

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

FRIDAY, 1ST SEPTEMBER, 1950.

The Council met at 2 p. m., His Excellency the Governor, Sir Charles Woolley, K.C.M.G., O.B.E., M.C., President, in the Chair.

PRESENT:

The President, His Excellency the Governor, Sir Charles Campbell Woolley, K.C.M.G., O.B.E., M.C.

The Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Mr. J. Gutch, O.B.E.

The Hon. the Attorney-General, Mr. F. W. Holder, K.C.

The Hon. the Financial Secretary and Treasurer, Mr. E. F. McDavid, C.M.G., C.B.E.

The Hon. C. V. Wight, C.B.E. (Western Essequibo).

The Hon. T. Lee (Essequibo River).

The Hon. W. J. Raatgever (Nominated).

The Hon. V. Roth (Nominated).

The Hon. C. P. Ferreira (Berbice River).

The Hon. G. A. C. Farnum, O.B.E., (Nominated).

The Hon. D. P. Debidin (Eastern Demerara).

The Hon. J. Fernandes (Georgetown Central).

The Hon. Dr. G. M. Gonsalves (Eastern Berbice).

The Hon. Dr. C. Jagan (Central Demerara).

The Hon. W. O. R. Kendall (New Amsterdam).

The Hon. C. A. McDoom (Nominated).

The Hon. A. T. Peters (Western Berbice).

The Hon. G. H. Smellie (Nominated)

The Hon. F. E. Morrish (Nominated).

The Clerk read prayers.

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on the 31st of August, 1950, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPER LAID.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Mr. Gutch) laid on the table the following document:—

1950 Review and Revision of the Ten Year Development Plan (Sessional Paper No. 6 of 1950).

UNOFFICIAL NOTICES.**MODERN LIGHTING FOR RURAL AREAS.**

Mr. FARNUM gave notice of the following motion:—

“WHEREAS it is desirable that every effort be made to encourage the youths of our villages to remain in the rural areas;

AND WHEREAS one means to give effect to this end is the provision of modern lighting for homes, community centres and village halls;

BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House recommend to Government the exemption from Customs and other duties, of gas lamps, windchargers and electric generating plants.”

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS**CUSTOMS DUTIES ON AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.**

Mr. FARNUM gave notice of the following questions: —

1. Is it the case that all agricultural machinery is admitted into the Colony free of Customs and other duties?
2. Are agricultural implements used by the small farmer exempted from these imposts?
3. If the answer to (1) is in the affirmative and 2 in the negative, would the Government consider the abolition of Customs duties on agricultural implements used by small farmers in view of the high cost of such articles?

ORDER OF THE DAY.

RETAIL SELLING PRICE OF GASOLENE.

Mr. DEBIDIN asked and the COLONIAL SECRETARY replied to the following questions:—

Q 1—What were the retail selling prices per gallon of Gasolene for each of the years during the war years and subsequently to the present time?

A —See Statement attached.

Q 2—What was the total local consumption of Gasolene for each of the above years and the source or sources of importation?

A —See Statement attached.

Q 3—How is the current price per gallon of Gasolene made up, giving details including first cost, duty and handling?

A —The current price of Gasolene is made up as follows:—

	Cents per gallon
Cost (including Insurance and (Freight)	28.82
Duty	31.00
Bill of Entry Tax86
Duty-paid cost:	60.68
Handling and profit	15.32
Current retail price:	76.00

STATEMENT

	Reply to Question 1. Maximum retail price of Gaso- lene in George- town. (per gallon)	Reply to Question 2. Quantity of Gasolene imported and Country of Origin.			
		United Kingdom	B.W.I.	U.S.A.	Vene- zuela
		(gallons)	(gallons)	(gallons)	(gallons)
1939	19. 9.39	50c.			
	7.10.39	53c.			
	16.11.39	58c.			
1940		58c.	11	1,066,150	..
1941		58c.	..	1,250,440	..
1942			..	983,303	..
	1. 6.42	59c.			
	10. 7.42	64c.			
	18. 7.42	77c.			
	19. 9.42	80c.			
	14.11.42	74c.			
1943			..	768,275	10
	10. 6.43	71c.			..
	4.10.43	74c.			
	23.12.43	73c.			
1944		71c.	..	953,930	..
1945		70c.	..	1,011,850	..
1946		70c.	..	1,298,214	260
1947		70c.	..	1,587,894	52
1948			85	1,966,768	1,200
	20.12.48	65c. (leaded) (motor spirit)			280
	20.12.48	70c. (unleaded) (domestic)			
1949			..	2,204,359	9,925
	1. 6.49	71c. (leaded)			..
	2.11.49	71c. (leaded)			
	2.11.49	77c. (unleaded)			
1950					
	January —				
	15th August		..	1,468,635	..
	17. 6.50	73c. (leaded)			..
	17. 6.50	78c. (ur.leaded)			
	12. 8.50	76c. (leaded)			
	12. 8.50	79c. (unleaded)			

