present time. That is why I say that we should express no opinion, but show our willingness to re-examine the matter. We are not beggars, nor are we begging. We are willing to go in and contribute our share to a common cause, but we must get first of all the blueprint to enable us to make such a decision. When that decision is to be made it must not be made here; it must be made by the people, because Federation involves a change of status, and it is something which vitally influences the course of the lives of the people of a country.

That is why, when the hon. Member for Agriculture (Sir Frank McDavid) made his analysis of the voting, I say with every deference to him, that it presented a picture which was not full, for this reason: Our Legislature rejected the principle of Federation. That Legislature comprised elected Members and nominated Members. The hon. Member pointed out, however, that when the question of Dominion status came up the voting was on a different footing — that the number of elected Members was the same on both sides, or more on the side in favour of Dominion status.

**Sir Frank McDavid:** On that particular amendment there were eight elected Members for, and four against.

**Mr. Luckhoo:** Yes, eight were for the amendment. In that observation Sir Frank McDavid left out the nominated Members who formed part of the Legislature then, and if we say he did so in order to obtain an expression of opinion by the representatives of the people of the country I would ask: Does it? And what right

does anyone have to say that those representatives did represent the opinion of the people of the country? We did not then have adult suffrage. The point I am making is that we cannot have an opinion coming from the elected representatives of the people under a restricted franchise and say it is an over-all coverage. Except we have adult suffrage, by which the Members of the Council would be representatives of the people on the broadest possible base, we cannot just select the opinion of the then electeds, leave out the nominateds and come to a conclusion.

**Sir Frank McDavid:** The point I was trying to make was that you cannot by the same token say that the elected Members of the Council rejected it. What the hon. Member is saying now is the reverse. That is the argument.

**Mr. Luckhoo:** But the hard fact is that the Legislature did reject it. What was the value of the rejection is another point. In other words, what weight should be put on that rejection? I agree with the hon. Member that the fact that we did not have representation of the people on the basis of adult suffrage would necessarily weaken the weight of that particular representation in respect of speaking for all the peoples, but you cannot say that was any more in favour of Federation than you can say here today if the motion is accepted by this Council. An acceptance does not mean that the people of the country would wish to join the Federation, because we are now even on a more delicate footing. Who are we? We are all nominated, put here in this Council. It was very necessary, because of the times, but can any of us rise and say that our views necessarily reflect the body of opinion of the people in this country, without first going to the

people? Have we gone to the people? The hon. Mr. Lee said he had received a telegram, and I think he said he went to some of his island folk.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think he said he had received a telegram from the Corentyne.

**Mr. Luckhoo:** He received a telegram from the Corentyne and he visited the islands. I think he conceded that he was not referring to the small islands of the West Indies but to the larger islands of British Guiana. The view I put forward is that we will have to re-examine and investigate. We want to know (to use the common parlance) what is the score. We want to know what it adds up to before we express the firm opinion that we should join the Federation.

In the course of some Members' speeches the question of race was introduced. My view is that no good is served at all by introducing this racial question. I feel that perhaps it exists here as it does in any other part of the world, but fundamentally we all live here and we are all so interwoven and dependent upon each other that no one can say that any racial group must have dominance, or that we can live within our own racial group. The point I make is that by repetition or undue reference to this we are conjuring up ghoulish dreads which sometimes materialise and haunt us. We in this country are Guianese, and if anybody does not like that, well there are boats coming here day after day; they can do the next best thing. But I say, do not repeatedly refer or make reference to race. It is to my mind accentuating a matter which is not of the dimensions some would have us believe.

I wish, with your permission, Sir, to move an amendment to this motion

[Mr. Luckhoo]

in its ninth and tenth lines on today's Order Paper, for the deletion of the words "that British Guiana should join the Federation", and the deletion of the whole of the second paragraph. The amended motion will then read as follows:

"That this Council, having noted the steps which are being taken by other Caribbean Governments and by Her Majesty's Government towards the creation of a British Caribbean Federation, and the statement of the Secretary of State for the Colonies in Parliament to the effect that the constitutional instruments will provide that British Guiana and other territories which might care to do so will be quite free to join the Federation, is of the opinion that the question of this country's participation therein should be re-examined."

