

SECOND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

(Constituted under the British Guiana (Constitution) (Temporary Provisions) Orders in Council, 1953 and 1956).

Thursday, 4th February, 1960.

The Council met at 2.30 p.m.

PRESENT :

Speaker, His Honour Sir Donald Jackson

Chief Secretary, Hon. D. M. Hedges.

Attorney-General, Hon. A. M. I. Austin, Q.C.

Financial Secretary, Hon. F. W. Essex, C.M.G.

} *ex officio*

The Honourable Dr. C. B. Jagan	—	<i>Member for Eastern Berbice (Minister of Trade and Industry)</i>
„ „ B. H. Benn		<i>Member for Essequibo River (Minister of Natural Resources)</i>
„ „ Janet Jagan		<i>Member for Western Essequibo (Minister of Labour, Health and Housing)</i>
„ „ Ram Karran		<i>Member for Demerara-Essequibo (Minister of Communications and Works)</i>
„ „ B. S. Rai		<i>Member for Central Demerara (Minister of Community Develop- ment and Education).</i>
Mr. R. B. Gajraj		<i>Nominated Member</i>
„ W. O. R. Kendall		<i>Member for New Amsterdam</i>
„ R. C. Tello		<i>Nominated Member</i>
„ F. Bowman		<i>Member for Demerara River</i>
„ L. F. S. Burnham		<i>Member for Georgetown Central</i>
„ S. Campbell		<i>Member for North Western District</i>
„ A. L. Jackson		<i>Member for Georgetown North</i>
„ E. B. Beharry		<i>Member for Eastern Demerara</i>
„ S. M. Saffee		<i>Member for Western Berbice</i>
„ Ajodha Singh		<i>Member for Berbice River</i>
„ Jai Narine Singh		<i>Member for Georgetown South</i>
„ R. E. Davis		<i>Nominated Member.</i>
„ A. M. Fredericks		<i>Nominated Member</i>
„ H. J. M. Hubbard		<i>Nominated Member</i>
„ A. G. Tasker, O.B.E.		<i>Nominated Member</i>

Mr. I. Crum Ewing — Clerk of the Legislature

Mr. E. V. Viapree — Assistant Clerk of the Legislature.

The Clerk read prayers.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Wednesday, 3rd February, 1960, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

LEAVE TO MR. RAI

Mr. Speaker: I have to announce that the hon. Minister of Community Development and Education (Mr. Rai) will be on leave on official duty from the 5th to the 18th of February this year.

ORAL ASKING AND ANSWERING OF QUESTIONS

MAIL AND THE POST OFFICE STRIKE

Mr. Tasker: I beg to ask the hon. Minister of Communications and Works Question No. 2 standing in my name on the Order Paper. Will the Honourable Minister of Communications and Works state whether all postal mail received by the Post Office before and during the recent strike by Government employees has been either delivered to addressees in British Guiana or despatched to addressees abroad; and if not, what action has been taken to hasten delivery and despatch?

The Minister of Communications and Works (Mr. Ram Karran): The Director of Posts and Telecommunications has confirmed that all postal mail received by the Postal Department before and during the recent strike by Government employees has either been delivered to the addressees in British Guiana or despatched to addressees oversea.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

The Financial Secretary (Mr. Essex): I beg to give notice of the introduction and First Reading of the

Public Loan Bill, 1960.

The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing (Mrs. Jagan): I beg to give notice of the introduction and First Reading of the

Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Bill, 1960,

ORDER OF THE DAY

BILLS — FIRST READING

The following Bills were read the first time :

A Bill intituled "An Ordinance to confer power to raise by loan or loans a sum not exceeding seventy-one million, eight hundred thousand dollars, and for matters connected therewith."

A Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance."

CONSTITUTIONAL DELEGATION TO LONDON

Mr. Speaker: The next item is the Motion standing in the name of the Member for Demerara River, as follows

"Whereas there was divergence of views among the members of the Constitutional Committee on the question as to what kind of Constitution should be recommended for British Guiana, which made it necessary for individual members to submit Minority Reports; and

Whereas it is necessary that all those who submitted Minority Reports should be afforded the opportunity to represent their views as expressed in the Report:

Be it resolved: That this Council recommends that the delegation to the Constitutional talks be comprised of all Members of the Legislative Council who are desirous of going."

Mr. Bowman: If we were to cast our minds back to the time when Sir Patrick Renison appointed the Elected and Nominated Members of this Legislative Council to be the Constitutional Committee it would be remembered that the majority in the Committee decided that the inhabitants of British Guiana should not be called before the Committee to express their opinion. It cannot be denied, further, that there was divergence of views during the deliberations of the

Committee, and that outside of the Committee, among members of the Majority Party there was divergence of views also, in fact in the Party's Council.

These things make it incumbent on me to move this Motion. Since we in the Constitutional Committee could not agree on specific issues, some of us were forced to submit Minority Recommendations. It would be unfair, therefore, if those of us who did so should not be given the opportunity to go to the Constitutional Talks and represent what we said in our Minority Reports.

It must be remembered that the constitutional advance that will result from the London Talks will spring from the long-held desire of the people of this country for self-government. It will be a move nearer the aspirations of the people, and so we found the Secretary of State for the Colonies suggesting that we should give the people a chance to express their views.

It would be wrong for this Government to impose its will on the people when it comes to constitutional advance. The Constitution of a country is so important that it is the "mother law", upon which all other laws are based. The Constitution is all the more important for a country becoming independent. If this country becomes independent, those who conduct its affairs can scrap the laws if they wish.

Since the Constitution of this country is an important matter, a wide cross-section of people should make up the delegation. What is the object of the Majority Party in wanting a delegation of seven? The Delegation to the Kenya Constitutional Talks consisted of 46 persons, besides the Advisers. Take little British Honduras in Central America, with its population of 85,000 people. That country sent a Delegation to London consisting of 15 persons, including the Governor. British Guiana has 83,000 sq. miles and over half a million people.

Mr. Speaker: I am a little puzzled. I hear the hon. Member mentioning the figure seven. I have not heard anything about it before.

Mr. Bowman: Sir, in the informal talks which Members of the Legislative Council have just had, the figure of seven was suggested by the Chairman of the Majority Party as being the size of the delegation.

