

SECOND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

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

Friday, 5th February, 1960

The Council met at 2 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

—*Member for Eastern Berbice*
(Minister of Trade and Industry)

” ” **B. H. Benn**

—*Member for Essequibo River*
(Minister of Natural Resources)

” ” **Janet Jagan**

—*Member for Western Essequibo*
(Minister of Labour, Health and Housing)

” ” **Ram Karran**

—*Member for Demerara-Essequibo*
(Minister of Communications and Works)

” ” **B. S. Rai**

—*Member for Central Demerara*
(Minister of Community Development and Education).

Mr. R. B. Gajraj

—*Nominated Member*

” **W. O. R. Kendall**

—*Member for New Amsterdam*

” **R. C. Tello**

—*Nominated Member*

” **F. Bowman**

—*Member for Demerara River*

” **L. F. S. Burnham**

—*Member for Georgetown Central*

” **S. Campbell**

—*Member for North Western District*

” **A. L. Jackson**

—*Member for Georgetown North*

” **E. B. Beharry**

—*Member for Eastern Demerara*

” **S. M. Saffee**

—*Member for Western Berbice*

” **Ajodha Singh**

—*Member for Berbice River*

” **Jai Narine Singh**

—*Member for Georgetown South*

” **R. E. Davis**

—*Nominated Member*

” **A. M. Fredericks**

—*Nominated Member*

” **H. J. M. Hubbard**

—*Nominated Member*

” **A. G. Tasker, O.B.E.**

—*Nominated Member.*

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 Thursday, 4th February, 1960, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

The Financial Secretary (Mr. Essex): I beg to lay on the Table in terms of section 8(2) of the Census Ordinance, Chapter 64 the —

Census Regulations, 1960 (No. 2).

ORAL ASKING AND ANSWERING OF QUESTIONS

DEBATE OF PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

Mr. Tasker: Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask the hon. the Chief Secretary Question No. 3 standing in my name on the Order Paper. In view of the concern expressed by the hon. Attorney-General, in the course of the Budget Debate on January 19, regarding the lack of debates on motions by Members of the "Opposition", will the hon. Chief Secretary state whether Government intends to observe the provisions of Standing Order 20 of the Legislative Council; and, if so, when opportunity will be afforded to debate the 27 motions by Private Members of which notice has already been given in this session?

The Chief Secretary (Mr. Hedges): Sir, the answer to the hon. Member's Question is as follows: As the hon. Member is aware, Standing Orders are for the regulation and orderly conduct of the proceedings of this Council and the Government Members, for their part, endeavour to comply with them. It is the practice here, as it is in the United Kingdom House of Commons, that Private Members' Motions are not placed on the Order Paper until the Government has had the opportunity of considering questions of policy arising out of such Motions. The process in-

evitably takes time, but I am sure the hon. Member will appreciate any attempt to vary this procedure will lead to ill-formed and inconclusive debates on Private Members' Motions.

It is the Government's wish that the Council should sit on Wednesdays to take Private Members' Motions whenever possible. The hon. Member will appreciate, however, that there will be occasions when, because of important Government business, such sittings cannot be held.

Mr. Tasker: Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate that the hon. Members on this side are expected to appreciate the Government's point of view, perhaps the hon. the Chief Secretary and other members of the Government will appreciate that, if the situation is as the hon. the Chief Secretary has said it is, it is unfortunate that a member of the Government Benches should criticize private Members for the lack of debates on Motions tabled by them, as was done by the hon. the Attorney-General in the recent Budget debate.

The Chief Secretary: Sir, I think the answer is largely in the second paragraph and that is: It is Government's intention, if it is possible, to sit on each Wednesday.

ORDER OF THE DAY

CONSTITUTIONAL DELEGATION TO LONDON

Mr. Speaker: Council will resume debate on the substantive Motion moved by the hon. Member for Demerara River (Mr. Bowman). It reads 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."

There were Amendments to the Motion. The first Amendment was by the Member for North Western District, that is:

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, three representing the People's Progressive Party, three representing the People's National Congress, one representing the Progressive Liberal Party, one representing the Guianese Independence Movement, one representing the National Labour Front and two Nominated Members selected by them from among their number; and

Be it further resolved: That this Council recommends that the Secretary of the Constitutional Committee should accompany the delegation as its Secretary."

Then the hon. Minister of Natural Resources moved the following Amendment:

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:

"Three Members of the Majority Party, three other Elected Members and one Nominated Member."

At the adjournment yesterday the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, was speaking on the Amendment. If he so desires he may proceed now.

Mr. Tello: At the adjournment yesterday I was endeavouring to impress upon this Council the great need to select as representative a delegation as possible in compliance with the Resolution which was passed by this Council in 1958. I said yesterday, that the Motion by the hon. Member for Demerara River fulfilled the Council's Resolution that a representative delegation should be sent to London, but that his Motion was not

specific and allowed for last-minute changes. I then suggested to the Mover that he should give consideration to placing a time-limit for Members to intimate whether they wished to form part of the delegation, so that the composition of the delegation may be known in proper time.

I also said that I doubted whether the Amendment moved by the Minister of Natural Resources complies, in any form, with the Resolution passed by this Council. I feel that to ask this Council to select a delegation of seven, consisting of three Members of the Majority Party and only three Members from the other Elected Members and one Nominated Member, is contrary to the intention of the Council's Resolution which specifically stated that a representative delegation should be chosen by and from this Council. What is the definition of the term "representative delegation" in that context?

Let us examine the composition of the Council today. We are all agreed that it has gone through several changes since the General Election in 1957. We have seen defection in parties and the rise of new parties. We have also seen a change in the names of certain parties, but we are asked to send a representative delegation from the Council as it is now constituted. The fact is that the Majority Party, without the assistance of the three Official Members, no longer has claim to being in the majority in the Council. No longer can the People's Progressive Party claim to enjoy such a position. In another place the leader of that Party publicly stated that the People's National Congress is the major Opposition Party, and because the People's Progressive Party no longer enjoys a distinct majority in this Council, I claim that it is fair to ask that the two Parties should have equal representation on the delegation.

I think that the hon. Member for North Western District did not err when he moved that three Members be selected from the People's National Congress. It is no use going back to

[MR. TELLO]

1957 and talking about the United Democratic Party and the Burnham faction of the P.P.P. We must speak about things as they exist today, because if we do not look at it that way we cannot say that we have the Guianese Independence Movement, as that Party did not go to the polls in 1957. I say that we must be realistic and accept things as they are today. I feel that Mr. Campbell's Amendment is in order as it takes cognizance of these changes and recognizes the right of those Parties to be represented on the delegation. The National Labour Front has not changed; it has had one representative in this Council since the 1957 Election, and it is entitled to be represented on the delegation.

I submit that the Amendment moved by the Minister of Natural Resources does not take into consideration all the facts as they are now, therefore, it stands condemned. It is not worthy of support or acceptance, because it seeks to have one Party substantially represented, and to have three out of four Parties and on "Independent" represented by three persons. It also seeks to justify the selection of only one representative of the Nominated section of the Council. Whatever may be said about Nominated Members, the fact is that they represent big business, small business and Labour. I, therefore, feel that in asking this Council to send a delegation with only one Nominated Member on it, the Majority Party is trying to rob this Legislature of the right to send a truly representative delegation.

It is no news to this Council that the Labour Movement in British Guiana is extremely anxious to be represented on this delegation. It is rather unbecoming that I, the only Nominated representative of Labour in this Council, should have cause to say it, but it has been intimated to Members of this Council officially by the Trades Union Council, so that I am not in such an invidious position as I would normally have been in such a case. I feel that in putting for-

ward the case for a representative of Labour on this delegation I am only voicing the opinion of the masses in British Guiana. As it is, the Trades Union Council speaks for more than 44,000 organized workers in this country, and it is quite safe to say that its influence covers some 30,000 other workers. So that in point of fact a Labour representative on the delegation would represent the views of some 75,000 workers, which is certainly a quite sizeable body of opinion in the Colony.

I make this point because, in another place the hon. Member for North Western District, in explaining his request for two Nominated Members on the delegation, stated that it was his opinion that they should be regarded as representing industry, commerce and Labour. I feel that this is a good opportunity to test this Legislature's attitude towards Labour and its right to be represented on a Constitutional delegation.

There can be one strong argument in favour of the Amendment moved by the Minister of Natural Resources, and that is the question of expense; but I have said before in this Council that I agree with a very eminent industrialist who said that people and people's opinions are much more important than money. In this case the question to be decided is too vitally important to be reckoned in dollars and cents. The cost of sending this delegation to London is a secondary matter. I said yesterday, and I repeat, that if the delegation is fully representative, and before its departure the members could meet and arrive at some degree of understanding, — some reasonable area of agreement — it could achieve much.

However, if the Secretary of State for the Colonies should accept, as I think he may, the Constitutional Committee's recommendation that future amendment to our Constitution should be made by the Legislature of this country on the basis of a two-thirds majority, it would be quite a long time — possibly never

again — before a British Guiana delegation would go to London on a Constitutional question. It is, therefore, only fair to the people of British Guiana as a whole, that every shade of opinion in this country should be represented on this delegation, and that we should not count the cost. It is proper; it is almost an obligation of this Council to see to that. If we do not do so we would be guilty of deliberately misleading the Colonial Office and the Secretary of State for the Colonies in this matter; because if we attempt to select persons who almost think alike, and try to impress the Secretary of State that the delegation represents the consensus of opinion in British Guiana, it may bring back a Constitution which might lead to a constitutional crisis such as we would not like to see in British Guiana.

However reactionary the opinion may be; however large or small the group, it is a democratic right that it should be represented in the presence of the Secretary of State. For that reason I am sympathetic to the Amendment moved by the Member for North Western District and which is causing some qualms in the minds of my friends on the other side.