In other words I am leaving it on the widest possible basis. The Governor, or the Governor in Council, has the right to send observers or representatives to conferences on Federation, and to go to the people of this country by means of a plebiscite. All then can be done, as may be deemed fit, to obtain the terms and conditions of our entry into Federation, and to obtain the wishes of the people. This amendment which I respectfully offer to the Council for consideration, not only shows a willingness to treat, a willingness to re-examine, but a willingness to do everything possible so that the ball may be set in motion again in order that we may have brought before us the relevant vital facts upon which the country will determine whether it will join the Federation or not. We cannot reason on probabilities alone. When we leave reason and give ourselves up to conjecture there can be no security and no progress of thought.

I feel, Sir, that the time is right here when we should give the most careful examination to this very difficult prob-

lem, but again I caution that we must not run too quickly to plunge ourselves into an affirmative declaration when we have not had those vital details.

What purpose can be served by removing that particular sentence in the motion about our joining the Federation? I ask the question and I answer it. It will show to the West Indian islands that we are willing to re-examine the question, but until we have the facts before us and we can be assured of better treatment, we will keep out of Federation. Instead, the motion suggests that we should say we will join the Federation, and then re-examine the question. This attitude will provide us with a better bargaining opportunity, to say we will examine and, if acceptable, will join, rather than to say we will join the Federation—let us bargain.

**The Attorney-General:** May I ask the hon. Member to deal with the point with regard to affirmation or re-examination in relation to this country. We are not at the moment dealing with the question of whether British Guiana should have six seats or 15 seats.

**Mr. Luckhoo:** In reply I will say I think this debate has served a useful purpose in stimulating interest in this very important subject. I say to the hon. Member: let us be realistic. Do you think the people in the street care two hoots whether we say "yes" or "no" today? They are going to formulate their opinions on the matter. How can we go to them before we know what facts we are going to place before them? (*At this point there were murmurs by hon. Members*) Every Member will have an opportunity to speak. I am not yielding the floor. Is it fair to this country? Are we beggars? Must we express an affirmative opinion on this question before we know how many seats we are going to receive? Let us tell the

people of the West Indies that we are willing to treat, willing to bargain, and when we can see the benefits of Federation we will decide whether we should join it. Federation on any terms I will not have. It must be on acceptable terms.

**The Attorney-General:** Are you afraid?

**Mr. Luckhoo:** I am not afraid of anything. I think the last person who should say that is the hon. the Attorney General, because he knows that I have stood up in this Council alone and expressed my opinion on matters like the Subversive Literature Bill and others, and I have never shifted from that. I am not a racist, and I am never afraid. I have no complex. This is my country. My view is that the whole facts must be put before this country before we decide whether we should join the Federation or not. We have a right to know before we answer the first part of the motion. Finally, Sir, I humbly invoke and pray that Infinite power which rules the universe may lead British Guiana to do what is best, not only for those present here today but for generations yet unborn.

**Mr. Carter:** I beg to second the amendment.

**Mr. Macnie:** Your Honour, before I speak on the motion before the Council, or on the amendment which has been seconded and very well moved by my hon. friend, Mr. Luckhoo, I wish to make a statement. I wish to make this statement because of a misinterpretation, if I may put it so, which was placed upon my question by the hon. Member for Agriculture, Sir Frank McDavid, yesterday afternoon. I think everyone will remember the question. I do not intend to repeat it,

but I am in a position to make a statement with regard to the attitude of the B. G. Sugar Producers' Association in this matter. The Association strongly supports the principle of Federation. This support is based on two major considerations. The first is, the Association believes that from the political angle the idea that this Colony would ever achieve Dominion status as a separate unit is for practical purposes out of the question. The second is, from the economic viewpoint British Guiana would have a greater opportunity for its development more speedily in a Federation than it would be as a unit or territory standing by itself. Let me say, those words were written by myself. They are my own words put in that short form, representing the views of the Sugar Producers' Association which are in a more lengthy report. I had refreshed my memory from my notes in giving the answer but I was careful not to hold up the paper which I had in my hand. Now, Sir, I hope I have made the position of the Sugar Producers' Association abundantly clear.

