

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

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

FRIDAY, 1ST APRIL, 1955

The Council met at 2 p.m.

PRESENT:

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

Ex-Officio Members :

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

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

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

Nominated Members of Executive Council :

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

The Hon. P. A. Cummings (Member
for Labour, Health and Housing).

The Hon. W. O. R. Kendall (Member
for Communications and works).

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

The Hon. G. H. Smellie.

The Hon. R. B. Gajraj.

The Hon. R. C. Tello.

Deputy Speaker :

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

Nominated Officials:

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

Mr. J. I. Ramphal.

Nominated Unofficials :

Mr. T. Lee.

Mr. W. A. Phang.

Mr. L. A. Luckhoo, Q.C.

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

Mr. C. A. Carter.

Mr. E. F. Correia.

✓ Rev. D. C. J. Bobb.

Mr. H. Rahaman.

Miss Gertie H. Collins.

Mrs. Esther E. Dey.

Dr. H. A. Fraser.

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

Mr. R. B. Jailal.

Mr. Sugrim Singh.

Clerk of the Legislature—

Mr. I. Crum Ewing.

Assistant Clerk of the Legislature—

Mr. E. V. Viapree (acting).

The Speaker read prayers.

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Thursday, the 31st of March, 1955, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

ORDER OF THE DAY

MOTION — BRITISH CARIBBEAN FEDERATION

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

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

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

The Attorney General: Mr. Speaker, when the Council adjourned yesterday afternoon I had referred to the speech of the hon. the Chief Secretary in regard to this matter, and to the policy of Government. In concluding my reference to the address of the hon. the Chief Secretary I quoted from the newspaper report which was not quite accurate. I have here an extract from *Hansard* and, with your permission, I shall refer to some parts of the hon. the Chief Secretary's speech. He said:—

"We cannot expect at this late stage to call a halt to the West Indian Islands' march towards Federation, so that the whole question of British Guiana's participation in it can be re-examined. I am

sure none of us would wish to do anything or say anything which would impede or prejudice the fulfilment of the London Conference Plan for Federation. What we can do is to take stock of our position. If it is demonstrated that it is the wish of the majority of the people in this country that we should join the Federation, we can open negotiation with the Federal Authority as to the terms on which we may enter. This, as we understand it, is the object of this motion, and as such we welcome it and support it."

I wish to emphasize that part of the hon. the Chief Secretary's address. He went on:

"The motion is in two parts. The first part seeks an expression of opinion, the opinion of this Council. The second part of the motion makes it plain that it is intended to be no more than that, as it is a prayer to the Governor that His Excellency should take steps to ascertain the state of public opinion in the country towards participation in the Federation. In other words, Sir, this Council does not claim to be in a position to represent the will of the people in a matter so vital as this. It may be asked "If this motion is adopted how will His Excellency implement this prayer." I do not think it would be right for us to attempt to read His Excellency's mind in the matter, to anticipate what steps he would take. All I would say is, there are more ways than one of finding out what the country thinks on this subject. One obvious way is by a plebiscite, but this is not the only way or necessarily the best way. Another way is by the establishment of a Commission which would obtain the views of all representative groups in the country not only on the principle of Federation but on the terms on which this country may wish to join the Federation. This, however, as I say, is a matter which, in the terms of the motion, must be left to the determination of the Governor.

"One thing is certain, that whatever steps His Excellency may take will take time to fulfil their object, and during that time the British Caribbean Federation will, we hope, be evolving into reality. The merit of the motion, as Government understands it, is that if it is adopted and implemented we may hope by that time to be in a position, if it is the country's wish, to start discussion with the Federation as to the terms on which British Guiana may join."

I have reiterated those parts of the hon. the Chief Secretary's speech, coming as I do at the end of the debate, because hon. Members will fully appreciate the importance of the statement made by the hon. the Chief Secretary in regard to any subsequent action that may be necessary if this Council adopts Federation in principle, and if the majority of the people of this country support the views of this Legislative Council. I hope that all hon. Members, and indeed the wider area outside this Council — that is, the people of this country — will read, mark, and fully understand what has been conveyed in the Government's policy, as outlined and indicated by the hon. the Chief Secretary, because it will be appreciated that it is not only what we say in this Council that is of importance, but it is the manner in which it is put over to the people of this country.

I therefore hope that all those, who are concerned in expressing a view in connection with this controversial subject of Federation, will strive to put in the fairest way both sides of the picture, and not give it an undesirable and improper slant. As I indicated yesterday, the hon. Member, Mr. Sugrim Singh, stated that we should hear both sides of the story, and I am sure that if hon. Members of this Council, or others who do not belong to this Council, are seeking to make representations to the people of this country, they will carry with them the high responsibility which should be taken in a matter of this vital importance to British Guiana.