The opinion has been expressed that a Party which has not faced the polls should not have representation on the delegation. Reference has also been made to the existence of a one-man Party. It is no use denying that a Party, whether one-man or otherwise, has an opinion to express. The fact is, we must present all patterns of opinion in this matter — progressive, modified, or reactionary — in order to bring about constitutional peace almost indefinitely.

I ask this Government not to use prejudice against the Nominated Members and regard them as inferior. This Council offers equal rights under the Standing Orders to Nominated Members. They are not in a special category. What applies to the Elected Members under the Standing Orders also applies

to the Nominated Members. It would almost be political sacrilege to send a delegation to represent this Council without due regard to the claims of Nominated Members.

Public opinion must also be represented. In this respect, I would draw attention to a letter from one N. S. Singh to the Editor, published in "The Daily Chronicle" on 2nd February last. This person is from the Corentyne, and this was his selection for the delegation —

Mr. Speaker : Is the hon. Member going to read the whole letter?

Mr. Tello : No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker : Does it contain anything that is controversial?

Mr. Tello : No, Sir. This person selected three persons from the P.P.P., two persons from the P.N.C., one from the N.L.F., one from the G.I.M., one from the P.L.P. one Nominated Member to represent Industry and Commerce and one to represent Labour. I refer to this because it shows that at least one section of the population is thinking in line with the hon. Member for North Western District. It should not surprise this Council that there is a great deal of interest on the part of the public in the exercises of these two days. It would be unusual if we do not take some cognizance of that. The opinion I just referred to was not expressed in an editorial; so that no one could say it was written by a member of the staff of the newspaper. We must be satisfied that we have given consideration to public opinion, because we are the servants of the public. We must be satisfied that we have acted to the satisfaction of our conscience and of our obligations to the public.

I am only doing my duty when I ask the Minister of Natural Resources to withdraw his Amendment, because it cuts right across the object of the Resolution passed in June, 1958, which

[MR. TELLO]

asked that a representative delegation be sent. The hon. Minister made no attempt to explain how his selection will be representative. I suppose he meant that we would accept it anyhow. The hon. Member for North Western District said he believed that his Amendment would best meet the need for a full, representative delegation. I know that the Minister of Natural Resources will not give serious consideration to withdrawing his Amendment, so I beg to move my own Amendment to his Amendment, by the substitution of "6" for the second "3" in the first line, and "2" for "1" in the second line.

If my Amendment to the Amendment is accepted, it would read: "Three members of the Majority Party, six Members of the Elected Opposition and two Nominated Members". I commend this Amendment to this Honourable Council because it is an attempt to give true representation on this delegation. It would permit any Member who is not carrying, at the moment, a party label to be included.

I am certain that, in casting their votes in this matter, hon. Members would give consideration to the fact that they want the representation distributed fairly. I think this Amendment is necessary. I am certain that my Nominated colleagues feel that the interest we represent should be identified on this delegation, and I feel they would act wisely in the interest of British Guiana as a whole.

Mr. Hubbard: Our debate is taking place against the background of momentous pronouncements by two British Statesmen.

Mr. Tello: The hon. Member is not speaking to the Amendment.

Mr. Speaker: The Amendment has not been seconded, therefore, it cannot be considered.

Mr. Hubbard: As I said, Mr. Speaker, our debate is taking place against the background of momentous pronouncements by two British Statesmen; statements of world importance; statements of especial significance to Colonial peoples. I refer, of course, to the speech made by Mr. Harold Macmillan, the British Prime Minister, to the South African Parliament, in which he said that the British people and the British Government cannot accept the theory that one race or one nation is superior to another. Mr. Macmillan, in fact, went into the very temple of the Herrenvolk, toppled down their disreputable philosophy of master race and dispatched it, so far as the British Government is concerned, on the way to the dusty archives of history. Earlier, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Iain Macleod, had told a very large delegation from Kenya that the minorities in Kenya would have to learn to live with the majority.

The British Government, through the Colonial Office has, at last, come to realize the inevitability of the fact that minorities cannot prosper, indeed, cannot survive in a community unless the wishes and the will of the majority are taken effectively into account. Mr. Macleod said, in effect, that minorities even in countries where the very idea of equality is heresy, would have to accept equality for all and take their place alongside or under the majority.

There is every evidence that in this country, the Colonial Office has also come to that conclusion; and it has worked since 1957 with those who represent the majority in this country, and it has given every indication of the will to continue to work with those who can speak for the majority. Here, there has been ample opportunity to test the staying power of the majority.

We have had defections in early 1959 and later on we had almost a general strike of certain categories of Government employees. We had the

Press sending out erroneous and mischievous reports. I have seen one such report under the name of the Editor of one of our local newspapers—a report which was false and had to be challenged and contradicted. The Colonial Office, therefore, is well aware of who commands the support of the majority in this country and it is well aware of what reliance can be placed on the pronouncements of the organs of public opinion.

The majority has been able to hold a united heart and speak with a united voice. It is competent. It has been able to look after its own affairs. It has been able to impress, not only the Colonial Office, but the world at large. What worries me is this inability of the minorities to realize their position in the context of this new policy and to settle down to work alongside the majority, if they are not to fall under them. What worries me is that there is not any single voice which can speak for the minorities; and there has not been even any attempt—far less a serious attempt—to compose differences and agree on a minimum programme for the minorities.

The problem facing this Council, as I see it, is the problem of trying to get those elements representing the minorities to reach some agreed position so that they can select a reasonable number of people who will go with a single programme to balance the united position of the majority and give the Colonial Office some indication of where the two sides stand.

The Constitutional Committee's Report which has been sent to London, sets out in quite clear terms the extent of the disagreement between the majority and the minority; and I think that if we select a delegation in terms of the Motion moved by the hon. Member for Demerara River, or in terms of the Amendment by the hon. Member for North Western District, we should be doing a grave disservice to what I would call, in all sympathy, a section of the population which is now without a voice. I think

that the Amendment proposed by the Majority Party, which does not seek more than parity with its elected opponents is, in the circumstances, a very generous proposal which could well be accepted by the minority if they could compose their own differences and arrive at an agreed position.

The Majority Party has gone further and suggested that it might add to the delegation one Nominated Member, so that there will be four persons in a delegation of seven who will not be under the control of the Majority Party. I think, therefore, that the minority might indicate whether there does, in fact, exist among them that level of statesmanship which will permit those people who have put their hopes in them, to believe that they can get the quality of representation to which they may feel entitled. I, therefore, take my stand in support of the Amendment proposed by the Minister of Natural Resources.

Mr. Campbell: I wish to make a few remarks on the Amendment proposed by the hon. Minister of Natural Resources which suggests a delegation of seven as full representation of the people of this country at the London Constitutional talks. It boils down to a difference between seven and 20 Members, as proposed in the substantive Motion by the hon. Member for Demerara River. My compromise proposal of a delegation of 11 Members, if accepted, will provide adequate representation of political opinion in this country. On the other hand, if the Amendment by the Minister of Natural Resources for a delegation of seven is accepted—and I have a hunch that it is going to be carried because of the divided opposition—it will mean that the delegation will reflect the Majority Party's opinion in London, and that alone.

When I suggested a delegation of 11, I bore in mind the phrase "representative delegation" used in the Resolution which was passed by this Council in June, 1958. It is true that the Majority Party represents a large body or race of people

[MR. CAMPBELL]

in this country, but it has been said that British Guiana is a land of six peoples. Here is a test case in which the six or seven peoples of British Guiana will not be able to have their views represented at the Colonial Office as to what form the proposed new Constitution should take. I am sure the Secretary of State for the Colonies does not want to hear the views of one political party alone. If that were the case we could send representatives of the Majority Party alone and let them write a Constitution according to their plan. I would agree to that, but it must not be described as a representative delegation.

Yesterday it was suggested here that the figure 7 has a sacred significance. If the figure 7 connotes something sacred, then my figure 11 is also significant, because among the 12 Apostles one was Judas, and when he defected, 11 faithful ones remained. In sport we have teams of 11 all over the world, so let us send a team of 11 to bring back a Constitution which would represent all shades of political opinion in this country. The number 7 is transparent; it would be loaded on the side of the Majority Party. When I suggested a delegation of 10 or 11 members at our informal meeting, I little dreamt that it would have caused such a furore, and that we could not reach agreement.

My sole interest is the progress of my country. I may regard myself as a lone wolf as political parties are the order of the day. I am in a party myself, but my loyalty is first to my country. If my Party has a policy or a plan which tallies with my conviction, all well and good; but if the policy of my Party is contrary to my conscience, I would have the moral courage to say: "Go about your business; I am not with you."

I treasure freedom of speech, and at this moment, please God, I am yet free to voice my opinion.

If a delegation of seven, as recommended by the Majority Party, goes to England and writes a Constitution for us, well, we might as well accept that Constitution or run.

Let us see "where the wind doth blow". No other party must have a say. A one-party system—contrary to democracy! It seems to me that democracy is being used to destroy democracy.

I love my country. I am one hundred percent. Guianese, my ancestors not having come from anywhere else. Long before history was written my people were here. They had codes which, I am often tempted to say, were superior to some of today's civilized codes. Time brought the Europeans and their civilization. They brought a lot of good and a lot of vices, and I am afraid the vices of civilization have degenerated the Amerindian in British Guiana and the New World. Some of them are still referred to as primitive. Yet, my brothers, you are not yet civilized, according to what the word "civilization" ought to mean. Among civilized people you have fine buildings, monuments, books and all manner of philosophies, but, my brothers, you are not yet civilized, for in a moment you get mad and blow the whole lot into smithereens. Until you learn to love your brother as yourself, then and only then will you be civilized. Whenever I speak, I speak the truth as I know it, and not according to politics. Politicians speak with two tongues. When they say, yes, they mean no, and when they say no, they mean yes—I cannot understand politicians.