Having done so, I will now proceed to express my personal opinion as a Guianese and as a Member of this Council. It is my honour and my privilege to be able to express my personal opinion here, so long as I may be here. It is also my sole desire to be quite impersonal. I am not one with any political aspiration whatever. All I desire, so long as I am able to do so is to be allowed to serve my country to the best of my ability. Therefore, I would again ask that no one who hears what I now say, or who reads it tomorrow or later, should do other than say that that was the view of that person Macnie, and I hope that no one would take what I now say as the view of the Sugar Producers' Association with whom I happen to be

[Mr. Macnie]

employed. I would like to be careful about that.

In this debate we have had a variety of viewpoints put forward. I will endeavour to put forward one or two, and I may cover some ground which has already been covered. I regret I will not be able to attempt to attain the heights of oratory which have been attained, especially by the last speaker, the hon. Mover of the amendment. First, Sir, I would like to read to the Council a very short sentence from a leading article of the "London Times" reproduced in the "Times Weekly Review" of Thursday, March 10. It is the first leader entitled "European Knot", and this is the opening sentence:—

"When a joiner is planing a piece of wood and comes up against a knot, he knows that if he tries to force it he would easily split the wood in two and ruin the whole work."

Here I feel that we are in the same position as a joiner. We are trying to plane or make smooth a piece of wood. There is more than one knot in that piece of wood, and we should endeavour not to split the wood. In fact we should endeavour not to do anything which would split the prospects of this country for the future.

During the very able speech of the hon. Member for Agriculture (Sir Frank McDavid) he referred to the voting in this Council Chamber by the Legislative Council which sat in 1951 and debated this subject. Sir Frank very carefully analysed the voting. I hope he would forgive me if I suggest—if my recollection is correct—that he was rather critical of the attitude of the four Elected Members who voted against the amendment for the acceptance of the principle of Federation. During the hon. Member's speech he referred to the Rev. Mr. Peters formula or form of words:

"Affiliation—Yes. Assimilation — No." I do not know whether all Members felt this, but I rather felt it and I am supported in this by a remark Sir Frank made subsequently—I think yesterday afternoon — when he said that he felt the Legislative Council in 1952 lost an opportunity. In other words Sir Frank made it quite clear that he and the hon. the Attorney-General had been on leave when the debate started, but he (Sir Frank) returned on the day the debate was finished. I do feel that, having taken part in that debate myself, as a humble Member—possibly far more humble than now, as I was then the Seventh Nominated Member—I may remind this Council of the tribute that Sir Frank paid to the 1952 debate when he was Mover of the Customs Union motion which came before the Council on the 20th February, 1952. Introducing the motion the hon. Member said — I quote from Hansard :

"The subject of the motion is of great moment in itself, but having regard to the Council's decision only a month ago that British Guiana should not participate in the proposed Caribbean Political Federation, acceptance of this motion will be of particular significance as a clear and positive expression of the sense of this Council on regional co-operation between this country and the British West Indian territories.

"As I was out of the Colony at the time, I was unable to be present during the first part of what has come to be known as "The Federation Debate," but I was in the Council during its closing stages and I carefully read from the Hansard Report all the speeches made by hon. Members during the opening stage. Although I personally may not agree with all the reasons both for and against the conclusion reached by the majority vote of the Council, I should like to say that I was struck by the high level of that debate, and by the earnest and sincere consideration which was brought to bear on the question by each and every individual Member who contributed to it. . ."

I feel, Sir, it is only right and proper that that tribute by the hon.

Member should be brought to the notice of this Council during this debate. It is only fair to those Members of that Council who are not present in this Council.

On the question of a Customs Union, as the hon. Member, Sir Frank McDavid, has told this Council — to use his own words — there was disappointingly little discussion. There was no suggestion then by the hon. Mover of the motion, who was at that time Financial Secretary, of re-opening the question of Federation, nor did the hon. Member, or anyone else for that matter, express a view one way or the other about Federation. But, as the hon. Member said, there was, surprisingly and disappointingly, little discussion on the motion. In fact, apart from the Seconder, the only other Member who spoke was Mr. Ferreira. The Chief Secretary seconded the motion. As far as I am concerned, and I know for some of my colleagues, we were fully convinced by the sound speech made by Sir Frank McDavid on that occasion. I was particularly impressed by these words and, therefore, did not speak, as I agreed with him entirely:

"I feel that in the difficult world of today, there is no satisfactory alternative of full economic co-operation between the British communities in the Caribbean region—that is to say, the region of British Central America based on British Guiana in the south and extending to British Honduras in the north. That is my personal feeling. I do not see how that area can hope to carry on satisfactorily in these very difficult times without a full measure of co-operation in commercial matters. . ."