**CATTLE STEALING PREVENTION
(AMENDMENT) BILL.**

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I move the first reading of a Bill intituled —

“An Ordinance to amend the Cattle Stealing Prevention Ordinance, Chapter 94, with respect to the revision of the Register of Brands, the Branding of Cattle, and for purposes connected therewith.”

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

EMPIRE PREFERENCES.

Mr. RAATGEVER: In moving the motion standing in my name on the Order Paper —

“WHEREAS it is proposed to hold a General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (generally known as Gatt) Meeting in the United Kingdom commencing on the 28th September, 1950;

AND WHEREAS no benefits have been received to compensate for the elimination and reduction of Empire Preferences already conceded;

AND WHEREAS such Preferences form a vital part of Commonwealth economy and economic policy;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Colony of British Guiana desires to impress upon the United Kingdom Government the necessity of resisting with all the resources at its command any proposal to grant any further concession either in the form of changes in existing Preferences or binding or reduction of duties in such a way as to impair the value of existing Preferences or to prevent the creating of new Preferences;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that unremitting effort should be made to recover the freedom of action to impose such duties and arrange such Preferences as may be considered necessary to safeguard the position of Commonwealth producers in Commonwealth markets, and to give full opportunities for the greatest possible expansion of intra-Commonwealth trade.”

I would like to mention that it was

tabled at the request of the Primary Producers of the British Caribbean and British Guiana, an organization set up in Barbados at a Conference held there in March, 1949, at which representatives from Jamaica, the Windward and Leeward Islands, Barbados, Trinidad and this Colony were present. The British Guiana Delegates at the Conference were Mr. Croucher, Mr. Farnum and myself.

Hon. Members will recall that this Council approved of the Colony's participation in the Organization and voted the first year's contribution. Hon. Members are no doubt aware of the benefits received by this Colony from Imperial Preferences, the modification or abolition of which will interfere very seriously with the economy of this Colony and the standard of living of every section of its people. This matter was discussed with the Sugar Delegation in the United Kingdom by many organizations, and the members were requested on their return home to move in the Legislative Councils of their respective Colonies, or cause to be moved, similar resolutions to this one which I am moving here today.

I have had circulated copies of a pamphlet entitled “The Havana Charter and British Empire Trade”, which was published by Imperial Industries Association and British Empire League giving the background of the Havana Charter. I think this Colony was represented at that meeting by Col. Spencer, the Economic Adviser. The facts are clearly set out in the copies which have been circulated, so I do not think it is necessary for me to say much more, except to commend this motion to hon. Members for their careful consideration and support.

Mr. FARNUM: I beg to second the motion.

The PRESIDENT: Does any hon. Member wish to speak on the motion?

Mr. DEBIDIN: Sir, in so far as this motion is concerned, it seems to me there are far reaching implications and I have reason to request this Council and the Mover of the motion that this matter be

held over for some time, so as to give Members more opportunity of going into what the implications are. I must confess that as soon as notice was given yesterday by you, Sir, I thought there was not adequate opportunity of going into what might be involved in this motion. Personally, as far as I can gather, there is but one preference so far as the United Kingdom is concerned, and that relates to sugar. I know, too, from the results I have been able to glean with respect to Preference to Canada, Great Britain has been making profits from the sugar which she has been buying and selling on the world market. Especially where we may have to reduce our agreements with Canada too, the whole question of inter-related preferences may have to come into consideration. Personally, I do not know to what extent any corresponding action in the form of protective tariffs may have on the people of this Colony, because we know that any tariff put up, though it may increase the revenue of the Colony, nevertheless it passes on to the people, the consumers of the Colony, and it is a matter which must require a certain amount of study, especially as to the economic aspect of the whole question. It is not so easy, and I feel sure that the Mover of this motion would not mind one bit if it is deferred for a fortnight or a little longer. I certainly will move that further consideration of this motion be deferred until such time as this Council sees fit to fix.