Mr. Speaker: Please; if you do not mind, I do not wish to know of anything you have done in domesticity. This is a meeting of the Legislative Council, and as far as I am concerned, this is the first time such information is being discussed. If it were something accepted by all of us and you referred to it, there could be no objection. I am entitled to be able to follow what the hon. Member is saying, and it is difficult for me to follow something of which I am not aware. I have no desire to interrupt the hon. Member unless it is necessary; it is only that he mentioned that. Seven is a sacred number in another place.

Mr. Bowman: It was intimated by the Chairman of the People's Progressive Party, and it cannot be denied. It would be unfair if only seven Members from this Council went. The delegation that will leave these shores will be unlike that of 1926-28, in that this delegation will deal with matters leading to independence. It is a most important time in the history of this country, and a small number of persons should not go to say what should be done.

However, we know that dictatorship is the order of the day in this country. Dictatorship has caused the breaking up of the People's Progressive Party on quite a few occasions. It is coming, and the very dictatorship is in this Council. That is why I am opposed to a few men going to represent this country.

Since some Members have submitted Minority Reports, the Secretary of State

[MR. BOWMAN]

should know what is in their minds. If they are present he would hear both sides of the story; there are two sides to a shilling. The Resolution passed last year called in principle for internal self-government. They (the Majority Party) wanted independence but I did not agree with that. I am speaking before their faces now. We should stick to that Resolution.

It will be noted that my Motion does not state that every Member should go, but only those "who are desirous of going". Those who vote against this Motion will by so doing show that they do not want to go. If any Member rejects this Motion and then accepts nomination to the delegation later, that Member should be described in terms which I would not like to use here.

Mr. Ram Karran: Tell us.

Mr. Bowman: I will tell him myself. Some people are not manly enough to say what they think here. I am saying what I think, regardless of what the future holds for me.

There is not much more for me to say. I have made my views clear in the Motion. The delegation will be one of the greatest to leave this country, and every Member, Elected or Nominated, should be allowed to go and say what he thinks.

Mr. Beharry: I beg to second this Motion, and I will explain why I am supporting it. If we were to exclude the Nominated element of the Legislature and we were to begin by considering the other Members remaining as being capable of recommending our Constitution, then I say to refer to seven Members on the other side of the Table as the Government and to have 14 Members on this side as the Opposition is an anachronism. I think the 14 Members should be the Government, and the other seven should be the Opposition; so when I hear from the Government that

so many Members from the Government and so many Members from the Opposition should go to represent the country, I see the whole context of who is the Government and who is not the Government as a farce.

Now the Secretary of State, and even the Constitutional Committee's recommendation, said that a representative delegation should go to London in order to present what should be our Constitution. The point brought out there is — a representative delegation. I would like to emphasize the term 'representative delegation.' We have here on the one side, as I said, 14 Members, and on the other side we have seven Members. It is true that in this country we can see existing today a minority Government with a majority Opposition. Why do we find that here in our country, especially in recent weeks and recent months? For us to have a representative delegation; for us to see the true context of who the Government is, I think there should be a moving from the Opposition side of a few Members to the other side. If when the selection is made we have a majority from the Opposition, and if it is going to be argued that the majority has been taken from the Opposition while the minority has come from the Government, I will say that that will not be the truth because there are several Members sitting on this side of the Table or on the Opposition side who do not really belong to this side. They should be on the other side.

A representative delegation, in my view, does not mean individuals — human beings. It means representative in the context of human thought representing the various views of the people of our country. So that when we talk about a representative delegation we must talk in the context of the views of the people of our country because the Constitution to be written will concern the entire country and a representative delegation will have to be a delegation to express the various views of the people of this country.

I agree with my friend on my left when he said that had the Majority Party allowed evidence to be taken from a cross-section of our people throughout the country, we would have heard much more and, maybe, the recommendations presented by this Council to the Secretary of State would have been different, because they would have been influenced by divergent views. I know there is a burning desire on the part of Members of this Council to see our country free. Every free and sane man, no matter how conservative he may be, every individual with any sense of responsibility would like to make sure that we receive freedom in its true context — freedom of the individual — not the will of some people because they had been elected—elected not by the majority of the people who have been able to reason for themselves or have been able to see the true leaning of the politicians and parties, but by people who have got a burning desire to remove themselves from the conditions under which they live.

We may get leaders, politicians and legislators who may not be fit to run a free country. There are conservative people, as I said, who would like to see this country free, but they would like to make sure that those politicians are matured individuals who are able to appreciate and respect the different views of other people. There are some people who do not have respect for other people's views or would not tolerate the views of other people once they can get their views put over.

This Motion is an important one. It deals with the basis of the freedom of the people of this country. If any Member feels that he cannot make any contribution to this delegation I cannot see why he should be called upon to go. Similarly, I do not see if any Member feels he can make a contribution why he should not be permitted to go and express his views. That is one of the reasons why I support this Motion. Members have been to me and have ex-

pressed their desire to go with the delegation and asked that I give them my support, but some Members have not got the courage, as the hon. Member for Demerara River has rightly said, to stand up here and say, "I have a viewpoint which I would like to put forward in order to make sure that our country would be run along lines by which individuals would be given freedom which today we seek."

The mover of the Motion has already intimated that several delegations, within recent times, have visited England to seek constitutional advancement for their countries and they took with them representatives in the context of various views, not representatives because they were human beings but representatives of a cross section of the country in order that a true understanding of the people would be evaluated by the Secretary of State for the Colonies and that he would have an understanding of how the people are thinking. Rather than allowing a small delegation to go and throw our country backward, I would say the best course to take would be to send representatives of a cross-section of our country.

In 1953, we saw the emergence of a Constitution better than that of any of the West Indian islands and today we see a Constitution lower than that of any other West Indian island. That is why I say every legislator who has the country at heart should support this Motion. It is not incumbent on any Member to go with the delegation. The Motion says that any Member who is desirous of going should go. We have had troops in this country because of a constitutional crisis. I would not like to see a recurrence of that. We have had Elected Members of this Council who were said to be representatives of the people and, rightly or wrongly, it has been argued that those people should remain there even if they carry this country to the gutter, because of democracy; but people can use democracy to impose their will upon the people.

[MR. BEHARRY]

The Constitution of a country is the basis upon which a country develops. The prosperity of this country depends upon how we behave ourselves. We have often heard that the people's earning power has been reduced; we have heard that the purchasing power of the people is not what it should be. I say even the Constitution can also influence the economic destinies of our country. I am asking Members of this Council to appreciate that a representative delegation means a delegation representing the different views of our people.