No mention whatever of a political matter was made, and that is why I accepted the motion for Customs Union. I still maintain that those words, so ably put by my hon. friend on that day, are sound. But whether we

federate or not all that will be done. I may be told that if we do not federate that would not be possible.

**Sir Frank McDavid:** Not possible !

**Mr. Macnie :** Allow me to say, Sir, that although I have not been in my seat all the time, I have been within hearing of every word said in this Council during this debate, and I think that can be said for most of us, except Mr. Tello, who is far away from here today. I think the hon. Member would have said in any case, that in the light of what has happened since, and in the light of this debate, what he said in 1952 was a mistake.

I agree, if that is the attitude of the hon. Member, but my point is that the hon. Member in the opening portion of his speech in introducing the Customs Union Motion, referred to the Federation debate which had taken place about two months before. He said he had read the speeches, and he paid tribute to the high level of that debate and to the earnest and sincere consideration which was brought to bear on the question by each member. But—and my point is twofold — there was no suggestion then by the hon. Member that the 1951 decision was wrong.

The second point is that I entirely endorse the words used by the hon. Member at the end of his introductory speech on the Customs Union motion —

"I do not see how that area can hope to carry on satisfactorily in these difficult times without a full measure of co-operation in commercial matters."

I do not want to embarrass him, but I feel it is only fair and proper to point that out, as one who was a member of the Council in 1951 (the most inexperienced Member; I still get on my feet with trepidation, I have always spoken in public with a great deal of difficulty, but I have not done badly so far as I have

[Mr. Macnie]

read the views of others, and I am now expressing my own).

Now, I would like to touch on the dominant feature of Federation: freedom of movement. We have been told that the recent conference at which we were represented, and I am sure, well and ably by the hon. Member, Mr. Gajraj, and his Adviser, Mr. Ramphal, jnr., has reached a compromise agreement based upon freedom of movement in five or ten years' time. That is all, in so far as I know, that any Member of the public has been told, as to what the compromise is. At the same time freedom of movement to my mind, is inherent to any birth or development of Federation; and I hope that the Federation which is being formed will suffer no embarrassment as a result of a compromise agreement on freedom of movement. I am sure everyone in this Council, as well as lots of people elsewhere, have heard of and know the name Cuke. Those who are for or against Federation will all respect Mr. Cuke's opinion and will not brush it aside.

With your permission, Sir, I would like to read what Mr. Cuke had to say at the Montego Bay Conference at which I think Your Honour was the leader of the delegation from this Colony. As far as I know, Mr. Cuke has not changed his views on the question of freedom of movement — my friend on my left (Mr. Ramphal) says he has not changed his mind. I am quoting from "Part 2: Proceedings" of the Conference on the Closer Association of the British West Indian Colonies, at page 110:

"I am clarifying what I meant by federation because I know that despite the fact that delegates will say they are in fa-

vour of federation, when it comes down to the actual facts of federation we find all sorts of reservations made, while I contend that if you accept the principle of federation of the West Indies, you accept in principle the freedom of movement of peoples and free trade between the islands."

No mention of us —

"and unless and until the people of the Caribbean made up their minds on those two subjects, it is idleness to pursue the question of federation. Up to the present the majority of people in the islands have not had that point put clearly to them."

Then he goes on to point out that in a Federation immigration restrictions did not exist, and this was fundamental. There must, he said, be removal from the West Indies of all immigration restrictions that exist today,

"and unless and until we can accept as a people these fundamentals, then there will be not much chance of bringing in this federal state, unless the peoples of these islands have those two points clear in their minds."

Freedom of movement is something we heard of extensively from the hon. Member, Mr. Sugrim Singh, and it is one of the questions which Trinidad and Barbados have raised. Of course, Mr. Cuke is as "true blue" a Barbadian as the hon. Member, the Attorney General.