We are a divided "Opposition" here. We have never been united. In other parts of the world you can find a distinct, united Opposition, but here we are divided up into five or six sides, and the Majority sweeps over the Council. And there you are. You are all quite free to do what you think.

Mr. Tasker: May I ask that the Council interrupt the debate and discuss

the hours of sitting, in order to avoid a recurrence of what happened yesterday? I think at this stage Members would like to know if we are going to sit after five o'clock, or if closure will be applied to the debate.

Mr. Speaker: Up to now, I have not been apprised of any intentions as regards further sitting today. It seems that the practice is to take the Speaker by surprise—I do not know why—or to conduct matters in such a way that he cannot know until at the last moment whether the desire is to observe the normal hours of sitting or not.

The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing (Mrs. Jagan): Sir, it does not seem that the debate will finish by five o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: I do not know. If it is not, then at the proper time, no doubt, I shall hear something.

Mr. Tasker: It is precisely to avoid that situation that I raise the question now, Sir. I also raise it in the hope that we may get an expression of views and agreement from Members and yourself.

Mr. Speaker: I am in the position of not knowing who will be taking part in the debate. What I know is this, that there are matters which can be reasonably anticipated but which are not reasonably anticipated, then someone at the last moment asks the Speaker to do something, irrespective of whether it is inconvenient or not. I am sure in a debate like this Members would know beforehand who are going to speak.

It is now 3.25 p.m. Those who should know could reasonably have anticipated this. Sometimes I am approached at ten minutes before the time of sitting, two o'clock, to decide on something which might need consideration. This is to be deprecated.

This is not to say that I do not appreciate what the hon. Nominated

Member, Mr. Tasker, has said. However, if we stop too long on this now, we will be utilizing the rest of time that is left until five o'clock. At the rate we are going, this debate might never end! We might spend another half-an-hour discussing something on which we should get a reasonable measure of agreement.

Yesterday, many Members were out of the Chamber during the debate, and this afternoon as well. With so many Members absent, we barely have a quorum. We might need their presence to discuss the matter of sitting and to come to some firm agreement. There is still time for them to agree among themselves. Please proceed.

Mr. Burnham: Mr. Speaker, when the Motion which, so to speak, gave birth to that series of discussions ending in the appointment of a Constitutional Committee was debated, I remarked that there were some things which were above Party loyalties and above Party divisions and differences. Over the past 48 hours I have been considerably disturbed by what, in the main, appears to be an obvious injection of these said Party differences and divisions, which we thought we had got rid of since the 11th of June, 1958, when discussing this particular subject.

Naturally, between the different parties there must be differences so far as the details and mechanics are concerned. These are not the differences to which I refer. It seems to me that so much of the disagreement that has been evident over the past two days, can be traced back to the desire of various parties or individuals to maintain the prestige of the particular Party or group to which they belong; and that, Mr. Speaker, I think, is most unsatisfactory and for me, most depressing.

May I remind hon. Members of the fact that the Resolution spoke of a representative delegation chosen by and from the Council; and it is a little difficult to understand how the Amendment moved by the hon. Minister of Natural Resources

[MR. BURNHAM]

can possibly result in a delegation which can be described as a representative delegation of this Council.

It is, of course, true and admitted on both sides that, so far as the People's Progressive Party is concerned, there must be and there no doubt is, objective unanimity so far as the world is concerned. All the members of that Party in this Council are unanimous. I am not concerned that there may be internal differences. As I understand a political party, a party must have one policy on certain important matters. I know there are differences between them, but that is not a matter for us. So far as we are concerned, they are of one mind.

An objective unanimity also must and does exist so far as the People's National Congress is concerned, but certainly we must have contemplated the constitution of this Council and the divergence of views when the Motion was passed on the 11th June, 1958. If you take away from the west side of this Council the three party members of the People's National Congress and one of the Nominated Members, who by his conduct in this Council has shown that he always agrees with the People's Progressive Party, it must be admitted that on this side of the Council it is difficult, if not impossible, to find unanimity on all the questions relating to the Constitution. In those circumstances, I do not see the constitution of this delegation as being a question as to who will have a majority and who will not have a majority.

The delegation which is supposed to leave, is supposed to be representative of various points of view as represented in this Council. The hon. Minister of Natural Resources seemed somewhat disquieted yesterday afternoon when he spoke of the constant maligning of the People's Progressive Party. Not only will I observe that to categorize criticism in a Legislature as maligning is a misuse of

the term, but I would say this: If even his choice of language were accurate, he and his Party would have themselves only to blame in the present circumstances of this debate and the choice of the delegation.

May I say this with the greatest amount of modesty: It is quite obvious, in spite of the 'loud silent' remarks being made across the table, that I do not have to plead my own case. It is inconceivable that any delegation of this sort should go without my Party being represented on it. But I think we should look further, not merely whether our particular party is represented or not, but whether or not opportunity is given for representation on the delegation of the main differences of approach and opinion represented in this Council.

Before I attempt a rather cursory analysis of what may be recognized as differences, may I observe that unless Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies and those who advise him are guilty of the most extreme opacity, they cannot afford to disregard the views as expressed by the Majority Party, even if the Majority Party sent only one person.

It is true that the Majority Party, as some have observed, did not obtain in 1957 an overall majority of votes at the polls, but certainly they obtained the largest minority. So far as the election results are concerned they, notionally at least, had the largest minority or the largest group of persons going to the polls.

May I also observe that though the People's National Congress cannot lay claim to having got the largest minority of votes in 1957, with pardonable immodesty I would contend that the views of the People's National Congress cannot be discarded by Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies and his advisers. Without letting the cat out of the bag or speaking out of turn, I would say that that had been conceded even by the Majority Party.

If we are realistic, those two parties can be described as together representing the views of the majority of the population of British Guiana. Those two parties can be so described; and if you agree that they can be so described, what are the fundamental differences between them on the question of the Constitution? One Party—the Majority Party—says it wants independence now. The other party favours independence, and it wants independence, but in the context of West Indian dominion.

Regardless of which view eventually gains an absolute majority support in British Guiana, the fact is that we have to pass through the stage, as I see it, of full internal self-government. I have read that an authoritative individual in the People's Progressive Party has said that that Party favours full internal self-government now, and independence within five years. The difference between that attitude and the People's National Congress is a difference of words rather than a conviction.

But what do we find here? We find the hon. Member for North Western District saying he will have nothing to do with full internal self-government or anything of that sort. So far as he is concerned he is afraid. So far as he is concerned he would like merely an improved colonial constitution. I disagree with him vehemently. But the hon. Member has a different view from mine. He has a different view from that of the party which I represent. He has a different view from the body of political opinion to which I subscribe. I have no fear if an individual like the Member for North Western District were put on the delegation. The essence of democracy is for people—the minority — to have their say. You may, in your wisdom, reject the views of the minority, but give them an opportunity to speak.

I do not think the Secretary of State for the Colonies would have the temerity to grant a Constitution like that which the hon. Member for North Western District wants. But in the context of British

Guiana today, when we hear the Majority Party pleading for co-operation, what greater generosity and largeness of approach than to say "We wish to have all of you represented; your views will be heard" if only to have an opportunity to shut you up. I cannot, therefore, see what is the objection to having these various points of view put forward.

You will find a different point of view put forward by the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, if you read the Constitutional Committee's Report—a view which is much too conservative for me and which I would not accept. All his fears of checks and balances in any forum, I would object to. But there are other Members who are just like Mr. Davis. The same applies to the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Fredericks. As we came down this Table on the western side we have the hon. Member for Georgetown South who wants independence, complete independence with a severance of ties with the British Commonwealth. I do not agree with him at this particular time or in this particular context, or at all. He has a different point of view, but what is the objection to his being permitted to put forward his point of view? This is not head counting; this is not an election in which, depending on the number of heads you have, you can decide whether or not you can carry a man. This is merely a delegation which will be going forward to enter into discussions with Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies.

The Majority Party has been accused of being dictatorial; of favouring one-party government, and of having no tolerance for views other than those which it holds. I am not at this point prepared to offer any comment on whether that accusation is right or wrong. At a reasonable time, and in the correct circumstances, I will offer an opinion on that accusation, but when it insists on narrowing down the delegation to seven isn't the Majority Party seeing that its own point of view will be expressed by at least three members of the delegation, with at least one of the three Elected

[MR. BURNHAM]

Members it proposes on this side of the Table giving to its points of view a majority of four out of seven?

So far as I am concerned, and my Party is concerned, on certain principles we are closer to the P.P.P. than we are to the N.L.F., but I would insist that views like those of the N.L.F. must be represented. I always think that it is a weak man who is afraid to allow his opponent to be heard. It is a coward who is afraid to give an opportunity to the other man to speak out what he thinks. British Guiana at the moment is not only, to use a *cliche* at the cross-roads so far as constitutional development is concerned, but there is a lot of division in this country, and I think the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry has admitted this division by his frequent pleading for co-operation. Here is an opportunity to give an earnest of your desire to co-operate. I think I am being quite accurate when I say that what may be described as a conservative or narrow point of view in this Council is not represented by the best or more competent debaters. It is all the more reason why you should give the conservatives an opportunity to say what they have to say. Allowing a man to be heard does not mean accepting his point of view; it means merely giving him an opportunity to put forward his point of view.

You decide that you want a delegation of seven, and that you will use your wealth of numbers to ensure that you get at least four of that seven, and what will you hear? There will be a loud noise that you want to have only your point of view heard, and it will be said that you have a packed delegation. Some people suffer from a fallacy of believing that numbers mean everything, but they are making a mistake by not seeing that different points of view are represented on the delegation.