Mr. SMELLIE: I think that you yourself, Sir, pointed out yesterday that the whole essence of this motion being debated and passed at the present time is because of the Conference which is sitting at the present time. I do not agree at all with the last speaker that it should be deferred for a fortnight, but that we should decide it today.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY & TREASURER: Perhaps I may help the Council by explaining a little more what is behind it. The Conference which is to take place on the 28th September is the third of a series of conferences taking place in connection with what is known as "The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade" (generally known as Gatt).

There was a conference at Geneva in 1937 at which the Caribbean Colonies were directly represented. There was another in 1949 and, as I said, this is the third. Certain agreements have already been entered into and, I think, Members of Council were informed of some of them. But on this third occasion, as I gather from the papers, some other countries than were not originally represented among those who formed part of the agreement have been invited to attend and they probably will make representations in regard to tariff concessions, etc. I see also from the papers that it is very unlikely that the West Indian Colonies as a whole will be concerned with this particular matter. The Conference is to be attended by a United Kingdom delegation headed by a Senior Minister and a representative of the Colonial Office on behalf of the Colonies. As a matter of fact we are invited to send an adviser if we care to do so, but we have not for the reason I have stated it is not necessary to do so.

Also from the papers I see that His Majesty's Government will take every care to ensure that no concessions are agreed to which will interfere with the Preference arrangements which we so much appreciate. Certainly it is not for our consideration and agreement. Consequently I do not think that any question of consideration of details arises either now, or will arise in a fortnight, or for some time. But this motion that the hon. the Third Nominated Member has moved is a gesture which will, perhaps, strengthen the hands of His Majesty's Government with regard to the feeling and the attitude of this Legislature relative to Preferences. Consequently, I think no harm but certainly a good deal of good will result from passing this motion. Certainly a token purpose will be served. No further information, no further details of any kind can possibly come to us in two weeks which will put us in a better position to pass the motion than we are in today. I do suggest that the motion be accepted.

Dr. JAGAN: Perhaps it will not be the desire of the Council to postpone this debate, and consequently I am going to

say what I feel about this matter now. As I look at the resolution, Sir, it seems to me that because a conference is to be held the matter is rather urgent and, therefore, this Council is asked to give its sanction to the resisting with all the resources at its command of any proposals to grant any further concession either in the form of changes in the existing Preferences or in the binding or reduction of duties in such a way as to impair the value of existing Preferences, or to prevent the creating of new Preferences, and further to recover the freedom of action to impose such duties and arrange such Preferences as may be considered necessary to safeguard the position of Commonwealth producers in Commonwealth markets. One has to safeguard against pressure, but may I ask, Sir, whose pressure, pressure directed by whom and against whom and for whose interest? I remember when the issue of Devaluation came upon the scene we were merely told — I believe it was a statement by the Governor that Devaluation had happened and it was going to cost the Colony so much. We had no opportunity to debate the issue of Devaluation. But on this occasion we are being asked in this Council to give its sanction to a thing which, I do not think, this Council has any power to intervene in.

This discussion, which is to take place in a couple of weeks hence, is between the Metropolitan Governments, and consequently the Colonies have very little to say in this matter except, as the hon. the Financial Secretary said, to send possibly advisers. He has also intimated that we have not to decide to send any adviser to this Conference or to the conferences already held. If that is so, I would first of all like to question the propriety of bringing this matter to this Council at the present time, whether it is placed before this Council in the right and proper manner? Do we have the power as a Council to debate such a motion, as it is going to be discussed by His Majesty's Government? I would like to know whether this Council has the right to give its opinion on an issue in respect of which it will not be a party. Obviously pressure is being put, possibly

on the United Kingdom, to reduce the tariff rates, and no doubt this pressure is coming from the U.S.A. When I was speaking on Devaluation in this Council, I remember the same hon. Member, who has moved this motion today, saying that my speeches at that time were irrelevant, but it seems to me now that what I was saying then is now bearing fruit and that is, the question of Devaluation was forced upon the British Government and further that pressure is being put on the Government by way of removing all trade barriers. In this case they are Preference tariffs.