**Mr. Sugrim Singh:** I think the hon. the Attorney General is a naturalised Guianese by now.

**Mr. Macnie:** I hope so. I was once called "a Berbician by absorption." I do not know if the Attorney General would like to be called "a Guianese by absorption." I know that the hon. Member, Mr. Lee, also spoke about free-

dom of movement, but I would also like to say a few words, probably with a different approach. The position, as I see it at the present time in this country, is that the people are very seriously under-employed and unemployed. This is the first fact that faces us. The second fact that faces us is that, provided good health conditions are maintained, in about 20 years our population will jump to about one million. We have no exact figures to arrive at a precise conclusion on that, but those who are competent in these things tell me this.

The greater portion of the money for the Development Plan has been provided to ensure gainful employment of the people who are at present under-employed. That I regard as forming part of the major task of this country for the present, and for some years to come, whether it be a "marking time" period, an "interim" period or what have you; and it is going to take time.

I believe in freedom of movement and, as a matter of fact, I find passport most irksome. I think it was the late Mr. Ernest Bevin who said he looked forward to the day when travel all over the world would be possible without passports. I submit in all seriousness that these are things we have to concentrate on.

The other night I sat down and scanned that most valuable work, "The Economic Development of British Guiana" — the World Bank Mission Report — and as Your Honour will see, in the copy I have here there are many little pieces of paper inter-leaved marking many pages. I do not propose to quote from them all, because they all say the same thing. Right through, and page after page they refer to the growth of population, and give some figures. On page 10 of the Report the International Bank Mission states :

"This is a factor of major significance for the economy, and one which, more than any other, has influenced the mission's recommendations."

I could select another one at random. As recently as last night in the G.I.S. radio programme, "Topic For Tonight", a distinguished visitor who leaves the Colony tomorrow, referred to our rapidly increasing population. I am only saying this to support my argument that we should preoccupy ourselves with solving the problem of how to provide gainful employment for our rapidly growing population. I was unemployed for a short time in my youth, and I know what it means. Having regard to that growth in our population, and having regard to the problem with which we must deal urgently and concentrate on (We cannot deal with it in a hurry, but we have to deal with it), can we afford to open our doors before we know where we stand, and before we have provided employment for our own people? I am not going to say that there are people from the West Indies knocking at our doors, but they may want to when things are being done and new lands are being opened. I say that our people must first be served in the first arrangement. At a later stage, if areas away from our coastlands can be developed and improved, and our own people are provided for, we can open our doors to settlers from the West Indies.

My point is that our coastlands are not extensive enough for our growing population, but if later on we can settle people in the interior we can open our doors to West Indians, some of whom are excellent farmers in our interior today. Some of the best ground provisions and fruit in this Colony are grown in the interior by people from the West Indian islands. But until we are in a position to im-

[Mr. Macnie]

prove conditions in our interior, by providing good houses, roads, lighting, places of recreation and cinemas, so as to prevent a trek to the coastlands, we cannot open our doors to the surplus population of the West Indies. Until those things are done we should not let them come here, because they would be worse off than they are now at home, and I know that some of them are pretty badly off. Those are my views on the question of freedom of movement which is part of Federation.

I will now deal with one other factor before I come to the motion proper. The tragedy is that even today, although there have been conference after conference, and newspaper reports of those conferences, there is no community of interest among the people of the West Indies, British Guiana and British Honduras. There is little or no community of interest. Your Honour referred to that at the Montego Bay Conference at which you were a delegate. I am sorry I was not able to be there at the time. You will forgive me for reading what you said at the Conference.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have not read it myself yet. All I can say is that I was a delegate at that Conference. We were not given any mandate, instructions or advice. The speech to which you refer was my own.

**Mr. Macnie:** What Your Honour said on that occasion was much the same as what I said in the 1951 debate in this Chamber. This is what Your Honour said:

"I know from experience on my visits to Barbados and Trinidad from time to time, and other places in the Caribbean area, that you will be surprised to know that I do not suppose that there are more than 50 notable persons from these islands of any importance who have been in the

Colony of British Guiana during the last twenty-five years, and then only on such occasions as cricket carnivals and, only quite recently, men representing various public bodies and labour unions. My only fear is that, if and when the Colony of British Guiana does accept Federation, there will be no person or persons from these units — even perhaps the representatives of the Colony itself — capable of dealing with its difficulties."