We must not under-estimate the skill and ability to manoeuvre which is

inherent in any Secretary of State for the Colonies and his advisers. It is true that Britain has shown much more liberalism in recent years so far as Constitutions are concerned, but she has shown prior to the War, that we must not believe everything we insist upon as our right will be handed to us on a platter. It must not be believed that they really want to give you whatever you ask for. You must not under-estimate their ability to find a pretext. Go to London with a delegation which has on it little or no representation of the conservative point of view and see all the rationalising that is going to be done afterwards in order to suggest something much more illiberal than either of the two major parties contemplate.

The more I think of this matter the more I am concerned. Let us face realities. I am not particularly attempting to castigate or criticize the People's Progressive Party. At this particular moment I am not particularly interested in political divisions; I am interested in what are the likely results so far as British Guiana is concerned. Of course we will fight the P.P.P. at the street corners and the hustings. If they win we shall be as turbulent in our opposition as we have been, and if we win I expect we shall find the same turbulence. But we must face the facts. I do not mean to besmirch, but what is the reputation, rightly or wrongly, enjoyed by the People's Progressive Party outside of this country? At the moment I am not offering a qualitative judgment because I think this is a grave moment. What is its reputation? Rightly or wrongly there are people who say it has tendencies towards dictatorship. Will not this action be seized upon as an example? That may be absolutely wrong in logic and reason, but if the world were guided by reason and logic we would not find countries in our position.

I am not interested at the moment as to whether the reputation is a reasonable conclusion on the facts. I am interested in the effect of the reputation, and however much, as a politician, I may fight

and work for the disintegration and complete removal from the political scene of the P.P.P., I cannot but realize that at the moment they represent the Government of British Guiana. What hurts them in this context will hurt all of us. It is not that I have any solicitude for them at all. At the personal level there are many charming individuals who can be liked and appreciated as individuals, but in the political arena what they stand for is undesirable to me. But they are the Government, and any impression in certain fields hostile to them is going to ensure to the disadvantage of this country.

As I have said before, I do not beg of them to go on the delegation. My Party does not have to beg for representation because, whatever may be the faults of the P.P.P., I do not think they are that naive as to think that the P.N.C. must not be represented. But I will at this moment assume the role of the leader of the Majority Party who is always pleading for co-operation. I would beg him to understand what is at stake. I would beg him to see that he has nothing to lose by letting every Tom, Dick and Harry who has a different idea, go. Words like "desirous" and "desirable" are difficult to define, and I would plead with the Majority Party to let it be said that all that has been said about the dictatorial tendencies of the P.P.P. is wrong; that all that has been said, that members of the Party only want to hear their own views even if they may have to use some metallic substance to get their voices coming back to them, is wrong. The conservative section of our community—big business, the Chamber of Commerce and so on—would then have the satisfaction of knowing that they have been heard.

As I said during the debate in June, 1958, and as I said when I began my remarks on this Motion, this is a matter in the consideration of which we must banish from our minds narrow Party loyalties. Of course, no one is asking, no one dare ask the People's Progressive Party or the People's National Congress

to change their respective stands on matters concerning the Constitution. One merely asks that the several points of view be represented, and it does not matter if, in order to have those points of view represented, you take more persons than the P.P.P. and the P.N.C. combined, because, as I said before, this is not an election.

I cannot out of conscience or conviction support the Amendment moved by the hon. Minister of Natural Resources. And let me say this right now, Mr. Speaker: I am not seeking for my Party more representation. I am not seeking to get in for my Party any individuals who come close to our point of view. I am convinced that the People's National Congress, so clear-cut are its views, can have those views put forward by one or two persons. I am not speaking for greater understanding. As I said before, I have nothing to get. My Party has nothing to gain from a larger delegation.

It is a little short of facetious to come here and say that the reason you are not carrying 11 or 12 delegates is that it will cost too much. A few thousands of dollars—will that matter? How long have the profligate become parsimonious? Little British Honduras sent a delegation of 15. Is their economy more buoyant than ours? [*Interruption*] I see some people emulate Shakespeare. They do not repeat themselves for fear that what they said at first was not as sensible as they thought at first. If little British Honduras can send 15, what is the argument about British Guiana sending 10 or 11?

The Minister of Trade and Industry
(Dr. Jagan): Trinidad sent four.

Mr. Burnham: I am informed by someone — whom Mr. Speaker cannot hear because he is sitting—that Trinidad sent four.

Dr. Jagan: Four or five.

Mr. Burnham: Four or five. I have always said that some people do not re-

[MR. BURNHAM]

peat themselves for fear that what they said might be inaccurate. Does it really matter? The Trinidad Government or the Trinidad Legislature must know what to decide. They might have been wrong or right. We must think for ourselves. (Noises). All right, let us have the heckling, but let us also have what is coming. We have a mind of our own. They have a mind of their own. I am saying that (Noises)——

Mr. Speaker: I recently drew Members' attention to the fact that something which I considered reprehensible had occurred because of cross-talk on both sides. The rules say that a Member must not be interrupted when he is speaking. If there is something to which a Member on one side or the other takes objection, it would be better for him to rise and put forward his arguments afterwards, and not sit and shout so that he can be heard. But if Members feel that it is proper to encourage remarks from one side or the other, they must not complain when replies are made to them. In this way debates last longer, and vital questions which could be decided in an hour may take five, six, or seven hours. I think the subject under debate is important and a decision can be reached speedily, but from the way I see things are going, it might take a longer time than I had anticipated.

Mr. Burnham: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for your remarks. May I say that I do not complain. I never complain about any remarks coming from the other side. If there is one thing the other side will admit, it is that I can answer them.

Mr. Speaker: One hon. Member on a previous occasion, even after I had spoken, got up and was heard to say how he deplored remarks from the other side. It happens on both sides: if one Member says he does not complain, that may be so, but the thing is, we have to keep our equanimity in this Council and try to maintain the standard of debate and the dignity that should attach to this Council.

Mr. Burnham: Mr. Speaker, you have ruled. As I was saying, the Amendment moved by the Minister of Natural Resources was not based on the example of British Honduras, which sent 15. I alluded to British Honduras to make this point, that if they could have reasons, best known to themselves, to send 15, British Guiana cannot use as an excuse the lack of funds if it decides to send less than 10 or 11. But it all depends on whether British Guiana feels that, without considerations of finance, 10 or 11 persons should be sent on such a delegation.

As I said before, the fact that Trinidad sent "four or five" — to quote the usually inaccurate Member — is no argument for us sending four or five. If in our context and in our circumstances, we feel it is desirable or expedient — with emphasis on the latter term — to send more than seven, then we should do so. If one is merely going to copy from Trinidad, then we should conclude that in view of the fact that Trinidad has a population of 750,000 and sent four, British Guiana, which has a population of 500,000, should not send more than three.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. I do not know what will be the final decision. It may be that a spirit of compromise may prevail. It may be that those who have a preponderance of Members will be hardened in their attitude, but let us understand this: (a) that if compromise does not prevail and there are untoward results, it is not those who are here that will suffer, it will be our country; (b) so far as even those to whom the Majority Party concedes the right to representation in the delegation are concerned, they could have second thoughts as to whether or not to accept the generosity limited only to one group.

We must think and act as Guianese — not as Members of Parties. We must behave with the realization that it takes all types of people of British Guiana, it takes all kinds of queer political ideas to

give you a sum total of political and constitutional thought in British Guiana. We must remember that when we unanimously — or at least *nem. con.* — passed the Resolution in July 1958, we said that we wanted a delegation that would be representative. In that context it meant a delegation representative of the Council. Take it or leave it. Some might think there is nothing in the point of view I urge. I should hate to be in the position afterwards to say, "I told you so."

At the beginning we started with an exchange of ideas. At the beginning we had a Motion by the Member for Demerara River which, to my mind, is a ridiculous Motion. But I think that out of that Motion he has moved we have had a fair compromise from the Member for North Western District. As far as I am concerned, the increase or reduction of the number he suggests by one either way does not matter to me. So far as I see it, the hon. Member for North Western District has put forward a reasonable compromise, and it is not a matter here of who want to be slaves or who want to be stooges, or who are irresponsible or hare-brained. What matters at the moment is, what compromise can we work out amongst ourselves.

The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing (Mrs. Jagan): Mr. Speaker, what is the "representative delegation" that seems to have concerned Members around this Table so very much during our discussions yesterday and today? Members have conceded a little bit that the Majority Party did get the majority of votes cast in the last General Elections. I should say that is about as far as they did concede. What is democracy? Is it not a reflection of the people's will through the process of voting? If 100 per cent. of the people, or less, go to the polls, that is the will of the people. Are we not in this 20th century going to recognize the rights of people endowed with the privilege of voting, or not voting, under adult suffrage?

One of the arguments put up by the hon. Member for Demerara River was that we should have compulsory voting. I think most people would object to compulsory voting. Well, then, if we accept what every nation accepts, Universal Adult Suffrage, and we pass the test of the will of the people, then what have we here in the Legislative Council, putting aside those Nominated Members who were thrust upon the community of British Guiana? We have a Legislative Council of 14 Elected Members, nine elected by the majority group. What is the will of the people, then? The will of the people was reflected in their votes. Examine their votes.

Five persons elected on tickets other than that of the People's Progressive Party had less votes than one member of that Party so elected. The Leader of the Majority Party received from the people of his constituency more votes than the Members for New Amsterdam, North Western District, North, South and Central Georgetown. Those are hard and true facts which we cannot overlook. Added to that were eight other Members of the Majority Party who were elected. So, the people elected as they wished; and so the choice of the people will sit here and reflect their wishes until another election comes, then the people will make their choice again in true democratic fashion. How, then, must we sit here and worry our souls and say there should not be representation on the delegation to go to London made up of three Members of the Majority Party, three Members of the other Elected group as well as one Member of the Nominated group? If that is not justice, equality and fairness, I cannot understand what is.