I know this Motion has been brought with sincerity; I know it has been brought with honesty of purpose because the Mover knows the Government of this country. It is the burning desire of the Mover to see that freedom is given to this country — freedom in its true context and meaning.

I ask Members of this Council to view with seriousness the importance, the necessity and the urgency of supporting this Motion. I commend the Motion to every Member of this Legislature. I know for certain that there are Members, even on the Government side, who may be willing to express different views if they were given the opportunity to go and express their individual views. I therefore ask each and every Member not to dismiss this Motion lightly, because in my view it is the most important Motion that has been brought before this Council since its inauguration, because it seeks to protect the rights of the people of this country to true freedom and independence.

Mr. Speaker (*after a pause*): If no other Member wishes to speak I shall put the Question.

Mr. Jackson: I am somewhat disappointed that the question of the selection of a delegation to London to discuss the type of Constitution which we hope to have for this country in the future should have been brought into

open debate. I assume that those who had thought of an informal discussion—

Mr. Speaker: The matter is now before this Council.

Mr. Jackson: Yes, Sir, but for the purpose of record I wish to say why I am disappointed, because I hold the view now that after having met for more than two hours yesterday—

Mr. Speaker: I have said before that there is nothing to prevent individual Members of this Council or Members of the Council in combination discussing in a domestic way any matter that concerns the country or this Council, but this Council cannot take any notice of a domestic discussion until the matter is properly before the Council. Whatever may have been done privately or informally is really not a matter for this Council, unless something is crystallised and brought before the Council. A Motion is before the Council, and Members will recollect that on a previous occasion when the Mover thought there was something which might anticipate his Motion I referred him to one of our Standing Orders which precludes any anticipation in this Council. There has been none, and none will be tolerated. I do not wish Members to refer to any details of any domestic discussion they may have had on this matter.

Mr. Jackson: I appreciate Your Honour's observation and I accept your ruling, except to say that when the proposal was made for that informal meeting it came from the Government side, and I take it that the idea of the Government was that it would be better to have this matter settled without coming to open Council, more especially when Members of the Government knew that a Motion had already been tabled to discuss the matter.

I agree with the hon. Mover of the Motion that a delegation going to London to discuss the question of our Constitution ought to be as representative as it could possibly be, and I fail to see any-

one who could be justified in taking any other stand, more especially in view of the fact that the Committee which was appointed to make recommendations for a new Constitution in the first place had disagreed upon the acceptance of memoranda, and had also refused to hear oral evidence from members of the public. I remember very clearly that some Members of this Council who were absent from the meeting of the Constitutional Committee at which that decision was taken, were very anxious to have placed on record their disagreement with the decision of the Committee.

That decision of the Constitutional Committee placed this country in a very embarrassing position, for it placed the Governor of the day in the position of having to come to this Council and say that a Constitution is not the property of Members of the Legislature, but that it concerns the public in general, and that because of that decision by the Committee he was forced to invite anyone who desired to submit memoranda to do so through him. That was a very unfortunate position. In my opinion it demonstrated very clearly that we lack statesmanship, we lack the ability to be flexible on any matter at all which concerns the country, as the decision of the Committee violated one of the ordinary principles of life—that when you govern a country, you govern it for all its people.

Laws are made for the people and in their interest, and it is my opinion that if laws are not made for the people and in their interest they are bad laws. If that principle applies to ordinary law it applies equally to a Constitution which takes care not only of those people who are alive today but those who are yet unborn. That is why it is very important and imperative that any delegation which is going to London to discuss proposals for a new Constitution should comprise a representative number of the Members of this Council who have been elected by the people in all walks of life. It has been said that we have been elected by

the people and we can speak for them, but I am convinced, and I know for certain, that the question of a change of Constitution did not at any time form part of any manifesto which was presented at the last General Election, therefore no Member of this Council has any right to say that we have received any mandate from the people as to what type of Constitution this country should have. For that reason I am very strongly of the view that any delegation which does not take into account the divergent views of the people who are represented in this Council is a delegation which cannot speak for the people of this country.

It has been said in some quarters that one Member of this Council is here to represent minority interests, but I disagree with that view because, under the present Constitution, there is no provision for anyone to be elected by anyone set of people. Every Member here has been elected by a broad measure of the population of this country, to a greater or lesser degree. To say that "Mr. X", who is a Member of this Council, can represent a minority view is, in my opinion, completely erroneous.

The Report of the Committee which was appointed by the Governor to make recommendations for a new Constitution indicates that there are divergent views on the subject. The People's Progressive Party recommends complete independence. It is of the view that as an independent country it could form part of the British Commonwealth of Nations, but anyone who peruses the report of the Committee will find that if we were to accept the suggestion of full independence now, there are several other factors with which some people do not agree. The People's National Congress, through its members in this Council and on the Committee, recommends full internal self-government. Therefore, those two Parties hold conflicting views, and apart from the major differences between them there are differences which exist in detail as to what should happen under a new Constitution.

[MR. JACKSON]

The National Labour Front, through the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Campbell, shares neither view. Mr. Campbell has said that he is not in favour of full and complete independence or full internal self-government; he wants a half-way house between the two ideas. Therefore, any delegation which does not reflect the view of the National Labour Front, as expressed by Mr. Campbell, could not properly say that it is speaking on behalf of the people of this country as a whole.

Any delegation which is going to leave this country to secure an improved Constitution ought to do so with the very minimum of points upon which its Members disagree. If we do not observe that we will find ourselves in the same position as Dr. Marshall when he and his colleagues from Singapore could not agree and left London disappointed. A majority of votes is not necessarily the answer, but a reduction of the points of disagreement.

There is the Guianese Independence Movement. The Member for Georgetown South, who is its Leader, supports full independence. Although he would like full independence outside of the British Commonwealth, he nevertheless supported independence within the Commonwealth in the Constitutional Committee Report. So it is quite right to say that the Member changed his stand.

It is evident that this country would welcome an improved Constitution, but it is I think very doubtful that the people would reject the idea that as representative a delegation as possible should go. Some people, of course, might say that representation need not be large, and that would be reasonable, because nations of people are represented by their ambassadors, one in each country abroad.

In this case, however, no one person can be chosen and no one Party can be said to represent the people's

true wishes. Even if we go further away from one Party to two Parties, even then it cannot be said that all the people's wishes are represented. And it cannot be denied that most of the Parties in British Guiana other than the People's Progressive Party stem from the People's Progressive Party. It therefore shows that a great many people do not agree with the P.P.P. Out of five Parties which have representation in this Council, three were formed by former P.P.P. members, and one, the National Labour Front, stemmed from the old United Democratic Party.