Yesterday, I tried to indicate the reasons why this Council could proceed to the discussion of this motion, and to show that this Council was fully competent to discuss it. I referred to the point raised by the hon. the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Raatgever), that the motion should not be discussed

without the consent of the Governor, as it was a motion which would dispose of or be a charge upon public revenue under the British Guiana (Constitution). (Temporary Provisions) Order in Council, 1953. The hon. the Deputy Speaker asked whether the consent of the Governor had been obtained. You, Mr. Speaker, ruled and—if I may say so—ruled correctly. It was not necessary in the circumstances of the motion which had been presented to this Council, that the Governor's consent should be had, in view of the fact that the motion did not in its terms seek to make any charge upon the revenue of this country. It only asked for an expression of the views of this Council and its approval in principle of this question of Federation. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, the point the hon. Member sought to maintain was not sustained by you, and I suggested that the motion has to be read and considered in relation to its other parts, particularly to the prayer that His Excellency should ascertain the views of the country.

As I stated just now in quoting extensively from the hon. the Chief Secretary's speech, the question as to how those views may be ascertained will be a matter for His Excellency the Governor. But that will involve the method of doing it, and it may be that at that stage the question of funds may arise. I do not know, and I am not seeking to anticipate what is in the Governor's mind. That does not arise at the present time. I would wish to add that an expression of opinion by a collective voice does not mean that this country is bound to Federation. All that this motion, if it is accepted, implies is that we, the Members of the Legislative Council brought into existence under the British Guiana (Constitution) (Temporary Provisions) Order in Council, consider that Federation of British Guiana with the West Indies is, in principle, a good thing for this country, but we recognise that we are a nominated body. We recognise, too, that

[The Attorney General]

as such we have no mandate from the people. In these circumstances we are asking the Governor to keep in touch with the events associated with Federation, and we are also praying His Excellency to take such steps as he may think suitable, to find out whether the people of this country are in favour of Federation in principle. Until and unless the views of the country have been ascertained in support of this opinion of the Legislature, this country would not be in a position to move forward and join the Federation, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that hon. Members will support and agree with the ruling which you gave on that point.

The amendment to the motion sought to re-examine the matter but gave no indication what this re-examination involved. As I said yesterday, it is somewhat vague and nebulous. It is wrong to say—as has been suggested—that the motion, if carried, would have the effect of charging our revenues by \$2 million. The motion does not, and was never intended to convey any impression that by its passage the revenues of this country would be charged with any provision for Federation.

Mr. Raatgever: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. the Attorney General, but I never said that.

The Attorney General: I never referred to the hon. Member, the Deputy Speaker, and never intended to do so. If I wanted to refer to the hon. Member I would have done so quite deliberately, and my omission shows that he was not concerned so far as that statement goes. I mentioned that because I think it is desirable to put it on record in view of what I have seen in public print, and because wrong impressions can be created through the medium of the public Press. I do not wish impressions of that sort to go uncorrected and unanswered.

I think it was said in this Council that this motion has been imposed by Her Majesty's Government. I think the hon. mover of the motion did in some way deal with that aspect of the question, but I would wish to emphasise that there is no truth whatever in such a statement. The hon. mover will, I am sure—if he has not done so already—ease the position and give the lie to any such statement. It is not true, and I hope and I know hon. Members of this Council do not accept it, but in view of the fact that this question is ultimately to be considered by the public of this country, it is desirable that there should be a categorical statement denying what has already been said—that this matter has been imposed by the United Kingdom Government.

Hon. Members are aware of the statement made by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that the door would be left open for British Guiana and British Honduras if subsequently they decide to enter into Federation with the West Indies. That is as far as it has gone. That statement was published, and there is nothing beyond that. The hon. mover of the motion introduced it, this Council has been debating it for a period of time, and, as other Members have already stated, it has served a very useful purpose to this country, because it focuses the attention of the public on this matter, and has, in fact, in many ways been the means of educating the public as to what Federation really involves, and what its effect might possibly be on British Guiana.

I do not wish to labour the point, but the hon. Member, Lt.-Colonel Haywood, who is not in his seat at the present time, pointed out yesterday that although this debate has been protracted, and although we have been engaged so long—this is the 13th day — on this matter, yet it could not be regarded as a waste of time. Some people are per-

sisting in making that statement, but if this Legislative Council, in its responsibility to the country, is seeking to hammer out and consider from every angle this very vital question, then it is completely wrong and completely undesirable for any such statement to be made. I do hope that those who are responsible for such utterances or such writings would stop that line of approach to the question, and would exercise their minds in presenting the matter to the public in a fair, equitable and impartial manner.