Here we have Members saying that the only just thing would be the Amendment offered by the hon. Member for North Western District, in which he proposes six gentlemen elected from the Opposition, three from the Majority Party, and two Nominated Members. Of the seven Members of the Opposition, two

[MRS. JAGAN]

obtained their votes from the Majority Party and thus represent P.P.P. votes. How could it possibly be fair for six out of seven persons to come from the Opposition, while three come from the Majority Party? Is it just that six Elected Members who, in a total count, could not have received as many votes as two or three Members on this side of the Table, should go to London with three Members from the Majority Party?

The hon. Member for Georgetown Central told us that all minority views should be represented. He pleaded with us that though he did not agree with the views of the minority group, they must be represented. But does he really mean it? I have here, before me, the Report of the Constitutional Committee of last year, in which the minority views of Messrs. Burnham, Jackson and Kendall were recorded, and in the record of their views of the electoral system—the system which is known as proportional representation—they said this:

“It is also proposed that any party obtaining less than 15% of the votes cast should not be allocated any seats but such seats as it may be mathematically entitled to should be distributed proportionately between the other parties which have obtained more than the 15% minimum. This recommendation is aimed at discouraging small parties which under the P.R. system may lead to instability.”

If we are to adopt the hon. Member for Georgetown Central's recommendation in the Constitutional Committee's Report, we will see that the two Parties that have seats here from 1957, other than the Majority Party and the People's National Congress, namely the U.D.P. and the N.L.F., would not have been represented in this Council because they held less than 15% of the votes cast. Therefore, there would be no expression of any minority views. So why tell us about the deep concern for the minority when he proposed that any minority group which got less than 15% of the

Parties? In a sense he has suggested that the hon. Member for New Amsterdam and the hon. Member for North Western District would be absorbed in the two Parties; so I do not know why there is this terrible concern? I am more concerned with what the delegation would do when it gets to London than with the 'counting of noses' as we are doing during this debate.

Mr. Tom Paine, who lived 200 years ago, had some caustic words to say on this question of freedom and independence, and he reminded us, I quote: “Every nation that does not govern itself is governed.” Do we want to continue to be governed? How long do Guianese wish to be governed from outside? Members of this Council have stood on their two feet and have urged that we should not get independence in British Guiana. What a shameful stand that anyone in this day and age should be afraid of independence—should shy away from independence. The days are long past for such utterances. Would that Tom Paine were alive to help us in British Guiana put some sense into Guianese as he did the Frenchmen and Americans 200 years ago.

If 200 years ago man believed in the equality of man and the right of man to govern his own affairs, what a pity it cannot be done today? Indeed, when he said these words:

“There are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will in this crisis, shrink from the services of his country;”

How many stand here and shrink from the services of their country? He goes on:

“but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman..”

We have in this Council many summer soldiers and sunshine patriots.

I felt ashamed as I listened to some of the debates of men who should know better—men who, at one time in their

lives, had the ardent desire to see this country free from outside rule and colonialism; yet today, when the moment to which all of us worked assiduously for 10 years has come, what do we find? They are fatigued by the struggle.

"Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom, must, like men, undergo the fatigues of supporting it," said Tom Paine. We have undergone the fatigues of supporting the fight for freedom in B.G. and if necessary, will continue. We cannot be fatigued in this struggle.

I would plead with those who go to London to remember the basic issues. Forget personalities; remember what were our basic and original desires. Tom Paine, quoting from Lafayette, says :

"Call to mind the sentiments which nature has engraved in the heart of every citizen, and which take a new force when they are solemnly recognized by all: For a nation to love liberty, it is sufficient that she knows it; and to be free, it is sufficient that she wills it."

Can we be free unless we will it? These are words written 200 years ago by a great patriot who gave much to the movement towards the independence of France and the United States of America. Would that we had more Tom Paines today!

I have been disturbed, also, in listening to this debate, by the level to which it has dropped. How can certain Members stand in this Legislative Council and say those shameful and shocking things which we heard yesterday? I felt like covering my face in shame for everyone in British Guiana when I heard words dropped from the mouth of the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara which made this room more like a pig sty than a Legislative Council. It is a pity and a shame that we should allow this Legislative Council to go so low. Why should the Member bring his bitterness and chagrin at being rejected by the Majority Party to this

Council? Let him cover his shame in another way and not burden this Council with his filth.

We are not alone—thank goodness for that—in our desire, in our anxiety to see this country independent. We are grateful that we are not alone. The Convention People's Party of Ghana has cabled the Majority Party these words through the Secretary :

"Regarding impending London Constitutional talks Convention People's Party send you best wishes for success in name of freedom, unity and peace. We march forward together to glorious destiny."

Why would they cable us in this way? —because Ghana knows the blessings of independence. Ghana has blossomed like a flower since she has become independent. The trade balance of that country, which previously showed an excess of imports over exports, has now reversed, with a greater volume of exports than imports. I saw some eyebrows lifted when I said that Ghana has blossomed. Any new country making its way like a child growing up, has troubles. I would be the last to stand up and praise everything that has gone on in Ghana, but I say that the blessings of independence have brought to that country a great change, and I predict that the Government will safely and quickly iron out the difficulties that exist at the moment. It is far better that they solve their difficulties themselves than that another power should sit there and make decisions for them.

Mr. Azikiwe, President of the Senate of Nigeria, has also written us in connection with this delegation, expressing his satisfaction and his good wishes, for, he writes :

"... We are one with you and the People's Progressive Party in your great struggle to liberate your country from foreign rule. We have been through the crucible and are now on the threshold of obtaining our independence. As far as we are concerned we would not allow any internal bickerings to make us swerve from our objective. We wish the People's Progressive Party continued success in its

[MRS. JAGAN]

endeavour, and we pray that the leaders and members of the P.P.P. will continue to struggle with fortitude until their goal has been achieved. Sincerely yours,
Nnamdi Azikiwe."

The last I shall quote of the many letters we have received is also from a well known freedom fighter who stands on the same pedestal with those other gentlemen. It is from Mr. Dom Mintoff, of Malta, who writes:

"Your letter of Dec. 30 has left a great impression on me and my friends. Indeed the Colonial Office has attempted to bring about the destruction of our movements by the same subtle and brutal methods employed against the People's Progressive Party in British Guiana.... I can think of no better wish than that our two countries will co-operate and work together with other oppressed nations for freedom and independence."

The countries not yet independent are with us in our struggle for independence. Those which have achieved theirs are with us in our anxiety to reach independence. But who are against it?—some Members of this Council. These are the ones everyone is urging should go to London to tell the "great white father" that we do not want independence. Is that really what the delegation is for—that we should go before the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the "great white father", and say that we do not want independence? Do we wish to remain slaves and say, like Uncle Tom, "We shall be thankful for whatever mercies you can bestow upon us?" Is that the stature of a nation, or is it the stature of kindergarten children? I would urge that the kindergarten and teenage Members of this Council grow up and face the challenge before them, and not urge upon this Council that the delegation to London should be packed with those who do not want independence. Is that the object? Must those Members go to London to say that the Majority Party is dictatorial, and that it wants to ruin the nation?

The Majority Party fought the election like every other Party and, having

won, it is now the Government. When the others are capable of doing the same they will have the same burdens upon their shoulders. Why should we not do all in our power to see that this country becomes independent? Can anyone seriously accuse the Majority Party of being unfair, in the Amendment moved by the Minister of Natural Resources? Quite clearly and simply we say, let us have three Members and the other Elected Members have three, and let us have one Member from the Nominated side. What could be more equitable? Does the Secretary of State for the Colonies want to sit there and hear the views of every single individual? If so you can go outside and find 50 more persons to send—all with different views. The Secretary of State will have a verbatim report of our discussions. He has studied the verbatim reports of the Constitutional Committee's meetings and he knows the views of everyone here.

The hon. Member for the North Western District (Mr. Campbell) claims that he represents the Amerindians of British Guiana. I challenge him on that. As the representative of Western Essequibo I represent a great number of Amerindians, and I venture to say that I see them more often than the hon. Member sees his constituents. I would also venture to say that I give them perhaps more detailed representation than he does. I represent the Amerindians in my constituency; they have a voice as all of us have. Even though the hon. Member represents the Amerindians in his constituency it is not necessary for him to go on the delegation purely and simply because of that.

Let us not refuse to accept the democratic process in this Council. Let us not be so immature as to accuse the Majority Party of dictatorship, because it follows the pattern of political parties. We have heard enough in this Council about certain Members not being allowed to voice their particular views when they were members of the Majority Party. We take our cue from the

Mother of Parliaments in the United Kingdom as to how political parties operate. We know that some Members of Parliament sit in the House of Commons year after year as back-benchers and never speak. Nor do they have an opportunity to make any major decisions, and if they vote contrary to Party policy out they go! If that is dictatorship, well that is how political parties work. It works that way in England and the United States of America. Many back-benchers do not utter a sentence in the House of Commons.

It is ridiculous for us to be treated like kindergarten children and to be told that that is dictatorship. If discipline did not exist in a party we would not have a party system, and we would be back to the stage we were in before our Party was formed in 1950. I do not know if some Members wish us to go back to that stage. Political parties have grown in this country through the persistence of this Majority Party, and they shall continue, and no doubt British Guiana will evolve like most democratic countries to the two-party system. Should we be charged because there is no proper two-party system? We have done our part and we have a solid bloc. Must we be condemned and criticized because those on the other side of the Table have not yet formed an effective solid bloc? Must we be called dictatorial because the "Opposition" cannot muster enough strength to call itself a real and true Opposition? Why must we be condemned for the sins, omissions and shortcomings of other political groups? Why must we be condemned, persecuted and slandered in this Council? Nevertheless, we are used to it, but now and again we must reply, as I am doing today.