The tragedy is (I know from having lived here and in some of the islands) that there is a lack of community of interest which is so necessary for federation — interest in one another and a desire for federation among the people as a whole in the areas to be joined together politically. I believe that this motion by my hon. friend, the Rev. Mr. Bobb, has evoked more interest in this subject and has created more discussion on it than anything that has been done before in this Council. I move around day and night and I have heard animated discussions at the street corners on the subject of Federation. If the hon. Member's motion has done nothing else it has done much good in that. Let us hope the same thing is happening in the other territories of the British Caribbean.

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not know whether I referred to it on that occasion, but I have had the experience of not being able to get one of our newspapers in any of those islands, either from a club or from any publisher. I think only once I was able to secure one of our newspapers from the office of the "Trinidad Guardian". Their newspapers are sold in this Colony, but one cannot buy or even see a newspaper of any kind from British Guiana in any of those islands.

**Mr. Macnie:** I have also had that experience, and it is most regrettable. There has been a recent development as a result of which we can obtain copies of the "Trinidad Guardian" here. I get

the "Sunday Guardian" regularly, but we do not see the newspapers of the other islands unless we subscribe to them, and have them sent by mail. You do not see the other Islands' papers at present. The same is the case in the several Caribbean territories. It is tragic, but I think it is being improved. I think that in course of time it must go. Federation without the people who would join is not Federation at all. People do not go into Federation just like that—because of a whim when it comes to that. I hope I have made it quite clear that I am not opposed to Federation. ("*Hear, hear!*") I believe that the salvation of this region, or the British possessions in this part of the world, may be found eventually in Federation, but, like my hon. friend, Mr. Luckhoo I say the time for the decision is not now.

We are asked to express an opinion. The hon. Member on my right (Mrs. Dey) says we have not been asked. We are asked to make a decision. We must make up our minds in order to express an opinion. I have had the privilege, which I do not think any hon. Member around this table has had, of serving for four years in a group of Islands in the West Indies known as the Leeward Islands, and I was there closely associated with this Federation idea in the Government, and saw all the despatches. I would never disclose what reports I saw. I have always believed that Federation of the British Caribbean territories should grow, starting first with the smaller Islands and growing upwards to Barbados (some years ago they had an absurd federation of the Leeward Islands beginning from 1871) then to Trinidad, then Jamaica, and then British Guiana and British Honduras.

No one must think that I do not believe that Federation ultimately is the salvation of this region, but my view coincides very much

with that of the hon. Member, Mr. Luckhoo, at the moment, and I have said this to the hon. Mover of the motion in a conversation. Today is not the time, because we are what we are in this Council. I am not saying that anyone in this Council is incompetent. I disagree with all this talk about not being competent to express an opinion. If we are not competent to express an opinion then our place should be in a certain institution in Berbice. We are competent, and every man who has any sense in his head is entitled to express an opinion. But as a Legislature, let us look at that.

This Legislature is created under an emergency, created in a most unusual manner and constituted solely of ladies and men who have no constituency—none of them—except the country as a whole. People talk about constituencies. Our sole constituency is the interest of the Colony as a whole. We are created under the most unusual constitutional arrangement. I am not a student and cannot dare to tread on the ground of Constitutional Law. I know my limitation. Where I see I cannot go, I will not go and fall into a pit. There are many pitfalls, I believe, in Constitutional Law. We are created in a most unique manner. We are put here for a reason. Now, would it be proper for us to take a decision, the ultimate result of which might well be an alteration of the Constitution of this Colony, in that we would be giving away the right to make laws if we commit ourselves to the present form of Federation as we know it? That is why I say it would be improper.

Where is the urgency for a decision now? No matter what anybody does, the Government itself recognizes—in fact I have been told by them—that we cannot go into the Federation as a founder member, but the time will come when we will go in. We have to wait until after the Federation is

[Mr. Macnie]

formed. That is not likely until after 1958.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry the hon. the Attorney General is not here to hear the hon. Member on this particular point.

Mr. Macnie: That is my main reason for talking as I have done. Where is the urgency now? Why? The debate on the motion will serve the purpose to stimulate interest and cause people to talk about it, but that will only last for a short while. After the debate is finished, like the froth from Enos in a glass of water, interest drops, and the debate will cease to be prominent conversation.