Here I would most sincerely wish to enjoin the Press in their publications to give both sides of the picture, so that the people of this country may be able to understand and appreciate the meaning of Federation, and to be in a position from that appreciation and understanding to consider whether it would be advantageous or otherwise for this country to join a political Federation.

I would say that it is a matter for regret that in dealing with this subject some organs of the Press have seen fit to emphasise one side of the matter and to give prominence only to those aspects which suited their point of view. I think they are missing the mark and are ignoring a fundamental fact that they are a vital medium of education, and their responsibility in regard to the appreciation, or lack of appreciation on any subject, is to lessen the ignorance of the reader on that subject. No one can quarrel with them for taking a particular stand, shaping a particular policy, presenting certain aspects of the question or using certain features of the debate to support their policy, but it is a different thing to seek out certain parts as presented by a few speakers and not give prominence to the rest. I hope it will be appreciated that that is quite unhelpful to the country. As I said before, let the people know both sides and let them judge and come to their conclusion.

Perhaps it would not be out of place, Sir, if I refer to a quotation which I used to see appearing in the *Argosy* for some time. It has disappeared now and I do not know the reason for it. It reads:

"A newspaper... is much more than a business; it is an Institution; it reflects and it influences the life of the whole community; it may affect wider destinies. It is, in its way, an instrument of Government. It plays on the minds and consciences of men. It may educate, stimulate, assist, or it may do the opposite. It has, therefore, a moral as well as a material existence, and its character and influence are in the main determined by the balance of these two forces. It may make profit or power its first object, or it may conceive itself as fulfilling a higher and more exacting function."

I ask the Press in this important question to fulfil the highest function of journalism. The question of Federation has engaged the attention of the Legislature of this country in various ways since 1945, as I said yesterday. Hon. Members who have spoken have referred to the history of this matter in British Guiana, but I would point out that the question of Federation is unfortunately always coming up for discussion under peculiarly difficult circumstances. Mr. Critchlow's motion in 1945 was considered by the Legislative Council when preparations were being made for elections after a lapse of about 12 years. Mr. Seaford's motion was considered on his return as one of the delegates to the Montego Bay Conference, and was tabled before the elections. Dr. Nicholson's motion was considered in November, 1951, and early in 1952.

That was the only occasion that this question of the acceptance of Federation was discussed so far as the principle and the merits went. And even then, as the hon. the Member for Agriculture pointed out, the discussion swung from one point to another. The hon. Member for Agriculture, who arrived on practically

[The Attorney General] the last day of that debate, sought here, and justifiably so, to make an analysis of the results of the voting on that occasion. But that is past history, and I do not mention it for the purpose of making a debating point. In 1953, shortly before the old Legislative Council came to an end, there was a debate in connection with the sending of an observer, and it is perfectly true, as has been pointed out by the Deputy Speaker, that the votes were almost even. The representative in 1953 was Mr. Smellie, and the Legislative Council of 1953 actually came to an end when Mr. Smellie was on his way to London, or in attendance at the conference.

I come back to the point I was seeking to make—that this country has always been dealing with the question under particularly difficult circumstances, and that may account for the fact of its indecisiveness. Here we are again discussing the matter in equally difficult circumstances, or circumstances which are not particularly ideal for this purpose, because we are a nominated Council and we have **no mandate from the people**. I suggest that we should still go ahead, otherwise we should still be bogged down. We must find ways out of the difficulties, to show the country that we are in a position to join whole-heartedly in a movement which must commend itself to every forward-looking man and woman in this country.

It was suggested that the motion was somewhat confusing, or that it would lead to confusion. I may not have framed the motion in the form in which it has been presented to the Council, but I am sure hon. Member will appreciate that its wording was a matter for the Member who moved it. I cannot subscribe to the idea that it is confusing, or can lead to

confusion. You, Mr. Speaker, remarked that it was not happily phrased. While that may or may not be so I think everyone in this Council and outside of it has taken the trouble to analyse the motion and to appreciate what the hon. Member has in mind, and what he seeks to achieve. As the hon. Mr. Luckhoo has observed, the motion falls into four parts. The two main parts are that the Legislature expresses an opinion and requests that the Governor take such steps as he may think fit to ascertain the state of public opinion in this country towards participation in Federation. I feel—and I am sure my view is shared by all Members of this Council—that there are many British Guianese who are re-examining the question of the desirability of a political Federation, and that is all to the good.

Much has been said and written about this subject outside this Council, and there have been varying expressions of views for and against British Guiana's participation in a political Federation with the West Indies. Those in favour say it is a good thing, while those against say it would be a sorry day for the Colony; that it would be disastrous for British Guiana. Perhaps the Council will pardon me if I spend a few moments on this question of Federation and what it means. I think that Mr. Sugrim Singh knows that much of it comes from the book which he quoted — "Whereas on Federal Government." It says :

"By the federal principle I mean the method of dividing powers so that the Federal and Regional Governments are each, within a sphere, co-ordinate and independent."