Mr. Jackson: We have another Tom Paine in our day and generation. Perhaps the Tom Paine who left England to go to America has been reborn, and the position reversed, so that an American has come to British Guiana to do what Tom Paine did nearly 200 years

ago. But the difference between the Tom Paine of England and the one in our midst may be that whereas the former went to America and converted the Americans to his ideas, the one in our midst will, at the end of her time, find that she has failed to convert the people of this country to her ideas.

However, we are grateful to the hon. Minister for the feeling manner in which she spoke, and for all the sentiments she has expressed, but we are not falling for the proposals which have been put forward by her Party, and that is why we have taken the stand we have taken between yesterday and today. As regards independence I can assure her and her Party that there is no other Party which falls for it. The People's National Congress believes in being realistic, and because of that belief it does not approach the subject as the People's Progressive Party has approached it.

There is no doubt that many people would like to agree with the premise that struggles and difficulties are inherent in achievement to the point where it brings about more pain and suffering than is necessary. I am speaking against the Amendment moved by the Minister of Natural Resources. I do so because I disagree with the limitation which is sought to be placed upon the delegation. I am not going to follow the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing in discussing whether one Member of this Council secured more votes in a constituency than four or five other Members in other constituencies, for that is the result of a short-sighted analysis of the situation, because such a comparison must take into account the density of population in any one area. But the very point she has made supports the proposal made by the People's National Congress for proportional representation.

That is not the point to be made at all. The Party to which I belong would take along people who may even be opposed to its viewpoint. Therefore we cannot be accused of stifling thought.

[Mr. JACKSON]

Members of the Majority Party have often spoken of the need for co-operation. The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing in effect said, "We are the Government". We acknowledge that. When that Party, which is in power, wishes to go and seek loans abroad, we are told, "let us co-operate". Since they are in power, they should go on their own where they please to seek loans.

Let us be frank and fair. The reasons why this Party is opposed to the Amendment moved by the Minister of Natural Resources are many. To analyze the situation, one would have to take into account how some Members voted in the Constitutional Committee and how they are likely to vote in this debate — a certain amount of anticipation is necessary in the latter.

Mr. Speaker: Please do not call any names. I do not want to know beforehand how people will vote — only when the time comes.

Mr. Jackson: shall grant your request, Mr. Speaker. What I am saying is, an indication was given in the Constitutional Committee why this Amendment by the Minister of Natural Resources should not be now accepted or why it should not have been put forward at all. In Paragraph 19 of the Report of the Constitutional Committee we have a record of those who voted for and against complete independence for British Guiana. It follows that when the Majority Party decides to take along a delegation to discuss the Constitution it has as a source to draw on those who voted for independence, whether Nominated or Elected Members.

However, the situation has not remained entirely the same, because some Members may no longer want to support full independence. In that case, their views should be heard on the delegation. And we can go on and examine other

decisions of the Constitutional Committee which were arrived at by voting: as shown in Paragraphs 22, 41, 47, 50, 61, 72, 76 and 79 of the Report and see what the strength of the Majority Party would be in a delegation of seven Members.

The Member for Georgetown Central told this Council that he hoped that there would be no room for disappointment on the part of this Council, this Government and this country. I quite agree with him, and I would add that he would be an unwise Secretary of State who would give full recognition to a delegation which does not take into account the views of the people who live in this country and who are represented in this Council.

My Party is in agreement with the Amendment moved by the Member for North Western District. It is clear, however, that he does not endorse the view of the People's National Congress. If he is wrong, then let us educate him as to what is right, and that is, that ultimate independence will have for us tremendous advantages. Nobody on the Government side has attempted to do that. In any case we feel that the Member for North Western District in his Amendment shows a more realistic approach to the question than the Minister of Natural Resources in that he seeks to provide for the representation of every shade of opinion in this Council.

Why is it that the Government refuses to take the simplest course of action? From her speech this afternoon the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing assumed the role of a teacher. Why is it that she does not teach us co-operation by listening to us? Other Members have not indicated how they will vote in this matter. The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Hubbard, has spoken, but the others have remained silent on this Amendment.

I feel that in spite of the place they hold; in spite of their being Nominated, we agree that they should be heard.

While I disagree with the T.U.C. for making its claims in the manner it has done, you have a labour representative (Mr. Tello), the Chamber of Commerce represented by Mr. Gajraj and Mr. Fredericks, who is an enterprising businessman, and I am sure that the views of these people put together would be a tremendous advantage to the delegation.

As I said yesterday when speaking to the Motion, it is not the number of heads which go that will make a decision, it is the views which go, and it depends on how the views are put forward for them to be accepted. But the members of the Government and the People's Progressive Party are so afraid that they would not carry more members than was suggested by the Minister of Natural Resources.

I want to make this plea because it must not be said that we have failed to do our duty on this vital question of a delegation to deal with the Constitution. I want to plead with the People's Progressive Party to reconsider their stand in this matter and withdraw the Amendment moved by the Minister of Natural Resources in favour of that moved by the Member for North Western District.

Mr. Bowman: Mr. Speaker, this debate came about as a result of the divergence of views—

Mr. Fredericks: To a point of order. I have not yet spoken to the Motion. I do not know if the Member is replying.

Mr. Bowman: I am indeed replying, Sir. If the Member wishes to speak, I will take my seat.

Mr. Fredericks: Mr. Speaker, every Member of this Council, without exception, is united in a common bond. Whatever may be the differences, ideological or otherwise, we share a deep love for this country. We all have high hopes for a brighter and prosperous British Guiana and we will all like to feel that

we have contributed, in a small measure, to bringing this dream to a reality rather than it remaining a mere figment of our imagination.

History has taught us that political and economic advancement must come together, hand in hand. The advantage of one at the expense of the other inevitably leads to chaos, strife and oftentimes to bloodshed. We all agreed here that political and economic advancement is necessary, and we all desire a more progressive and liberal Constitution. We perhaps may not be unanimous in the principle of the necessity for an advanced Constitution and there may be some divergence of opinion on the degree of advancement that is required; also of the political machinery that may be necessary for the satisfactory working of a new Constitution. It is my own belief that we are more likely to get a more liberal Constitution if the members of the delegation selected by this Council are fewer in number; as I think they are more likely to reach agreement on major issues, or, alternatively, narrow the areas of disagreement to a minimum. With a small delegation it is much easier to agree and reach agreement or some sort of compromise, but with a larger delegation the areas of disagreement or the likelihood of disagreement would be greater.

I have in mind a delegation of eight comprising three members of the Majority Party, three of the other elected Members and two Members of the Nominated section. One Member has referred to British Honduras having a larger delegation. We have read in today's papers what has happened to that delegation. It was divided into two sections having their own separate meetings. I would not like such a thing to happen to our delegation, hence my support for a small delegation. I do agree with some of the Members on this side that all points of view will not have the opportunity to be represented in that small delegation, but I am also satisfied that all points of view of Members here

[MR. FREDERICKS]

are adequately represented in the Constitutional Committee's Report. Other points of view from outside have also been sent in, in the form of memoranda and reports similar to that very well written document which emanated from the People's National Congress.

I have heard it said yesterday that business must learn to get along with politics. It should also be recognized that democratic political growth flourishes best in the soil of stabilized economic progress. Hence we must recognize and appreciate the importance of the complementary rôle of both politics and business in solving our many and varied problems. It is my belief that private enterprise must play its legitimate, necessary and indispensable rôle in the development of this country, and I feel that business interests must be properly represented in order to ensure a proper climate for expansion in an equitable manner.

As regards the two Nominated Members on this side of the Table, I do not foresee any difficulty in their selection, as we are fortunate in having adequately qualified persons who can and will serve the delegation efficiently and well. One Nominated Member here is almost an authority on rice—one of the three industries on which our economy is almost wholly based. He is a landlord, a farmer and a producer, and his business interests and other activities eminently qualify him to be a member of the delegation.

We have another Nominated Member who is connected with a very large commercial interest. He has served this country with distinction on numerous Committees and delegations in and out of this country. We also have another Nominated Member who is associated with the largest business in this country, and we in this Council have learnt to respect his enormous capabilities. All of those Members are eminently qualified, and I feel that there should be no diffi-

culty in selecting the delegation. I—and I believe the hon. Nominated Member on my left (Mr. Hubbard)—do not desire to be selected as a member of the delegation for many reasons and one of those is that I feel there are other Nominated Members who can serve just as well, or probably better than I can. Consequently I would ask each and every Member of this Council with the best interests of this country uppermost in their minds, to give thoughtful consideration to the selection of a small delegation, and I will take this opportunity to move a slight Amendment to the Amendment moved by the Minister of Natural Resources, by substituting two Nominated Members for one, so that the delegation would consist of eight persons instead of seven as proposed.

Mr. Davis: I beg to second the Amendment.

Mr. Bowman *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: Just one moment. If no one else wishes to speak you may proceed.

Mr. Bowman (*replying*): I rose just now to say that this debate is the result of the divergent views which were expressed in the Constitutional Committee, to the extent that some of us were forced to submit minority reports. I would like to ask: why is the P.P.P. afraid of a larger delegation going to London? In this Chamber during the discussions of the Constitutional Committee we accepted the principle of what was termed a Bill of Rights, but here we see the very Party which claims to be democratic and the champion of the people's rights refusing to allow the views of minorities to be heard on this delegation.