That brings me to the point that the mass of the people, the non-intellectuals, have not made up their minds that they can rely fully on any one or any two political parties. The Nominated Members are persons who perhaps have not had the desire to face the electorate. Whether that is so or not, the fact is that they are associated with important interests, and because of that were chosen to represent these interests in the Council. It is true that they are not bound and tied in their actions here; it is true that they are given the freedom to speak as they like and vote as they like. Why therefore should they not be included in the delegation?

I support the view that a representative delegation is one which would take care of all the views expressed by the Committee reporting on Constitutional advance. In the interest of the country I ask the P.P.P. to be more flexible than it is in this problem and agree to have included in the delegation people representing different views, if even critical of the P.P.P. Personally, I have always acted on the principle of allowing a person who opposes my views to have his say. In that way I know where he stands and I act accordingly. I believe life grows with opposition. I have never run away from anyone who opposed me. I think the opposite is happening in this issue: the Majority Party seems to be fighting shy of having in the delegation people whose views will have some influence.

I would plead with the Government to give more consideration to this Motion and if possible—I wish it were possible—to accept it and not hold on to any concept with which they may have come to this Council.

Mr. Campbell: This Motion, I repeat after one of my colleagues, is the most important Motion tabled since this Legislature has come into being, for it gives the public an opportunity to hear the views expressed by several Members. The Motion calls for a representative delegation comprising of the whole of the Council. If that is done, certainly, we will have full representation.

In 1958, a Motion was tabled here by the hon. Member for Georgetown South asking for Constitutional Reform and that a representative delegation should go to London to talk the matter over with the Secretary of State for the Colonies. That Motion was lost. I believe in progress in every sphere of life, even in politics. I believe that the people of every race or nation have the right to have some say in the affairs of their country. I also believe that they have got the right to rule themselves in time. I will qualify it this way: when the time comes for the people of the Colonies to say what they want to run the affairs of their countries—politically, socially and otherwise—then it is high time for those Colonies to have full-fledged independence.

The Government amended that Motion to ask for full independence for this Colony. I disagreed with that Amendment. I was, perhaps, the only Member to say 'No' to it, but owing to the intricacies of procedure it was written as unanimously carried. However, the outcome of that was that the Secretary of State for the Colonies asked the Governor to appoint a Committee of the Legislature to get the opinions of members of the public by memoranda and evidence. In spite of the Chairman's invitation to members of the public to offer their opinions, at the first meeting of the Committee—I think there were

about six of us absent—a Motion was passed stating that they were competent to write a Constitution for the whole country. That was not in accordance with democratic practice, as I understand it. That was more in accordance with the dictatorial ways of the Government. However, the door was locked for nine months, for the Report has gone to London and we are now asked to follow and discuss it at the Colonial Office.

The Motion here asks that the whole Committee go to London. I may be in it, but would insist that the delegation be comprised of representatives of the various political ideologies and opinions. I am tired of having one-sided views in this Council. We are here with the consent of the people for the benefit of the people; therefore, let a delegation representative of the people be sent—a delegation that would please the majority of Guianese.

I said sometime ago that a country of 85,000 people sent a delegation of 15 Members to talk about a constitution. This country wants to send seven. I hold that seven does not constitute a representative delegation. I would like to see British Guiana become an independent country, taking its place among the great nations of the world. I am not against that idea, but I would like Guiana to be run by men who really know the job of running a country for the good of one another. I have my doubts, at the present moment, that we have the men who have the welfare of the country at heart. They are too sectional. We want men broad enough — men who have love for their fellow men and men who make sacrifices for the good of the country. If I were sure that we have got those men here today, I would bow and say, "yes, carry on", but I am not convinced at this moment.

We are just learning how to run our country. Let us not rush it. Just writing sentences does not mean you know anything about State affairs. There are thousands of us who do not know the meaning of the word 'politics'. More

[MR. CAMPBELL]

often than not they say "politicians are clever guys; don't trust them." And again, one of the reasons why I am afraid, and I express the views and opinions of many, is because we are too race conscious. To have full-fledged independence, I see trouble ahead; I see confusion. I do not see harmony and peace. I see chaos. I would suggest to the Government to give this whole matter a second thought, and that it should not be too dictatorial about it, for that attitude would boomerang sooner or later.

I am a reasonable man; I pride myself as being reasonable and as being able to use my intelligence in weighing things. I will not go into further details, but I say that we need men of honour, integrity and loyalty to this country in the right form and not in a one-sided sort of way. I have suggested that we should ask for internal self-government and it has been said that I am ultra-conservative, but I do not mind that designation. I am afraid, and there are many who are afraid of what might happen if this country were given full independence now. It is my opinion that we are not yet ready to manage our own affairs. One of the things we have not got is money. We have to be dependent upon grants-in-aid, loans and what not. In my opinion political independence for this country at the present moment is as farcical as a child of seven years telling his parents that he wants to get married and asking to be furnished with a home and furniture, but saying that his parents must have nothing to do with his house.

As much as I support the Motion I would like to move an Amendment so as to fix a definite number for the delegation. I therefore move the deletion of all the words after the words "comprised of" in the third line of the Resolve Clause, and the substitution therefor of the following:

"11 members, 3 representing the People's Progressive Party, 3 representing the People's National Congress, 1 representing the Progressive Liberal Party, 1 representing the Guianese Independence

Movement, 1 representing the National Labour Front and 2 nominated members selected by them from among their number".

In moving this Amendment I would like to suggest that the Secretary to the Constitutional Committee, the Clerk of the Legislature, should accompany the delegation to London, and I am asking that that suggestion should be incorporated in my Amendment.

Mr. Speaker: It is purely a matter for you. You may proceed step by step.

Mr. Campbell: I will do it separately.

Mr. Kendall: In seconding the Amendment just moved by the hon. Member for North Western District, I wish to reserve the right to speak at a later stage.

The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Benn); I do not think there is much necessity to go over how we came to our decisions in the Constitutional Committee, what were the Motions moved, or how the Committee went about its business. It is quite late in the day and we are nearing the time when we should make up our minds as to who should comprise the delegation and when they should leave the country. I understand that we have to leave at an early date.

What I do wish to say is that every opportunity is taken in this Council to malign the Majority Party. Many Members on the other side of the Table, whenever they get up to speak on constitutional issues, point their fingers at the Majority Party. They say it is dictatorial, it takes away people's lands, people's cars, people's wives and everything.