That means, for instance, that Jamaica or Trinidad would remain as separate units with regard to particular subjects, independent of the Federal Government which would have authority over and above the constituent units

with respect to certain subjects which would be exclusive to it. I quote again:

"Federal government exists when the powers of government for a community are divided substantially according to the principle that there is a single independent authority for the whole area in respect of some matters, and that there are independent regional authorities for other matters—each set of authorities being co-ordinate with and not subordinate to the other within its own prescribed sphere."

There are certain pre-requisites to Federal Government, and while I may be repeating to some extent what the hon. Mr. Sugrim Singh said in his speech, I hope to do so briefly.

"The communities or states concerned must desire to be under a single independent government for some purpose at any rate."

That is essential, and I hope hon. Members will appreciate that because of the fact that this Government is a nominated Government, they must have some regard to that aspect, apart from the question that they do not have a mandate from the people on the principle of Federation.

"The desire to be under a single independent government is not enough. They must desire at the same time to retain or to establish independent regional governments in some matters at least. Without this desire to be separate in some things, the communities could form a unitary state with some appropriate degree of decentralization. There would be no reason why the federal principle should be invoked. . . . So far, then, it would seem that federal government is appropriate for a group of states or communities if, at one and the same time, they desire to be united under a single independent general government for some purposes, and to be organised under independent regional governments for others. Or, to put it shortly, they must desire to be united, but not to be unitary."

Then arises the question of the capacity to work a Federal Government. I quote again:

"A desire for federal union among communities is a first and obvious factor which

produces in them the capacity to make and work a federal union. It would be obvious also that community of race, language, religion and nationality would produce a capacity for union. With so much in common, states would inevitably work easily together. But of all the factors which produce the desire for union, the one which at the same time produces best the capacity for union, is similarity of social and, particularly, political institutions."

I emphasise that aspect of the quotation because, if I may be permitted, later on I shall refer to that quite briefly in dealing with the suggestion of our relationship with the two Guianas:

"The desire for union has practically never been aroused unless similarity of political institutions was present, either actually, or potentially, among those who envisaged the union."

I mention that because, although the hon. Mr. Sugrim Singh referred to them at some length, I do not wish hon. Members to forget what basically are the requirements for a Federal Government. I am sure that hon. Members who have read the Rance Report will find there a very careful presentation of the implications of a Federal Government, and particularly the type of Federal Government which is being pursued here in the Caribbean area.

There is one point to which I would refer at this stage, and that is that the machinery to bring into being a Federal Government will have to be a United Kingdom Act, followed by an Order in Council. It will be appreciated that no one Government can bind another. For instance, Jamaica will not be able to bind Trinidad, and Trinidad cannot bind the Leeward and Windward Islands, and so on. It will be appreciated that there must be an over-all authority which will be derived from the U.K. legislation. I hope that hon. Members fully appreciate that, and I think if reference is made to the Rance Report

[The Attorney General]

it will be seen there stated in paragraph 78 on page 37.

As has been said so often, this question of Federation between the West Indies and British Guiana has been under discussion for 10 years. So far as the West Indies are concerned, the difficulties which have been in existence have been overcome, and conflicts have been settled. Indeed, as a result of the Trinidad Conference they are in a position to move on towards concrete action. Arrangements are being made and plans are being prepared, and we ourselves here in British Guiana realise that we are witnessing the birth of a West Indian nation. Within three years, or less than that, I am sure that Federation, so far as the West Indies are concerned, will have come their way.

We have heard from the hon. Mr. Gajraj that in a few days the Conference which took place in Trinidad settled outstanding differences, and it is a lesson to us all that, although those difficulties seemed to be very great, by their vision and by their spirit of give-and-take the delegates who were assembled there were able to conclude their deliberations and come to a firm decision in a comparatively short time. It is very creditable to think of, and it shows that the spirit of compromise, understanding and vision has grown to very desirable proportions in the West Indies, and that within the Caribbean area there are men of statesmanlike approach to the questions which will come before them for consideration.

It is in that setting that I would wish to point out to hon. Members that there can be no question whatever of the larger West Indian islands ganging up against British Guiana, or of the small islands not receiving their just

due and fullest consideration for any proposals which may be made. I am sure the hon. Mr. Gajraj could tell this Council that the spirit which pervaded the Conference, but which cannot be translated into words, was very admirable. Indeed, as he told us, he was not only an official observer; he was treated as if he were a delegate. There was a very thin dividing line, and it speaks volumes for the approach of those gentlemen of the West Indies, and the attitude which they will take to any problem and any matter affecting this Colony. I think it was the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Raatgever) himself who referred to occasions when he visited the islands as a member of the Regional Economic Committee, and the fact that he himself was elected and put in charge of much of the work which was being undertaken at the time when he was a member.