In 1950 when the Waddington Constitutional Commission came to this country I heard at street corner meetings the Leader of the Majority Party say that the British Government should have allowed a Constituent Assembly of Guianese to write a Constitution for British

Guiana. What has happened to that desire that the people of this country should frame its Constitution? Members of the public were denied an opportunity to submit memoranda or to give oral evidence by the decision of members of the Majority Party on the Constitutional Committee, in disregard for the expressed desire of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

My Motion does not suggest that every Member of this Council should be compelled to go on the delegation to London, but that they should be given the right to go if they so desire. Some Members have expressed the opinion that my Motion has no merit, but I think it has a lot of merit.

There are six races living in this country, but let us ask ourselves how many races are represented in this Council? Where are the Chinese and Portuguese representation? There are racial groups which have their own views on the question of the Constitution, and I am sure they are opposed to the proposals contained in the Constitutional Committee's Report. Do the members of the Majority Party say that their recommendations in that Report represent the opinions of all the people of British Guiana?

During the debate I heard one Member say that some of us are afraid of independence even though we were clamouring for it before. It is not that we are afraid but that in facing the facts we have realized that if we were to receive this status now British Guiana would be a second Cyprus. Personally, I am not opposed to independence, but I feel that at this point we should ask for internal self-government, as there must be a transitional period before independence.

We will need the full capacity to govern ourselves under independence. There was a lot of talk about importees. Are we going to ask these same importees to stay? We can send men and women abroad to qualify in order to

take up the various posts later. All these things must be considered when we talk about independence. And I am quite sure that the Resolution of this Council, passed in June, 1958, did not ask for full independence. This question of independence was brought in by the Leader of the Majority Party during the meetings of the Constitutional Committee.

I see the pattern that is being set today by the Majority Party, and I am saying that it is dictatorial. If we all accept it, what Castro is doing in Cuba will be done here. Many of us will be sent to jail. There will be bloodshed. Anybody can see the tendencies of the Jaganites. I was a Jaganite, yes, but that was at a time when their dictatorial tendencies were not exposed to the world. We know — [Interruption].

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Benn: You will lose at the next Elections.

Mr. Bowman: I could beat you in any constituency. It is the hon. Member—[Interruption].

Mr. Speaker: Order! I have spoken over and over again. I expect better from the hon. Minister of Natural Resources. Proceed.

Mr. Bowman: These interruptions disturb my trend of thought. I was saying that when I was in the P.P.P. in the early days these dictatorial tendencies which are being manifested today were not seen at all. During the time when the Party was negotiating with Governor Renison—

Mr. Benn: I do not think that is in order, Sir.

Mr. Bowman: It is in order, Sir!

Mr. Speaker: I rule that it is out of order. At this time you cannot bring up reference to negotiations with His Excellency the Governor, who is not

[MR. SPEAKER]

here, unless you proceed by way of a substantive Motion. If you persist, I will have to name you.

Mr. Bowman: Yes, Sir. It was suggested that a certain Member should be made a Minister. It is natural that that Member supports the P.P.P. at every turn. That Member is not sitting here as a P.P.P. Member, but I know he is "a P.P.P."

Mr. Speaker: You are going off the question now. The Amendment, let me remind you, is proposing that there should be in the delegation three members of the Majority Party, three other Elected Members, and one Nominated Member. Please confine your remarks to the Amendment.

Mr. Bowman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed with every respect to the Chair, but this Member (Mrs. Jagan) referred to the Member for Eastern Demerara and nothing was said about it.

Mr. Speaker: Will you proceed with your speech, or shall I have to ask you to take your seat? We are sitting until half-past five.

Mr. Bowman: You will not be doing me justice, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: If you knew the Standing Orders, you would be aware that I have no power to go on after half-past five, unless a Motion is accepted to the contrary.

Mr. Bowman: This being a matter of great importance, Sir, I thought you were going to give us some sort of leeway.

Mr. Speaker: I could have stopped at five, but the Standing Orders give me the right to continue until half-past five.

Mr. Bowman: The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing referred to the fact that Ghana, since independence, had doubled the volume of her external trade.

Why is this so? Investors have gone there and invested capital. What is the position here? Men are afraid to come, and there is need for the Government to create confidence which is lacking among investors abroad.

We want a Constitution for all Guianese. We do not want a Constitution written by the P.P.P. to suit the whims and fancies of the P.P.P. They cannot fool me, and that is why they do not want me to go to England [Laughter]. That is a fact! Let them laugh. They are afraid of Bowman more than anybody else in this Council [Laughter]. What has become of the "Bill of Rights" which they themselves accepted? When the Member for North Western District was speaking on this "Bill of Rights"—

Mr. Speaker: I cannot go beyond half-past five unless there is a Motion to that effect.

Mr. Tasker: Mr. Speaker, may I move that the question be now put.

Mr. Speaker: If you had put it a moment before; but I doubt very much if I have any power to do so now. There should be a Motion for the Council to continue before that Motion can be put. If that Motion was to be put it should have been put in time — before 5.30. If that time has passed, then I have no power or authority for Council to be continued.

Mr. Tello: I beg to move that the sitting of this Council be continued for 30 minutes at the end of which time the Motion can be put.

Mr. Gajraj: I beg to second the Motion.

Mr. Bowman: There are two questions which I would like to ask. One is about the Bill of Rights. Why is it that the People's Progressive Party wants to deny the minority opinion from going to

London to express their views? The other question is —

[*Interruption*].

I was asking why is it that they had declared their own Party elections *null* and *void*? Since the will of the majority must be carried, and they must have a majority on the delegation to go to London, because they have the majority, the majority will at Party elections should have been carried also.

Let us compare the delegation which went to Trinidad and Venezuela last year and this delegation that is to go to London. Place these two delegations in juxtaposition. Of these two delegations which is the more important? The one to see after the writing of a Constitution, the fundamental law of this country, or the other one? Why is it that these people are afraid to carry a larger delegation? It is only because they want to stifle opinion.

Many people believe that the majority of people in the P.P.P. are 'yes' men. I was not one. I am an individual who thinks for himself and who expresses what he thinks. They are afraid. Why? Because they want to impose upon Guianese what they want.

The Minister of Natural Resources has introduced an Amendment, but I want to describe him as a ventriloquistic instrument; and that is why I expressed the opinion last year that he is simply a mouthpiece —

Mr. Speaker: I will have to stop you or name you if you do not refrain from personalities, and I will have no hesitation in doing so. I have been exceedingly tolerant with you. In point of fact, I take it that you do not appreciate it. You are not debating the Motion, you are replying; but pointing to individuals all the time and saying 'they and they' and 'these men' is not proper. You might have done it out of exuberance, but you must refrain from doing it. If you persist I will have to stop you.

Mr. Bowman: The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing, while she did not call a name, did, in fact, say 'this gentleman'; and after the Minister of Natural Resources made a statement yesterday, I expressed the opinion that whatever he said was from the Party. Mr. Speaker, my vocabulary is limited —

Mr. Speaker: You must always be aware of your limitations.

Mr. Bowman: And if I have a certain trend of thought in mind and I am prevented from expressing that thought, then I certainly have to find other words. I am not opposed to independence. But I want, first of all, to see this country advance to internal self-government and let us have a transitional period during which time we will send our sons and daughters to qualify to fill the posts occupied by the importees.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, in order to refresh your memories I shall read to you the several questions. The first Question is the Motion moved by the hon. Member for Demerara River (Mr. Bowman) which reads:

"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 the Members of the Legislative Council who are desirous of going."

That is the substantive Motion. Then there was an Amendment by the hon. Member for North Western District (Mr. Campbell), which proposed the deletion of all the words after the words "comprised of" in the third line of the Resolve Clause of the Motion, and the substitution therefor of the following:

"11 members, 3 representing the People's Progressive Party, 3 represent-

[MR. SPEAKER]

ing 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.

And be it further resolved: That this Council recommends that the Secretary of the Constitutional Committee should accompany the delegation as its Secretary".

Then there is a second Amendment which was moved by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Benn) for the deletion of all the words after the words "comprised of" in the third line of the Resolve Clause of the Motion, and the substitution therefor of the following:

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

There is a third Amendment by the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Fredericks, to the Amendment moved by the Minister of Natural Resources, for the substitution of the figure "2" for the figure "1" in the second line. In effect his Amendment reads: "3 Members of the Majority Party, 3 Members of the Elected Opposition and 2 Nominated Members".

I am going to put the last Amendment first, that is the one moved by the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Fredericks, in which he asks that the Amendment moved by the Minister of Natural Resources be amended to read:

"That this Council recommends that the delegation to the Constitutional talks be comprised of 3 Members of the Majority Party, 3 Members of the Elected Opposition and 2 Nominated Members".

The Council divided and voted:

<i>For</i>	<i>Against</i>
Mr. Hubbard	Mr. Bowman
Mr. Fredericks	Mr. Beharry
Mr. Davis	Mr. Tasker
Mr. Gajraj	Mr. Tello
Mr. Jai Narine Singh	Mr. Jackson
Mr. Ajodha Singh	Mr. Campbell
Mr. Saffee	Mr. Burnham
Mr. Rai	Mr. Kendall.—8.
Mr. Ram Karran	
Mrs. Jagan	
Mr. Benn	
Dr. Jagan.—12	

Did not vote

The Financial Secretary
The Attorney-General
The Chief Secretary.—3.

Mr. Speaker: The Motion, as amended, is therefore carried. The other Amendments are lost.

Mr. Fredericks: I beg to move that the Council proceed with the selection of the eight members of the delegation.

Mr. Burnham: I rise to a point of order. I submit with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, that the Motion, as amended, should now be put. What has been carried is an Amendment to the original Motion, and I submit that the Motion, as amended, should now be put.

Mr. Speaker: What has been put is an Amendment to the Motion, and as that Amendment is carried, what is carried is:

"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 3 Members of the Majority Party, 3 Members of the Elected Opposition and 2 Nominated Members".

What is carried nullifies the other Amendments. There is therefore no need to put them now.