Mr. Speaker: People's wives? I have never heard that.

Mr. Benn: That was a slip of the tongue, Sir. Many Members on the

other side seem to have very little to say, except to attack the political party which has made many of them the politicians they are today, and which has put many of them in the seats they occupy in this Council. I am not afraid to say that I am a member of the People's Progressive Party and that I have been put here by that Party. I have not defected. Political parties all over the world put Members in parliaments, and those Members owe allegiance to their parties. We hear in this Council talk about Members having their personal views, and that the Majority Party uses its majority.

I wonder what some of the Members on the other side would do if they were sitting among the Labour Members in the House of Commons when the Conservative Party uses its cast iron majority to carry any matter? We hear on the other side that the Majority Party is not a democratic party; that it uses its cast iron majority, or whatever majority it is. But, as I understand it, that is the essence of democracy, and in the Mother of Parliaments the party which has a majority rules the country. But in this Council, we of the Majority Party are being maligned because we have the sense and the tactics not only to keep our side together but to get Members on the other side to see our point of view and to vote with us. When some of those Members on the other side see our point of view and vote with us they are regularly insulted by other Members who do not want to see our point of view.

But this is not the time for much talking. Many Members like to have what they say recorded in *Hansard*, and I know that future generations will be ashamed of the many things that have been said by Members on the other side of the Table in this 20th century, in this day and age when people in Africa and Asia are standing up and fighting for their right, fighting for freedom and democracy, fighting for independence. Many Members in this Council say they

are afraid, as if we have some *kanaima* hiding behind some door. All these things are being noted for the future, and I do not wish to say more, except to move an Amendment to the Motion moved by the hon. Member for Demerara River. My Amendment, which has been circulated, is for the deletion of all the words after the words "comprised of" in the third line of the Resolve Clause, and the substitution therefor of the following:

"3 Members of the Majority Party,
3 Members of the Elected Opposition,
and 1 Nominated Member".

Mrs. Jagan: I beg to second the Amendment.

Mr. Beharry: I would like to make some observations on the last Amendment. When I spoke in support of the original Motion I stated quite clearly that we should send a representative delegation—representative in the context of the thoughts and aspirations of our people throughout the country. It is true that Members sit here because they were elected in 1957 by the people of this country, but since the 1957 elections we have seen the emergence in our country of a monster in the form of racialism—not what political parties should stand for.

We have seen the emergence of political parties representing not what people stand for, but racial groups. No one can deny that the People's Progressive Party is not a racial Party today. Any man who will deny that the P.P.P. is a racial Party—

Mrs. Jagan: Nonsense.

Mr. Beharry: Mr. Speaker, it is my view, and I would like to express it in this Council.

A Member: Irrelevant.

Mr. Beharry: In 1957 we told the people what we could do for them. The

[MR. BEHARRY]

supporters voted for the Party and the candidate in expectation that they could do something for them. Today, those supporters are disappointed because they have not seen the promises fulfilled. They have seen the emergence of racial thought throughout the country. That is as far as the P.P.P. goes. On the other hand—

Mr. Speaker: I understood you to say you were speaking on the last question.

Mr. Beharry: On the last Amendment, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The last question is quite correct. That is, that the delegation should comprise of three members of the Majority Party, three members of the "Elected Opposition"—I do not know if that means three other Elected Members—and one Nominated Member.

Mr. Beharry: In dealing with this matter of sending a delegation and the P.P.P.'s approach to it, I regret that I cannot in the context of the subject refrain from calling names. To turn to the other Party, which is supposed to represent the unofficial Opposition: this Party also has a racial slant. Not that I am accusing any Party: I am speaking of an aspect of politics as I see it, one that is important when we are talking of sending a delegation to secure a Constitution which reflects the thoughts of all the people. I am certain that had it not been for racial thinking many people of African descent would not have been followers of the P.N.C. and people of East Indian descent, followers of the P.P.P. We may have started out with ideologies and with programmes of what we could do for the people, but out of frustration the Indian people have found no other alternative. So that if this Council were to send a small delegation based on representation of political Parties, we cannot be certain that it will be a representative delegation, one repre-

sentative of the aspirations, views and thinking of the broad, common masses. Because of this I am not prepared to support the idea of a small delegation.

Further, I have heard reference to the fact that Parties apart from the P.P.P. and the P.N.C. may be one-man Parties, and it was said that a representative of one of those Parties sits in this Council. In that case, if that Member were to be selected to go in the delegation, it could not be said that he represents the feeling of the broad masses of the people.

There was talk that Members on the Government side were being maligned. That brings me back to the point I made earlier, that independence is a treasured thing. It is also something which should ensure tolerance for the views of both sides. It was also said that certain people sit here because of political parties. That may be true, but it is also true that there are people sitting on the other side because of their race. We know that if some of those people were put to contest a seat in what may be termed an African constituency they would never sit in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker: I am not so sure that this is relevant.

Mr. Beharry: Sir, I see all those things as inescapable facts in our political situation. The people at one time hoped that a political giant would relieve them of their suffering. They were disappointed and they had to fall back on race. Men like myself hope and pray that all leaders will one day see the true meaning of politics and realize the prosperity they can create.

It is not really my purpose to criticize any individual, but I do express the hope that when this country attains freedom and independence its destiny will be guided by men who are mature and who are capable enough to run this country. I have said some biting things, but they are true. I appeal to Members of this

Council who love their country to take stock and see where they are going. Some people, because of their burning desire to rule, have taken this country backward rather than forward.

Mr. Speaker: Just for my own edification: would the hon. Minister of Natural Resources enlighten me as to the meaning of the words "...Members of the Elected Opposition" in his Amendment?

Mr. Benn: Three other Elected Members.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. Tasker: I approach this Amendment from a slightly different viewpoint from the last speaker's. I am one who still feels that the Constitutional Committee made a very serious mistake in refusing to accept memoranda and oral representations from the public. I think it is a pity for two reasons.

Firstly — and quite obviously — our deliberations were viewed by the public in an unhappy light. Secondly, I think, on re-reading the Report of that Committee, that had we had the benefit of oral views and memoranda, we might possibly have come closer — at least on some issues — to unanimity than the Report records.

I am not happy about the Motion by the hon. Member for Demerara River, because I do not think it is good enough simply to say that any Member of the original Committee should have a chance of going to London and arguing the issues with the Colonial Office. I think we must be more specific in terms of representation of views.