I say, let us do as the hon. Member, Mr. Luckhoo has suggested. Let us keep in touch with the development of the matter. The Governor in Council has the power to do that without a motion from us. In fact it has done it, as Mr. Luckhoo has so rightly pointed out. Let that be done. I will not be any party to doing anything now which no proper Guianese would accept. I have a lot of friends in all parts of this country doing all kinds of work. I do not want them to come to me later and say: "See what you voted for!" I say, let us keep in touch. Do not rush it. Do not split the wood by forcing the plane against the knot—split the wood and ruin the whole work.

Mr. Lord: Mr. Speaker, I feel as the hon. Member, Mr. Macnie, did, that the 1951 Legislature has made it a very difficult matter for me to get up and speak on this very important matter. The subject of Federation is one that has been much discussed not only in the public Press but in the Legislatures of this Colony and the British West Indies. I think there is so much talk about Federation in the air today that the time is opportune for this Council

to give an expression of opinion as to whether or not this Colony should join in the proposed Federation. As regards the propriety of doing so, this is a duly constituted Legislature of this Colony, and as such it is competent to make a decision. But as the decision with regard to federating with the West Indian Colonies is one that affects the whole of the social, economic and political future of the Colony, I feel that this Interim Government, being composed of Nominated Members, should not commit the country to Federation, but it can very reasonably be expected to express an opinion as to whether the Colony should enter the Federation or not.

The hon. Member for Agriculture, Forests and Lands and Mines (Sir Frank Me David) in his analysis of the voting which took place in the Fourth Legislative Council, said that it was not expedient for the Nominated Members of that Legislature to vote. By the same token, even though the present Nominated Members may be of the opinion that Federation is the correct course, it would not be expedient for this Nominated Council to commit the Colony to Federation.

As the result of discussions and conferences which have taken place from time to time between representatives of this Colony and of the West Indian Governments, certain organizations have been formed which, on the face of them, are of a federal nature. We have the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture of the West Indies; the Customs Union, the Standing Committee on Closer Association, the Regional Economic Committee from which we get the service of the Trade Commissioner for British Guiana and the West Indies; we also have the University College of the West Indies and other organizations to which this Colony in one way or another does

subscribes. The next step that would seem logical is that of political federation. It seems to me, Sir, that the trend of events at the present time makes it inevitable that this Colony must eventually federate with the West Indies.

On the economic side, the West Indian Colonies, British Guiana and British Honduras are all separate territories and do not have the same voice in the fields of development as they would have, speaking as one unit. At present British Guiana and the West Indian Colonies unite in order to obtain markets overseas for their mutual benefit. That has been exemplified quite recently by the West Indies sending representatives abroad in connection with citrus markets, and sending representatives to attend conferences on General Agreement on Tariff and Trade. At the present time we are concerned with the future of our rice. This Colony is attempting to supply the West Indian markets, and at the same time certain West Indian Colonies are feverishly working to make themselves self-supporting in one of our main exportable commodities. With Federation I feel that that would cease, and we should then be assured of our markets in the West Indies.

With regard to the development of these areas, in order to improve the standards of living of British Guiana and the West Indies, a great deal of capital is needed, but that development cannot take place in my time purely by working one apart from the others. With our present and growing population there will be need for capital, and that capital, I feel, can only come from outside the Colony. There is need for the development of such projects as Water Power, Improved Communications Increased Agricultural Production, which cannot be undertaken purely by

the efforts of the people of this Colony. As I see it, that capital can only come from outside to improve the standard of living and increase the productivity of the Colony.

On the other hand there are certain disadvantages to be overcome with regard to federation. One of the chief disadvantages is that of the distance to be travelled from one territory to another. I am not prepared lightly to brush aside that particular aspect, because travel over such distances calls for the expenditure of a great deal of money. Another disadvantage is the question of the location of the Federal Capital. It has been already said that certain Islands desire the Federal Capital to be located in their territories, and there is bound to be some competition to have that done. The story is told that when the Colonies of Canada were to be federated there was great rivalry as to where the Federal Capital should be, and the good Queen Victoria at that time called for a map of the territory, closed her eyes and placed her finger on the spot which was to be the Federal Capital. That spot we now know as Ottawa. It is hardly likely that the same expediency will be applied in deciding the Federal Capital of this Federation.