Mr. Fredericks: I beg to move that a selection be made now.

Mr. Beharry: I beg to second the Motion.

Mr. Burnham: To a point of order there are certain types of Motions that can be taken without notice, and I submit that this one cannot be taken without notice.

The Minister of Community Development and Education (Mr. Rai): But that was to give effect to the Motion.

Mr. Burnham: I stated a point of order. It is for the Speaker to rule and not for the hon. Minister to speak.

Mr. Rai: I am also rising to a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: If a point of order is made, I must first rule on that point of order.

Mr. Burnham: It was a new Motion, of which notice had not been given, and it does not come within the ambit of Motions which can be taken without previous notice being given. Nowhere in the Standing Orders will it be found that a Motion must be taken because it is consequential.

Mr. Speaker: I rule that this Motion is one which is implicit and intimately connected with the Motion which has been passed, and therefore this Council can vote on it, and we can proceed at once. I would like to remind Members that we cannot go beyond the half-hour.

Mr. Hubbard: I am proposing that the selection of the delegation be done by ballot.

Mr. Speaker: Under what Standing Order, may I ask? Can you refer me to it.

Mr. Hubbard: I cannot.

Mr. Speaker: Well, if you cannot, the question is, that we proceed immediately with the selection of the delegation.

Agreed to.

Motion affirmed.

Dr. Jagan: I beg to nominate Messrs. Burnham, Jackson, Gajraj, Davis, Rai and Benn.

The Minister of Communications and Works (Mr. Ram Karran): I beg to second the Motion.

Mr. Benn: I beg to nominate Dr. Jagan and Mr. Jai Narine Singh.

Mr. Rai: I beg to second the Motion

Mr. Bowman: I beg to nominate Messrs. Tello and Kendall.

Mr. Tello: I beg to second the Motion. I also beg to nominate Mr. Bowman.

Mr. Kendall: I beg to second the Motion.

Mr. Burnham: I beg to nominate Mr. Beharry.

Mr. Beharry: I would rather give way to a man from the P.N.C., and so I would ask to stand down.

Mr. Burnham: I beg to nominate Mr. Campbell.

Mr. Tello: I beg to second the Motion.

Mr. Speaker: There is not enough time for us to take the votes.

The Chief Secretary (Mr. Hedges): I beg to move that the sitting of this Council be extended for a further 15 minutes.

Mr. Gajraj: I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion affirmed.

Mr. Jackson: May I at this stage be allowed to stand down?

Mr. Speaker: The Clerk of the Council will now proceed to record the voting in respect of the Members nominated.

The voting resulted as follows:

For Mr. Burnham : *Against*

Mr. Bowman
Mr. Beharry
Mr. Tasker
Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Fredericks
Mr. Davis
Mr. Tello
Mr. Gajraj
Mr. Jai Narine Singh
Mr. Jackson
Mr. Campbell
Mr. Kendall
Mr. Ajodha Singh
Mr. Saffee
Mr. Rai
Mr. Ram Karran
Mrs. Jagan
Mr. Benn
Dr. Jagan — 19.

Did not vote

Mr. Burnham
The Financial Secretary
The Attorney-General
The Chief Secretary —4.

For Mr. Gajraj : *Against*

Mr. Tasker
Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Fredericks
Mr. Davis
Mr. Tello
Mr. Jai Narine Singh
Mr. Ajodha Singh
Mr. Saffee
Mr. Rai
Mr. Ram Karran
Mrs. Jagan
Mr. Benn
Dr. Jagan — 13

Did not vote

Mr. Bowman
Mr. Beharry
Mr. Jackson
Mr. Burnham
Mr. Kendall. — 5.

Did not vote

Mr. Gajraj
Mr. Campbell
The Financial Secretary
The Attorney-General
The Chief Secretary —5.

For Mr. Davis : *Against*

Mr. Bowman
Mr. Tasker
Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Fredericks
Mr. Gajraj
Mr. Jai Narine Singh
Mr. Ajodha Singh
Mr. Saffee
Mr. Rai
Mr. Ram Karran
Mrs. Jagan
Mr. Benn
Dr. Jagan. — 13.

Did not vote

Mr. Beharry
Mr. Tello
Mr. Campbell. — 3.

Did not vote

Mr. Davis
Mr. Jackson
Mr. Burnham
Mr. Kendall
The Financial Secretary
The Attorney-General
The Chief Secretary. —7.

For Mr. Rai : *Against*

Mr. Tasker
Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Davis
Mr. Gajraj
Mr. Jai Narine Singh
Mr. Jackson
Mr. Campbell
Mr. Burnham
Mr. Kendall
Mr. Ajodha Singh
Mr. Saffee
Mr. Rai
Mr. Ram Karran
Mrs. Jagan
Mr. Benn
Dr. Jagan. — 16.

Mr. Fredericks. 1.

Did not vote

Mr. Bowman
Mr. Beharry
Mr. Tello
The Financial Secretary
The Attorney-General
The Chief Secretary. — 6.

For Mr. Benn : *Against*

Mr. Tasker
Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Fredericks
Mr. Davis
Mr. Gajraj
Mr. Jai Narine Singh
Mr. Jackson
Mr. Campbell
Mr. Burnham
Mr. Kendall
Mr. Ajodha Singh
Mr. Saffee
Mr. Rai
Mr. Ram Karran
Mrs. Jagan
Mr. Benn
Dr. Jagan. — 17.

Mr. Bowman
Mr. Tello. — 2.

Did not vote

Mr. Beharry
The Financial Secretary
The Attorney-General
The Chief Secretary. — 4.

For Dr. Jagan : *Against*

Mr. Bowman
Mr. Tasker
Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Fredericks
Mr. Davis
Mr. Gajraj
Mr. Jai Narine Singh
Mr. Jackson
Mr. Campbell
Mr. Burnham
Mr. Kendall
Mr. Ajodha Singh
Mr. Saffee
Mr. Rai
Mr. Ram Karran
Mrs. Jagan
Mr. Benn
Dr. Jagan — 18.

Did not vote

Mr. Beharry
Mr. Tello
The Financial Secretary
The Attorney-General
The Chief Secretary. —5.

For Mr. Jai Narine Singh

Mr. Tasker
Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Tello
Mr. Gajraj
Mr. Jai Narine Singh

Mr. Campbell
Mr. Ajodha Singh
Mr. Saffee
Mr. Rai
Mr. Ram Karran
Mrs. Jagan
Mr. Benn
Dr. Jagan. — 13.

Against

Mr. Bowman
Mr. Beharry
Mr. Fredericks
Mr. Jackson
Mr. Burnham
Mr. Kendall. — 6.

For Mr. Tello :

Mr. Bowman
Mr. Beharry
Mr. Campbell
Mr. Kendall. — 4.

Did not vote

Mr. Davis
Mr. Tello
Mr. Burnham
The Financial Secretary
The Attorney-General
The Chief Secretary.
—6.

For Mr. Kendall :

Mr. Bowman
Mr. Beharry
Mr. Tasker
Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Fredericks
Mr. Davis
Mr. Tello
Mr. Jackson
Mr. Campbell
Mr. Burnham
Mr. Kendall
Mr. Ajodha Singh
Mr. Saffee
Mr. Rai
Mr. Ram Karran
Mrs. Jagan
Mr. Benn
Dr. Jagan — 18.

For Mr. Bowman :

Mr. Bowman
Mr. Beharry
Mr. Tello
Mr. Jackson
Mr. Campbell
Mr. Burnham
Mr. Kendall. — 7.

Did not vote

The Financial Secretary
The Attorney-General
The Chief Secretary.
— 3.

Mr. Campbell:
to stand down.

Did not vote

Mr. Davis
The Financial Secretary
The Attorney-General
The Chief Secretary.
tary.—4.

Against

Mr. Tasker
Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Fredericks
Mr. Gajraj
Mr. Jai Narine Singh
Mr. Jackson
Mr. Ajodha Singh
Mr. Saffee
Mr. Rai
Mr. Ram Karran
Mrs. Jagan
Mr. Benn
Dr. Jagan. — 13.

Against

Mr. Jai Narine Singh
—1.

Did not vote

Mr. Gajraj
The Financial Secretary
The Attorney-General
The Chief Secretary.
— 4.

Against

Mr. Tasker
Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Fredericks
Mr. Davis
Mr. Gajraj
Mr. Jai Narine Singh
Mr. Ajodha Singh
Mr. Saffee
Mr. Rai
Mr. Ram Karran
Mrs. Jagan
Mr. Benn
Dr. Jagan.—13.

Mr. Speaker, I beg

Mr. Speaker: I wish to announce the results in terms of the Motion which was carried. Three Members of the Majority Party — the Minister of Trade and Industry (Dr. Jagan), 18 votes; the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Benn), 17 votes; the Minister of Community Development and Education (Mr. Rai), 16 votes.

Three Members of the Elected Opposition — the hon. Member for Georgetown Central (Mr. Burnham), 19 votes; the hon. Member for New Amsterdam (Mr. Kendall), 18 votes; and the hon. Member for Georgetown South (Mr. Jai Narine Singh), 13 votes.

Two Nominated Members — Mr. Gajraj and Mr. Davis each secured 13 votes.

The Delegation will therefore comprise:

The Hon. the Minister of Trade and Industry (Dr. Jagan)

The Hon. the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Benn)

The Hon. the Minister of Community Development and Education (Mr. Rai)

The Hon. Member for Georgetown Central (Mr. Burnham)

The Hon. Member for New Amsterdam (Mr. Kendall)

The Hon. Member for Georgetown South (Mr. Jai Narine Singh)

The Hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Gajraj.

The Hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chief Secretary: I beg to move that Council do now adjourn to next Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker: Council is adjourned to Wednesday, 10th February, at 2 p.m.