Although the Amendment by the Minister of Natural Resources goes some-way towards recognizing formally the divergencies of views, my own belief is that the Amendment by the hon. Member for North Western District is probably the best compromise in the circumstances. I

want to make it clear that I do not support it on the ground of numbers alone, for I do not think there is any virtue in size; but I think that the views expressed and recorded in the Report of the Constitutional Committee are too varied to be reflected, except in general terms, in a small delegation.

My belief, therefore, is that having produced this Report, and having brought upon ourselves a measure of disagreement by our refusal to accept evidence from the public, the only thing to do is to endeavour to give representation to as wide a cross-section of views as can be found from among the Members of this Council.

Mr. Kendall: I think the Member for Demerara River should be complimented for his Motion because, from the views expressed by the Members who had spoken before me, it has given added information which should form a very important addition to the Constitutional Committee's Report of 1959.

I agree with the Motion because I feel that this country should have a delegation to the United Kingdom that can be truly said to be representative of the views of the people of this country. I feel that the future of British Guiana is largely dependent upon this delegation and the type of Constitution it would bring back to this Colony.

It was said, not very long ago, that some Members are very silent and their views are only heard when the Budget is debated. That might be true to some extent. For those of us who have been in this Assembly for over a decade, as I have been, and have listened to various statements by various Members, it is well worth the while to be silent lest in expressing one's views as one would like to express them, one would come to no other conclusion than that this is a forum where one can see the various intrigues, subterfuges and violations of consciences that can ever be shown in any organized body. Because this debate deals with the type

[MR. KENDALL]

of individuals to be selected, and because I have as much interest as any other person in this country—it is my country and I think of its welfare all the time — I think it is right that I should express my views.

The Amendment by the Member for North Western District, as one speaker said, is a reasonable compromise to the Motion by the Member for Demerara River. You, Sir, before the Amendment by the hon. Minister of Natural Resources was submitted, had no idea of the number as suggested by the Majority Party. Now that it has become known, one will see from that Amendment that in truth and in fact, if that Amendment is carried, this country will be sending a very unbalanced delegation — five Members of the Majority Party and two Members with opposite views. My calculation is based on the fact that the one who spoke never supported anything or any view that I have expressed here in this Council.

Mr. Benn: To a point of correction. The Amendment says three Members of the Majority Party and not five.

Mr. Speaker: I am listening.

Mr. Kendall: I have been here over 10 years—13 years—and I think I should know what I am saying. When I stand to say anything I know what I am saying.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot quite follow when you say “five”. It seems to me that the Amendment has three from the Majority Party, three of the other Elected Members and one Nominated Member. How you make that five from the Majority Party I really do not know.

Mr. Kendall: You, yourself, found it difficult to appreciate the Amendment as presented to you.

Mr. Speaker: I was not quite sure who is elected to the Opposition. He

then qualified it by saying he really intended it to read, three other Elected Members.

Mr. Kendall: That clarification was for your benefit, Sir, because of the question asked. I know that that Amendment was purposely written and couched in the type of words that would carry a decision and would give the necessary protection in the event of any criticism being made.

Mr. Speaker: I would not say that.

Mr. Kendall: I think, with all due deference, at times Members should be given an opportunity to express their views and if, by any chance, their views are wrong, time will tell.

Mr. Speaker: I do not mind any Member expressing his or her view, but when Members seek to take the powers of divinity, it is just there that I am in doubt

Mr. Kendall: As a student of metaphysics I think I know what I am saying. I know, too, that if the Amendment by the hon. Minister of Natural Resources is accepted, they will see five of the Members are sympathizers of the Government. As one speaker rightly said: This is a most important debate based on a Motion by the Member for Demerara River because the future of this country will rest upon the results of the delegation. And it is true that the views of the Majority Party are not the views of a very large and responsible section of this country, because a good many of us feel that British Guiana is not ripe for independence. Although we would all like to see British Guiana independent, we feel that to reach that goal there are certain stages that must be adopted.

A good many of us feel that we should have full internal self-government as a first step. If that Amendment is accepted the delegation would comprise four Members who are in favour of immediate independence, one Mem-

ber who may be induced to compromise at some stage, while two Members will have a big task, but not an impossible task, to convince the Colonial Office that their views are the views of a very large and responsible section of the people of this country. Because of that I am persuaded to suggest that the size of the delegation should be increased so as to embrace a wider field of opinion and give the Colonial Office an opportunity to see how the country is thinking.

I have my doubts and they are fortified by some of the observations made by Members who were, at some period, closely associated with the Party in power. Because of that, I hope that the members of the Majority Party, if their love for British Guiana is as true as they profess, will be big enough to forget some of their personal dislikes and face the issue that the delegation is expected to secure a Constitution which will help to make British Guiana a prosperous country; because it is true that the type of Constitution which a country has, helps to attract foreign investors. If, in spite of its urge for independence, this country cannot do without foreign investors, I think it is well that Government should see to it that proposals are put forward, for a new Constitution for British Guiana, which would attract more capital into the country and encourage people with capital who are already in British Guiana, to have the impetus to expand in various fields. Therefore, I think that as a compromise, the Amendment put forward by the hon. Member for North Western District should be accepted, as it would give the people of the country the feeling that their representatives in this Council are thinking of their interests.

Mr. Tello: I desire to comment on the Motion and the two Amendments which have been moved. In the case of the original Motion, I am not proposing an Amendment but merely making a suggestion to the Mover. I think that as his Motion stands, it is a bit untidy. I would suggest to him that in the last line of the Resolution the full stop be deleted and a

comma substituted, and that the following words be added:

“and who signify such intention not later than Monday, February 8, 1960.”

I am suggesting this addition because, as the Motion stands, it would be possible for a Member to decide at the very last moment whether he desires to go or not.

Mr. Speaker: When is the last moment? Do you know?

Mr. Tello: The last moment would be when the delegation is leaving.

Mr. Speaker: In point of time?

Mr. Tello: I do not know. It was suggested to us that the delegation will leave early. We should know who are the people who will comprise the delegation. It is up to the hon. Member whether he accepts my suggestion or not. In the case of the Amendment moved by the Minister of Natural Resources, I feel that it does not fulfil the object of Resolution No. XXIX passed by this Council on the 11th June, 1958, which states:

“...requests Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies to receive a representative delegation chosen by and from this Council...”