So I suggest to this Council, and indeed to the people of this Colony, that it cannot be regarded as a question of the small islands ganging up against British Guiana. It has not been the experience in the past. In fact, if experience counts for anything, it is the other way about, and that is that the delegates from this country have always been received with open arms. I can assure hon. Members of this Council that ever since I was a boy, British Guianese arriving in Barbados were always received with open arms.

That, Sir, is the setting, the background to the problem which is exercising the minds of hon. Members of this Council. One cannot actually translate into words the atmosphere, but those who have had contact with the individuals who occupy those small islands will know there is the same feeling, the same outlook, the same generosity and the same desire to move on. And may I ask whether at this crucial period of world history, we in this region have got

to think and work regionally, or should we stand aside or hold ourselves aloof? Experience has shown and taught us that the people of the West Indies have been one with us in thought, action and in aspiration. I refuse to believe that the people of this country are suffering from any psychosis. I refuse to believe they are the victims of fear. I refuse to believe that they think that we cannot produce, or do not in this Colony possess statesmen of the same calibre, intellect and understanding as the people in the West Indies. I was born and have lived in Barbados, and I have lived here for ten years. I know the people of this Colony as well as some hon. Members of this Council, and I venture to say, without fear of contradiction, that this country is capable of producing men who can become the Prime Minister of this Federation of the West Indies.

Why then are we afraid because of space, because we have 87,000 square miles of land? I refuse to believe that that is the criterion to be applied. I want to tell hon. Members that this is a very joyful day in the history of this Colony, because we are thinking not only of ourselves, not only of our children, but of the people of this whole region, because we are part and parcel of the conditions prevailing in the world. Let us not fool ourselves and our children and the people of the Caribbean who are thinking in the same terms, and whose aspirations are the same as ours.

Hon. Members have made references to various organisations, associations and individuals who have expressed themselves in favour of Federation. There are some who have expressed themselves as against. But it is heartening and encouraging to know that the Chamber of Commerce has in no uncertain terms expressed itself in favour of Federation. The commercial body of this Colony has gone on record by reso-

lution, and through the mouth of its President, that they are in favour of Federation. They are part and parcel of the West Indies Chambers of Commerce. The hon. Member, Mr. Macnie, when he began his speech, told this Council that the British Guiana Sugar Producers' Association had gone on record, and through him wished to convey to this Council the information that they were in favour of Federation. I regret I cannot express deeper appreciation of the courage of Mr. Macnie when he proceeded after that to indicate his hesitancy to join in the Federation at the present time. I hope I have interpreted his speech correctly. One thing is certain: he began by saying that the Sugar Producers' Association had decided to support Federation. That in itself is not only encouraging, but it also indicates a broad and liberal and understanding view of the situation, and a proper appreciation of the changing circumstances in this rapidly changing world.

And so, we have two very important industries in this country expressing themselves, through their representatives, in favour of Federation—industries whose interests may be adversely affected. I do not know, but I doubt it. I say "adversely" deliberately, because they deal with commerce on the one hand and with sugar on the other hand. But I accept their views, as they must have gone into this matter with a considerable amount of care before they decided in favour of Federation. Sir Frederick Seaford expressed himself in favour of Federation and, as you, Mr. Speaker, know, Sir Frederick Seaford was one of the delegates to the Montego Bay Conference in 1947 and, indeed, on his return there was a motion before the Legislative Council dealing with the question. And so again I say it was heartening and encouraging to see the attitude which Sir Frederick Seaford had taken in

[The Attorney General]

relation to this subject. There are other instances that I can mention. I believe the hon. Member, Mr. Jailal, knows a great deal about rice and about the rice farmers and other people who are engaged in this industry. He not only seconded the motion but expressed himself in favour and in support of Federation yesterday. That adds to the list—rice, sugar and commerce.

Mr. Raatgever: Mr. Jailal cannot speak on behalf of the rice producers of this Colony. There has been no meeting of the Rice Producers' Association at which this matter has been considered. I did not want to correct the hon. Member when he spoke of the Chamber of Commerce, but that is a non-political organization, and its rules debar it from taking any part in politics.

Mr. Macnie: I am sure the hon. Member would welcome this interruption. With some reluctance I ask that the opportunity may be given me on a point of order to say something. I thank the hon. the Attorney General for having referred to what I said. May I remind him, and Your Honour, that in effect most of my speech was in support of the motion. But why the hon. the Attorney General should use the word "hesitancy"? I asked two questions and I would like to take the opportunity in this interruption to remind Your Honour to ask the hon. the Attorney General to deal at least with one of them. I expressed the hope that he would do so before he concluded his speech.