If the United Kingdom has the power to resist at the Conference, do we in this Council have the constitutional right to intervene at this particular moment? Are we being used merely to show that we are helping His Majesty's Government's Advisers or Officers who will be deliberating at this Conference by strengthening their hands to the effect that they are able to say that the Colonies, possibly the West Indies and British Guiana, have already agreed to such a resolution and, therefore, they cannot make any concession at all? I wonder if that is really the objective for bringing this motion into this Council at the present time? No doubt pressure is being put, but we in this Council have to analyse the matter afresh. What may be good enough for Great Britain, it does not necessarily follow, is good enough for the Colonies and for British Guiana. I say that advisedly. At one time Great Britain was the great champion of Free Trade, because at that time she was the chief industrial nation of the world and the chief maritime country of the world and free trade suited her. But today we find no one Power has risen to that position, and consequently we now find that even the U.S.A. with its protective trade barriers is advocating the abolition of these barriers. I feel we must be very careful to look at all the issues to determine whether any action taken will be in the interest of the Colony or in the interest of the Metropolitan Government.

The hon. Member who moved the motion states in his preambled

"Whereas it is proposed to hold a General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (generally known as Gatt) meeting in the United Kingdom commencing on the 28th September, 1950; And Whereas no benefits have been received to compensate for the elimination and reduction of Empire Preferences already conceded;

And Whereas such Preferences form a vital part of a Commonwealth economy and economic policy;"

There can be no doubt about it, we have had possibly certain advantages by Preferences and, as one Member pointed out, a clear example is the case of sugar. But there is the other side of the story too. Because of Preferences in many cases we find that most of our products are from the United Kingdom. It can be said that our economy is somewhat integrated. It is so directed that we are to produce the raw materials and buy the manufactured goods from the United Kingdom at a low preferential tariff.

What has to be considered is that with devaluation the people in the Colonies are suffering, because goods for which they were accustomed to pay one American dollar (then \$1.20 in B.G. currency) are now costing them \$1.70 in B.G. currency, and with duty and bill of entry tax added, those goods are costing very much more in this Colony. It is true that many purchases have been diverted to the U.K. and Europe, but it is a well known fact that prices in Europe and the U.K. do not generally compare favourably with prices in the dollar areas. Therefore we have to ask ourselves this question: If devaluation which, in my opinion, has been forced upon the British Government, has created hardship on the people of the Colony, would it be a good thing for this Colony to lower its tariff barriers against goods coming from the dollar areas so that we may get goods from those areas at reduced prices? I know that in Surinam they have one tariff for goods imported into that country, and I want to feel that at this time it might be advantageous to the people of this Colony to have our tariff rates levelled so that we might pay the same rates of duty whether we buy from the U.S.A., Canada, the U.K. or Europe. Of course, if we did that we would be doing a disservice to the indus-

trial recovery of Great Britain, therefore we have to consider the whole aspect of the situation.

But we have to follow economic trends. As a result of the dollar shortage in the world the U.S.A. is faced with the problem of not being able to sell its manufactured goods. The result is that there are six million people unemployed in the U.S.A. today. If the American capitalists cannot sell their goods in the Colonies or in the Commonwealth areas because of the dollar shortage then the next best thing would be for them to set up factories in the Commonwealth areas. That is one avenue of removing the bottleneck, but another avenue is being exploited by putting high pressure to have the tariff barriers reduced in the Colonies. In this Colony the British preferential rate of duty is 16 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., while the rate on American goods is 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. If those rates were levelled to a common figure of 16 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., or 20 per cent., or even 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. it would mean that competitively the British goods would be put out of the market.

Mr. RAATGEVER: That is not correct. They would not, because, with the rate of exchange at 72 per cent., the first cost of American goods would be higher than that of similar goods from the U.K. and Commonwealth countries.

Dr. JAGAN: That is not a true statement of fact. I know that in my line I can still buy from the U.S.A. despite the devaluation, and get goods landed here cheaper than I can get similar goods from the U.K.