The hon. Minister's Amendment, if accepted, would rob the delegation of its true representative quality. Let us examine what was intended by “a representative delegation”. At the time when that Motion was moved, I believe it was anticipated that, as closely as possible, unanimity would have been reached in the Report of the Constitutional Committee. But whether or not we arrived at a unanimous Report, the Resolution requested that there should be a representative delegation. The hon. Minister's Amendment suggests three Members of the Majority Party, three Members of the Elected Opposition and one Nominated Member. Can anyone truly say that that would be a representative delegation from this Council?

[MR. TELLO]

I do not think it is necessary for me to go into the constitution of this Legislature. We know that there are several political parties represented here, and that there are Elected Members who are not members of any party. There are also Nominated Members who represent specific interests. If the delegation is restricted to three Members of the Majority Party, three Members of the Elected Opposition and one Nominated Member, it means that of the four political parties represented in this Council one will not be represented on the delegation, because it is impossible for four parties to be represented by three persons.

In the case of the Nominated Members, I heard my friend on my left (Mr. Davis) say in another place that they represent big business (commercial and industrial) small business and Labour. I would like to know how one Nominated Member on the delegation will represent those three interests?

In the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for North Western District we see some effort to select a representative delegation, although it has been stated by Members who are qualified to express an opinion, that some of the political parties represented in this Council are not really representative of the people's views. But the fact remains that they are parties, and I suppose they are recognized publicly and are entitled to representation.

We must bear in mind that if some of the recommendations in the Constitutional Committee's Report are accepted by Her Majesty's Government, it may be some years before another Constitutional delegation will be sent to the United Kingdom. For instance, it is recommended in the Committee's Report that in the future, any amendment to the Constitution should be made by the Legislature. In the circumstances it is very necessary that we should send as representative a delegation as possible. As the majority

decision of the Constitutional Committee is that in future any amendment to our Constitution should be made by our Legislature, I think in fairness to the inhabitants of British Guiana this Constitutional delegation should be representative of every possible opinion.

I think it is a mistake for the Government, in effect, to say, "We are not taking Mr. X because he is known as a reactionary and his views are not modern." In fact, it would be unfair to the United Kingdom Government and to British Guiana. We, and the world, should be satisfied that all viewpoints have been heard before a decision is made.

We are, in effect, seeking an extension of democracy. Let us in doing so observe democratic practice by protecting the Minority and allowing it to be heard. The whole world would have greater faith in British Guiana if, in the selection of this delegation, we demonstrate that we accept democratic practice.

The financing of the delegation must be taken into account. In this respect I want to observe that to say that anybody who wishes to go should be allowed to go is too wide. The Mover of the original Motion (the Member for Demerara River) should tidy it up a bit and say that at a given time Members should state whether they intend to go, and funds should be provided for the expenses of those going. In that case we will know at a certain point how the delegation is made up, and from that point we will proceed to narrow the margin of differences so that we can go to London with as united a front as possible.

If we look at the Amendment moved by the Member for North Western District we will see that he is suggesting that ample provision be made for the expression of every shade of opinion, as put forward in the Constitutional Committee. He is perfectly right in doing so when we consider that we never had the opportunity to listen to evidence from the

masses of people. His Amendment can give the Majority Party an opportunity to say: "We will tolerate you by giving you a seat at this Conference; we will take you reactionary guys along so that you cannot say we only brought our stooges".

It was said in another place that in the old days in this country, the conservatives and the capitalists used to appoint a couple of labour champions so as to balance the composition of different bodies. Things are different now. The people have gone to the polls and under adult suffrage have chosen their representatives. Even after the elections, we found consultations going on with the Leader of the Majority Party, after which nominations were made. Nominated Members were considered necessary, and they were given a place in this Council in the interest of British Guiana. Any sane or right-thinking man would therefore agree that since the Nominated Members were chosen after consultation with the Leader of the Majority Party in order to balance the composition of this Legislative Council, it follows that the Nominated Members have just as much a claim to proportionate representation on the delegation as the Elected Members.

Important interests in this country are simply handed this by the Majority Party: "We will choose one!" That is not the spirit in which the delegation should leave this country. That is a sign of mass leadership and mass pressure. "We are in the majority and we will impose our will."

Mr. Speaker: The time has passed but it seems that you are in the middle of your discourse.

Mr. Tello: Exactly, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I was hoping that we might have been able to conclude today. That is my ardent desire; if not, we will have to come back tomorrow.

The Chief Secretary (Mr. Hedges): This is an important Motion that we are discussing today and, of course, everybody is interested in it. It is important that we should finish it at an early date so that those who have been chosen can prepare themselves for London; and the earlier we can expedite and finish this business, the better.

I beg to move that the Council adjourn until eight o'clock this evening when we will continue.

Members rose—

The Minister of Trade and Industry (Dr. Jagan): I think all Members will agree that this is a very important matter and the quicker we get it settled, the better it is. I did not know that by making such a request it would be so upsetting to Members on the opposite side, because the hon. Member for Georgetown Central knows that on several occasions I took time out and had meetings with him; therefore, I would suggest that he should meet us on this occasion. I would also appeal to other Members to try to meet the wishes of the Members on this side of the Table. If this is not done, it will mean that the hon. Minister will have to ask leave to go to Jamaica or he will have to postpone his visit.

This is a very important Motion. I would therefore like to appeal to Members for that reason, and also for the reason suggested by the hon. the Chief Secretary; that is, Members would want enough time to prepare themselves on this matter. If the Members on the opposite side say they do not want to meet this afternoon, then the Members on this side would say they would have to meet after the hon. Minister's return; that is, in the next 10 days. Therefore, I am pleading with Members on the other side.

Mr. Burnham: The hon. Minister of Trade and Industry has, with accuracy, alluded to two interviews which we had but, fortunately for me and for him, we both had a particular time to meet. I

[MR. BURNHAM]

agree. But it is unfair to ask Members to come back at eight o'clock. Certainly, we are men of affairs; we are busy men. We have heard of the importance of this matter, but I have not heard of the importance of this matter as against the importance of the visit of the Minister of Community Development and Education to Jamaica. I do not see any difference between meeting this evening and meeting tomorrow. It is only to decide who is to go on the delegation. I cannot understand why our failure to meet this evening should result in the postponement of this debate. If it were the Leader of the Majority Party I would have thought it reasonable, but why, if a Minister has to leave, must we postpone the debate for 10 days? The Minister of Trade and Industry at one time pleads and at another time he threatens; and I think, also, there has been no solicitude for the convenience of the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Don't worry about the Speaker.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: We will continue until six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker is always very accommodating. He was here since a quarter-past one.