The Attorney General: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Raatgever) has told us that the Chamber of Commerce is a non-political organization. I accept that, because I know, and every hon. Member knows, that the hon. Member has been for some years the President of that Chamber.

I will accept what he says with regard to the Rules, but despite that fact the Chamber of Commerce went out of its way to express itself in favour of Federation. The members may have been so convinced, that for the moment they put the glasses on the blind eye, forgot the Rules to which the hon. Member referred, and violated the fact that they were not a political organization. It is because they realized the extent of the importance of that decision, and how it would affect this country, that they wanted to place it on record that they favour Federation. I do not think the hon. the Deputy Speaker can say that my interpretation of that course is not justified.

As to the hon. Member, Mr. Macnie, I am not suggesting that he did not in some parts of his speech express himself in favour of Federation, but he is one of those who, I am sure, at the end of this day, realizing where the true interests of the Colony lie, will fully support the motion. The hon. Member asked if I would give a reply to his two questions. Obviously it is not necessary to give a reply for "still the little maid would have her way and so we are here." I suppose that whatever the reply is, the hon. Member would not be dependent on it for his final decision.

Mr. Macnie: I would ask the hon. Member not to include me in his remarks. Will Your Honour be good enough to ask the hon. the Attorney General to answer my questions?

The Attorney General: I remember one but not the other.

Mr. Speaker: If you do not feel inclined to answer, you may not do so now.

The Attorney General: I hope to be able, before I sit down, to refer to the hon. Member's points. I was making a comment on the hon. Member's interrup-

tion, because he said he had in some parts of his speech expressed himself in favour of Federation. I thought I was justified to refer to it in those terms.

If I may be permitted to continue, Mr. Speaker, in this Council, as I have already said, opinions have been fully and freely expressed. All hon. Members have spoken in favour of the motion, except the hon. Members, Mr. Sugrim Singh, Mr. Luckhoo, Mr. Lee, Mr. Macnie, Mr. Phang and the Deputy Speaker. But I want to suggest to this Council that there is no difference as to the principle between those who have supported Federation and those who have not. The attitude of the Opposition has been based upon time—it is not yet ripe; it is untimely; we must know first how many seats we are going to get, and matters of that sort. But that has nothing to do with the principle which this motion seeks to establish. It is whether this Council goes on record as being in favour of Federation. So far as the principle is concerned there is really no difference between the protagonists and those who are opposing.

Mr. Sugrim Singh: May I rise to a point of correction relative to my hon. friend's last point? The motion does not call for the acceptance of Federation as a principle.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think the hon. Member need rise to point that out. I have already said that the interpretation given to the motion may entitle Members to draw certain inferences. It may not agree with yours, but that does not entitle you to interrupt. You see what I mean. You cannot rise to a point of order to do that.

Mr. Sugrim Singh: I rose to a point of correction. There is a difference between Federation as a principle and Federation. You cannot separate the word from the context.

The Attorney General: The hon. Member is thinking of federating with Australia. When we are talking about the principle, we think that everybody in this Council knows that federation with the West Indian Islands is meant. Anybody who reads Dicey, or Wheare, or something of that kind, can hold up his hand and say "I am in favour of Federation". That is academical. The motion seeks to ascertain whether the Council will go on record in favour of the principle of federating with the West Indies. Then follow so many things. That is all that is being asked so far as the motion goes, and I say and repeat that the arguments which have been adduced by those who are against Federation, as expressed in this Council, have not shown any great difference. All that has happened is this: they have expressed themselves, some as being hesitant, some consider it untimely, or the time is not yet ripe, or they want to get more information. But as to the principle of federating with the West Indies it is untroubled. I hope the hon. Member appreciates the distinction.

Mr. Sugrim Singh: The Attorney General has perhaps given me a word I would have to look up my lexicon for.

The Attorney General: I know what sort of word the hon. Member would understand.

Mr. Sugrim Singh rose.

The Attorney General: As I was saying, there is no distinction between those who are for and those who are against. It is a matter of degree. I want to appeal to hon. Members who have a largeness of outlook, a sense of urgency and a full appreciation of what is going on around us, not only in this area of the Caribbean but in the world, to realise that we must begin now. I think it was the hon.

[The Attorney General]

Member, Mrs. Dey, who produced for us the slogan "Federation Now". It is no use hiding from ourselves the real facts. We must appreciate, as I think the hon. Mr. Luckhoo said, the inevitability of the whole matter.

It has taken us ten years to reach the point where we are nearer an expression of opinion as regards the principle of Federation, and I think much has happened in this country, in the West Indies and in the world, during that time. Those of us who have been thinking otherwise do realise that we must think regionally. We can no longer think in water-tight compartments, or that the world is bound by our rooms. We must have wider vision and wider horizons.