The PRESIDENT: If you have the dollars you can, but if you have not the dollars you cannot. That is a simple fact. We must not deceive ourselves.

Dr. JAGAN: With your permission, Sir, I would like to read a quotation from this book "Britain's Crisis of Empire."

The PRESIDENT: Who is the author?

Dr. JAGAN: The author is R. Palme Dutt. The quotation is from an article headed "America Conquers Britain," by Ladwell Denny, which was written in

1930. On page 43 of the book the article states :

"We were Britain's colony once. She will be our colony before she is done; not in name, but in fact. Machines gave Britain power over the world. Now better machines are giving America power over the world and Britain

"Of course, American world supremacy is rather horrible to think about. But American supremacy can hardly be worse than British and others gone before

"What chance has Britain against America? Or what chance has the world?"

On page 44 there is a quotation by the writer of the article from a speech made by Virgil Jordan, President of the National Industrial Conference Board of the U.S.A. to the Investment Bankers' Association of America on December 10, 1940. I quote:

"Whatever the outcome of the war, America has embarked on a career of imperialism in world affairs and in every other aspect of her life. Even though by our aid England should emerge from this struggle without defeat, she will be so impoverished and crippled in prestige that it is improbable she will be able to resume or maintain the dominant position in world affairs which she has occupied so long. At best, England will become a junior partner in a new Anglo-Saxon imperialism, in which the economic resources and the military and naval strength of the United States will be the centre of gravity.

"The sceptre passes to the United States."

Those are the very people who are now putting pressure on us to remove these tariff barriers so that they can come in and, as you said, if dollars are available, sell their goods very easily to the Colonies. My point is that we in the Colonies have to be very careful. As long as Great Britain pursues her imperialist policies, which are today directed by America, we have to think of ourselves, and by thinking of ourselves I mean that probably in the long run it might be better if we could do, as the people have done in Surinam, that is to put all our tariffs on the same level. The hon. the Financial Secretary suggests that I am supporting

American imperialism, but I am faced with no choice, because British or American imperialism is the same to me. As a colonial I fail to see that one is better than the other, and that is why I say that as long as Great Britain continues to follow the path arranged by American imperialism we will have to think of ourselves. I say that seriously, because we know today as a fact that Great Britain is pursuing a lot of adventurous schemes which she can ill afford, merely at the bidding of the U.S.A.

The Financial Secretary referred to the Bank deficit in dollar payments. I have the figures right here. The deficit in the balance of payments from 1946 to 1949 was £1,130 million. During that same period on military overseas expenditure £806 million was spent by Great Britain. America is calling the tune and Great Britain is dancing to the extent of nearly 7/10ths of her total expenditure on overseas military requirements. If this is really a British Commonwealth of Nations why do we have to police the world? We had war in Malaya —

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY & TREASURER: Surely that is not relevant to the question under discussion.

Dr. JAGAN: Whenever I speak the question of relevancy is raised, because I seem to touch on certain points which some hon. Members do not like to hear. I prefaced my remarks by asking whether the Council was in order to discuss a matter like this in the first place, because it is so complicated and so wide. It has very little reference to the Colony as such, because the Metropolitan Government makes the decisions which are binding on the Colonies. Now that I speak I am told that the matter is not relevant. I want to feel that we should accept the facts as they are, and if it is inevitable that the U.S.A. will be the supreme power in the world then we must face up to that fact and try to make the best bargain possible for British Guiana. If I were the individual directing policy I would agree with the hon. Member who has moved this motion, that there should be no reduction in tariff barriers, and that every effort should be made to

preserve them, but since we in the Colonies do not direct policy (and we have seen it in the recent rice debate, and we will see it in many more things to come) I feel that one imperialist policy is as bad as the other, and I think it would be a good thing for this Colony if the tariff barriers were removed and we were allowed to buy wherever we can, if we have the dollars, of course. If we do not have the dollars we would probably go to Japan and Germany where we are told prices are even cheaper. But if we have the dollars we should buy from the dollar areas if the prices are cheaper.