Another disadvantage—and possibly one of the main ones—is the question of representation, about which we had a great discussion in this Council. I feel that this Colony is entitled to demand representation on a parity with Trinidad and Jamaica. We have got the land and they have got the people; without land their people would perish. Therefore, we have a strong bargaining point in our undeveloped areas. There is also the bogey of this Colony being swamped by the united votes of the small Islands. I do not think

[Mr. Lord]

that in actual fact that would be the case. I think there is far more rivalry between the Islands themselves than is likely to be between the islands and British Guiana.

There has been the talk of what has been called "Continental Destiny". I do not think that old *cliche* can be sustained. For one thing, there is the language difficulty. I do not think there is 10 per cent. of the population of this Colony who can speak either Portuguese, Spanish or Dutch.

I would also like to know what increase there has been in the volume of commercial traffic between British Guiana and Brazil, British Guiana and Venezuela for the past 50 years. The truth about it, in my view is lack of communication. If we had adequate means of communication, it is quite possible there would be an increased flow of traffic. But who is to be blamed for not having that increased communication? This Colony cannot on its own provide the money. I think history has shown that where there are similar racial groups federation is inevitable. You find that desire in the will of the people. We have had it in the United States of America. We have it in the Dominion of Canada; we have it in Malaya, and quite recently we have had it in the Central African Colonies. I do not feel that this is a time when this Colony can maintain the position of splendid isolation. We have got to federate.

However, Federation would bring another problem, and that is one which is the subject of discussion at the Conference to be held in Trinidad. That is the free movement of population. We cannot afford to have unrestricted immigration into this country. We do not

like to have a situation, such as has been created in the United Kingdom by the unrestricted influx of people from the West Indian Colonies. Such immigration should be controlled. It should be on a gradual basis, and immigrants should only be permitted to enter the Colony when suitable agricultural or other undertakings are prepared for their reception. I feel sure that the British Government has got a problem on its hands at the present time with regard to immigrants in the United Kingdom. On that account, if no other, it would be prepared to spend large sums of money to carry out schemes and projects in this Colony so as to absorb those persons who are now finding their way into the United Kingdom.

This question of immigration, so far as the West Indian Colonies are concerned, is a very serious one. We have seen what happened in Europe less than 16 years ago, when there was a war because of the need for what was called "Leibensraum". With your permission, Sir, I would read an extract from the report of the proceedings of the Commonwealth Parliaments Conference held in the Legislative Council Chamber at Nairobi in August of last year. It is on page 99, and is part of a speech made by Dr. the Honourable A. S. Cato of Barbados. He said:

"You can, of course, consider the question of immigration; and in the West Indies we have been trying to explore the possibilities of emigrating to British Honduras and to British Guiana. There are a lot of difficulties in the way—difficulties of a capital, difficulties of a certain amount of resentment in the territories themselves."

He went on to say:

"British Honduras needs a lot of capital development and I fear that for very good reasons some of the present population of British Honduras do not take kindly to the

advent of too big an influx of West Indians into their territory. For one reason or another—good reasons, and sometimes bad—the question of finding places for excess population within the West Indian area itself is a rather difficult one. But I fear Sir, that it is equally difficult if we cast our eyes over other parts of the British Commonwealth.”

That fact is there. The people of the West Indian Colonies have nowhere else to go but to this country and to British Honduras. Dr. Cato went on to say:

“Sir, if Canada finds it impossible to sponsor a Colombo Plan of that kind, we have in the West Indies a Caribbean Commission. It should not be beyond the bounds of possibility to devise a formula by which Canada can be directly associated with the work of the Caribbean Commission and give her social aid and technique and knowledge towards the development that has to take place in the West Indies.”

This gives us an indication of the trend of thought amongst leaders of the West Indian colonies. They feel that their people have got to emigrate, and funds have got to be provided for them to do so.

On the other hand, I feel that when the time comes for initiative in that regard, this Colony has got the men who will be able to put forward as strong a case as possible for British Guiana, to ensure that we get correct representation in the Federal parliament, and that the necessary funds would be provided to take care of any schemes of immigration. I feel that British Guiana, when the time comes, should demand an entry into the Federation on its own terms.

Mr. Speaker: Would any other hon. Member like to speak now? We have 15 minutes to spare. The hon. the Attorney General was absent when Mr. Macnie was speaking, but he raised a constitutional aspect in connection with what would happen if we did not join in now, and he suggested, not with any emphasis, that we would not be entitled to have the same privileges as if we had joined earlier.

I propose to adjourn until Tuesday, next week.