I referred just now to the number of associations, organisations and individuals who have expressed their support of the principle of Federation. I do not say this in any desire to adversely affect anybody, but there was one statement of the hon. the Deputy Speaker which, I am sure, on reflection he would withdraw, and that is, that those who are in favour of Federation are traitors.

Mr. Sugrim Singh: I do not think so.

Mr. Raatgever: I think I said I would never be a traitor to my country.

The Attorney General: Hon. Members have got that. The point I was making is this: I concede to all Members the right to disagree, and as I said at the opening yesterday, it is part of our democratic system, and our appreciation of liberty and freedom, to protect the interests of the minority in a parliamentary institution. Whether the hon. Member is saying he would be a traitor to support Fed-

eration or not, the implication remains, and I would ask the hon. Member if it is desirable that those who disagree with him, and who are convinced in their own minds and hearts that Federation is a good thing for their country, should be considered traitors to their country. Would those who spoke in favour at the Chamber of Commerce—would Mr. Maurice Green, would Sir Frederick Seaford be traitors? I do not think the hon. Member means that, but I would suggest to him as my good friend, that I do not relish the idea that a person who disagrees and is not in the same camp or following the same camp, is at the moment or will be a traitor. I am not saying that with any malevolence or anything of that sort, but I personally feel that the attitude and approach of Members are those of people who are quite sincerely seeking to find an answer to a question that is difficult in some ways, and has caused much controversy. I hope the hon. Member does not take this in any way awry, but a debate on such a matter demands that one should not leave out any debating points.

Mr. Speaker: At this point I recall hearing something of an advertisement, "A pause for refreshment." I am trying to estimate the time this debate takes before concluding. I do not want to restrict Members at all, but it is desirable that we should make some decision whether we will leave and return. In the interval some refreshment would be necessary.

The Attorney General: I think hon. Members will finish this afternoon. We are prepared to remain for that purpose.

Mr. Raatgever: If it is a question of getting tea or something else, perhaps it can be ordered. When it comes we can have a break, and resume

afterwards. I have no objection, and I think all Members will agree.

Mr. Speaker: It is already ordered. The hon. Member may proceed.

The Attorney General: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So far as the principle is concerned I think I am justified in saying that there is no Member who can put his hand on his heart and say "I am not in favour of Federation with the West Indies." As far as the motion is concerned, those who have been expressing themselves against it are sufficiently liberal in their views, and sufficiently understanding of the various facets and factors associated with this question that they can go on record as being in favour of the motion. They have expressed themselves in regard to certain aspects, such as bargaining for the number of seats, and matters of that sort. The hon. Member, Mr. Sugrim Singh, after having treated this Council to a very long speech — I am not seeking to rival him—in which he dealt with all the possible aspects which would be inimical to British Guiana if it decided to join, finished up on a most heartening note—"I have an open mind."

The hon. Member, Mr. Sugrim Singh, was the third speaker in this debate, and there have been several speeches since he concluded. I am sure that that openness of mind must have even convinced him of the fact that Federation is a good thing, and that his mind is not closed to being in favour of the principle. As a barrister who knows and appreciates, or must know and appreciate the argument of the other side, I am sure he would be one of the first to consider the point that the arguments in favour of this country adopting Federation are very strong and almost incontrovertible. I particularly refer to the hon. Member, Mr.

Sugrim Singh, because of the nature of his address, the strength of his language and the vehemence of his attack on the principle of the motion, and I think he would be the first to admit that there are very many aspects in favour which might have helped him before the debate had reached this stage.

I know that the hon. Member, Mr. Luchoo, although he has expressed himself as being one of those who are a bit hesitant, will appreciate that he was arguing from a point which does not yet arise. Mr. Lee and Mr. Wight went along as observers to the Montego Bay Conference. It is true that they are referred to in the Rance Report as "Members", but the hon. the Deputy Speaker more than once corrected those who referred to the two observers as delegates. Rightly so, because British Guiana has never gone on record, or expressed itself in favour of the principle of Federation.

That being so, we have tried to do three things: to remain out, to peep, and not to say we are coming in. We refuse the invitation and are yet looking through the keyhole. I hope hon. Members will not think I am being jocular about it, but I hope that Members see the point. We are outside. We have been asked to come in. We say: "No, we cannot come in. We are going to show our interest. We are going to sit outside at the door always and have a look in." Yet we say, "You have not given us the same consideration and the same due as if we had gone inside." I think this is an impossible position. Time and time again we have been debating the outstanding fact that British Guiana was given only six seats. British Guiana should not have been given any at all, because it was outside. Until we accept Federation we are not entitled to receive any allocation. Mr. Wight and Mr. Lee

[The Attorney General] went there, but they had no standing. Mr. Lee says they had to threaten to leave and so on, but British Guiana had no authority to argue. So I suggest to Mr. Luckhoo that our position was somewhat nebulous, ambiguous—

Mr. Luckhoo: Nebulous.