Mr. MORRISH : I have listened to what has been said up to now in the course of this debate, and I am astonished that anyone could suggest that the motion before us is even controversial. I have before me an extract from the British Empire Producers' Organization News Letter dated 10th August, 1950, and with your permission, Sir, I would like to read certain paragraphs which are extracts from speeches in the Imperial Parliament on the subject. I quote :

"Mr. Russell asked in the course of his speech on the Gatt debate in Parliament, how were the Colonies going to fare if Imperial Preference was finally abolished? How were we going to improve conditions in the Colonial Empire, as we were pledged to do, if we could not give priority to their produce? How would Mauritius or Barbados be able to find a market for their sugar in the face of competition from Cuba if there was no preference in our Empire trade system? The Government were putting the clock back 100 years by adopting the policy of the Havana Charter.

Mr. Braine said that the economy of the Dominions and Colonies had been expanding rapidly in the past 10 years. The untapped resources of the British Colonial Empire alone were enormous. Yet it was at this moment that the Government had sought to bind our hands and to limit our control over our own economic destiny. Fortunately, all was not yet lost. There was time for second thoughts. He trusted that the Government would see fit to instruct our delegation at Torquay accordingly, and to re think their whole attitude and policy on this matter.

Miss Hornsby-Smith said that it was no good spending millions of the tax-

payers' money in Colonial welfare and the development of new industries in order to raise the standard of living of those Colonies, unless we were prepared to provide markets for the goods which we encouraged them to produce. Colonial development was not worth the paper it was written on unless we were prepared to protect the goods whose production we stimulated there."

I suggest that those remarks I have quoted have a very considerable bearing on the subject before us, and I recommend hon. Members to consider them seriously.

Mr. FERNANDES : The motion before the Council is a very simple one. All we are asked to do is to arrive at a decision as to what British Guiana requires in the matter of Empire Preferences for the information of those who will have to do with the negotiations. I am supporting the motion most wholeheartedly. We have lived in the past as members of the British Empire and we have had quite a lot of freedom which I appreciate and am grateful for. If there is any crisis in the British Empire, as the book from which the hon. Member for Central Demerara (Dr. Jagan) quoted states, or tries to convey, I am going to show my gratitude by doing everything possible to help in that crisis. The hon. Member referred to the very large expenditure for military purposes. There is, in my opinion, only one way in which Great Britain can cut down that expenditure. That expenditure is being incurred not only for the protection of Great Britain herself but for the protection of British Guiana and all other parts of the Commonwealth. My friend has quoted in this Council from books which, as in one case I remember recently, originated from Moscow. It is just possible that he may be able to get some of his friends there to get the Government of that country to —

Dr. JAGAN : To a point of correction. I have no friends there. (Laughter).

Mr. FERNANDES : I stand corrected, but in view of the fact that the hon. Member has been able to quote from books produced there I thought perhaps he got them from friends there. I am glad to know that I am wrong, but at

any rate it is obvious that the reason for this increased expenditure on military services and so on is due to the desire of one country. I cannot say whether it is imperialistic or not, because my eyes cannot penetrate the Iron Curtain. Anyway I much prefer to live, as I have lived for 49 years, free to express my opinion, free to criticize the Government, free to say all I feel like saying as long as it is true and honest, than to see Great Britain cut down that military expenditure and to find that in a very short time that, instead of my being here in the open daylight, I am behind an iron curtain. So I am not going to criticize that expenditure as excessive. It is something which we cannot avoid, something which is being forced upon us, and I am sure every Member of this Council will agree that it is not being forced upon us by the U.S.A.

We have heard a lot about the U.S.A. dominating Great Britain; that the U.S.A. is calling the tune and Great Britain is dancing, and things like that. Personally I feel that the U.S.A. is trying to co-operate with Great Britain and

with quite a few other countries to save the world from domination by any single power. However, that is just by the way. I think the time is opportune for us to express our opinion on matters of preference and take a decision today, so that if by any chance, as the hon. Member for Central Demerara (Dr. Jagan) says, the Home Government should make a decision that was not in our interest, or against our interests, at least they would have done so knowing which way we wanted them to act, and if they acted contrary to our request and could have avoided acting in that way, well then of course I would have my say and express my opinion on the matter. But I disagree with the hon. Member when he says that this Council has no right to debate the matter, because I maintain that we have every right to let those who are going to negotiate on our behalf know exactly what we want.

Motion put and agreed to.

The Council was adjourned until Thursday, September 7 at 2 p.m.