Mr. Jackson: I think it is unfair to ask that we meet tonight. The hon. the Chief Secretary ought to have recognized that the debate on this Motion, which is so important and urgent, would have gone on longer than five o'clock, and he should have seen the need as to whether or not we should go on tonight. It is unfair. This is, perhaps, an after-thought of his. I rather think it is an after-thought than something designed.

I, personally, have another meeting which should have started already, and at which I would like to be present. Even if it is agreed to meet tonight I shall not be able to attend, and I shall have to ask for an adjournment, also, for 10

days so as to facilitate the Minister of Trade and Industry and the other Member for whom he spoke.

Mr. Tasker: I assume, from what the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry has said, that he views the voting on this issue as a matter of importance to his Party, and that, therefore, he is prepared to postpone the debate until the hon. Minister of Community Development and Education gets back from Jamaica. But if that is done, then the delegation will not be able to go until later in the year, assuming that agreement on dates is reached with the Colonial Office. I think we should recognize that if we cannot agree on the composition of the delegation within a reasonable time, we shall, in fact, be admitting that we are unable to send a delegation to London when invited to do so.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: If Members who wish to serve the community cannot put aside what they have to do tonight for a matter which is of paramount importance, then they have no right to be in this Council. When it comes to the country and its people everything should be put aside.

Mr. Beharry: I do not know if, by meeting at eight o'clock tonight, this debate will be finished. There is no guarantee, because Members may speak on the issue for quite a long time more; so I cannot see our meeting tonight will solve the problem.

Dr. Jagan: I am not aware that any other Members wish to speak. If they do not, possibly the Motion can be put.

Mr. Burnham: I propose to speak.

Mr. Jackson: And I shall speak on the Amendments.

Mr. Beharry: I have not spoken on the first Amendment.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: I wish to move a Motion for the continuation of the debate.

Mr. Speaker: Just one moment. If a Member has spoken on No. 1 Amendment before No. 2 Amendment is moved he would have the right to speak again, but if he has already spoken on the second Amendment he cannot then claim the right to speak on the first Amendment. If there is a third Amendment a Member cannot speak on Nos. 1 and 2 after he had concluded his speech on No. 3. That is the position.

I am willing to co-operate as much as possible, but I will not stretch my co-operation to the extent of sitting here through the night until morning, as one Member suggested. I did not adjourn at five o'clock because I considered this an occasion on which I would allow the debate to go on with the hope that the deadlock might have been resolved. But, from what I am now hearing, it seems to me that it is a vain hope. In a matter of this sort it is always best that Members should reach agreement.

The Attorney-General (Mr. Austin): I am rather surprised at the attitude of certain Members of the "Opposition" who give the impression that this debate is a sort of pastime, and that when they have other matters which interest them, they can defer this debate which is of the utmost importance to the country. I suggest that the sooner the delegation is fixed the better, because those who are going will have a great deal of home work to do. It is no good their turning up in London without having given serious thought and study to the matter. I think the country demands that those who will have the privilege of going, should take their responsibilities seriously, and time is running very short. I think that even a day will make a lot of difference. I am reminded of the story in the Bible of the rich man who gave a feast and issued invitations to people. One said "I cannot come because I have a wife", another said "I cannot come because I have some oxen in the field", and so on. This is a most serious matter and I would suggest that Members put their country before their private interests.

Mr. Speaker: I was thinking of the continuation of the story—how he got people together and furnished them with garments and so on.

Mr. Jackson: I am taking objection to the remarks made by the hon. the Attorney-General. I am not taking this matter as a pastime, and it is because it is not a pastime I say I am not agreeable to continuing this debate this evening. The Attorney-General forgets that yesterday afternoon the Members on the Government side did not seem to know what they were about. They twisted and turned; one suggested an adjournment until Friday while another suggested today. They could not make up their minds. I have no private activities; I have other activities which are equally as important to this country as this debate. I look after people's welfare as well, and I am objecting to the Attorney-General's observation. As an Official Member he is not taking part in this debate because he is not concerned, and he had no right to speak in the manner he has spoken.

The Minister of Community Development and Education (Mr. Rai): I would like to take part in the debate and I would like to vote when voting time comes, but I would also like to discharge my duty as this country's representative at a meeting of the Council of the University College of the West Indies, for which many Members have expressed solicitude.

Mr. Burnham: Isn't it unfortunate that this Minister who had several opportunities to take part in this debate but has not spoken, should now realize that his views should be put forward? It is unfortunate that the Attorney-General should make the remark that Members regard this debate as a pastime. We take this matter seriously, and because we do, we object to this late hurry. The Attorney-General himself has, with commendable foresight, spoken to the Members of the "Opposition" about the Budget debate, and as a result we came to a

[MR. BURNHAM]

reasonable arrangement. Now, because one Minister is going to a U.C.W.I. meeting in Jamaica, this debate suddenly becomes a matter of urgency, for which everything must be sacrificed. I cannot see the difference between continuing this debate this evening and continuing it tomorrow. I notice that the Attorney-General's face wears a very pleasant appearance, because he recognizes that he is only making himself a tool of the Majority Party in telling us about pastime. We are interested in our country certainly, but that does not mean that we must pander to the convenience of other people. It is for the Minister to decide whether it is more important for him to remain here to vote in this debate or to go to the U.C.W.I. in Jamaica where he can be represented by proxy.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: I do not defend Englishmen and other persons coming from abroad, but I will not stand for the insulting of persons who do not wish to reply. To call the Attorney-General a tool is to insult a person who does not wish to enter into acrimonious debate. He sits there as a representative of the British Government and not as a member of the P.P.P. We should extend to him all civil rights, and

it is a shame for a Member to hurl insults at him. It is not right.

Those are the people who run this country. I am asking for independence, to free myself from them, but not in an atmosphere of insults or by taking away whatever culture or investments they have here, but in a spirit of co-operation, or, if it comes to the point, wrenching away from them. Do not insult them or buffet them about. I will not sit here and allow it to continue. I must rise even if the individual himself does not wish to rise.

Mr. Bowman: Mr. Speaker, now that the seats of three Members are empty I do not think it would be fair to put the Motion.

Members: We have a quorum.

At this stage Messrs. Kendall, Jackson and Bowman left the Chamber.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chief Secretary (*after consultations*): I beg to withdraw my previous Motion and to move that this Council do now adjourn until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

Council adjourned accordingly, at 5.38 p.m.