The Attorney General: I am glad for that word, but I think it is quite clear that we are seeking and we are arguing from a very inconsistent position which arises solely from our own action. We cannot expect to sit by and say: "We are not deciding to come in. We do not wish to come in—not until you tell us what you are going to give us. Yet we are not saying we are not accepting Federation in principle." We sent Mr. Smellie. Mr. Gajraj also went as an observer, and the fact that he went as an observer made him emphasise the generosity of the Island representatives. He was treated as a delegate.

Mr. Sugrim Singh: He did not peep through the keyhole.

The Attorney General: I was only using that to try to illustrate what I was trying to convey. In other words, much of the argument which proceeded from that basis was not justifiable, for the simple reason that we cannot begin to argue or bargain. We have to decide, as we are seeking to do now.

Some Members have said that we should have 8, 9, 10 or more seats—as many as Jamaica and Trinidad, but we have not reached that point. I am sure that on reflection those Members who oppose Federation will realise that that is not a good and valid ground of objection. We have to declare ourselves and our attitude on the question first. When we have done so then we can speak from the point of view of the authority and standing which is given to a delegate.

In fact the hon. Mr. Tello said that he had a conversation with Mr. Grantley Adams, of Barbados, about the question of seats, and Mr. Adams said:

"That is around the bargaining table. We do not say that six seats is your maximum, or the end of the road, but is a token of the fact that although British Guiana and British Honduras have not decided to enter, we have left something there, but you will be in a position to discuss it if and when the occasion and the opportunity arise."

That, I suggest to hon. Members, is the proper way to approach this question. We have been arguing, and some of us have put the cart before the horse. Let us put the horse in its proper place and the cart will move along.

Hon. Members who have spoken have surveyed the whole field of advantages to be derived from joining in Federation, and I do not propose to go through the field again, but I would emphasise the fact that this whole unifying process has been going on for years, and all we are seeking to do is to put the legal impress upon the association which, the hon. Mr. Luckhoo reminded us, must come from the people. The people of Trinidad, Barbados, Jamaica and British Guiana have all been in the mix-up in the Caribbean. This morning I saw in one of our newspapers a photograph of headteachers of some of our secondary schools in Jamaica where they are attending a conference. Only a few days ago there were students from the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture in Trinidad here in British Guiana, and we propose to send students to the Imperial College. We have students from British Guiana in Jamaica, and one of the lecturers at the University College of the West Indies in Jamaica is a Guianese. The Registrar of the College is a Barbadian. Here we have the Comptroller of Co-operative Societies who is a Jamaican. I have

been here long enough, but I am very hesitant to regard myself as a Guianese.

That unifying process is going on all the time. Two weeks ago we had one of the members of the West Indian Court of Appeal, the Chief Justice of the Leeward and Windward Islands. A few weeks ago we had the sad news of the death in our midst of the Chief Justice of British Honduras (Sir Alfred Crane) who was a Guianese. We have at the present time in Trinidad Mr. Stanley Gomes and Mr. Duke who are both Guianese, while on the Bench of this Colony we have Mr. Camacho, who comes from the Windward Islands, and Mr. Justice Hughes, who comes from Grenada. There is a Chief Justice of Jamaica who was born in Grenada. That process has been going on all the time. We have here Mr. Justice Boland who is from Trinidad, and Mr. Justice Phillips from Jamaica.

I have only mentioned a few. I do not wish to go into any long list of sons and daughters of the West Indies who are working in British Guiana, or Guianese who are working in the West Indies. Today Queen's College is paying tribute to one of its Masters, Mr. Pilgrim, who has been here 50 years, and generations of boys have passed through his hands. That is the process which has been going on, and I am sure that all hon. Members know and appreciate the work that Mr. Pilgrim has done. Members also know that Mr. A. A. Thorne, of Barbados, has been a teacher for many years in this Colony, and a member of the Municipality and of the Legislature. I only mention this to emphasise and illustrate my point. Can we, in the face of all these living factors of unification, of understanding, of working together and co-operation, say to the people of the small islands that we do not want to be a dumping ground for them? How can we?

I took the trouble to read some extracts from Wheare's book, and I believe Mr. Luckhoo emphasised the point that the desire to come together must be manifest, and must come from the people. I have given those illustrations to indicate that the process has been going on for a long period of time, and to bring before the minds of hon. Members the fact that people who move from one place to another carry with them certain thoughts and perhaps certain outlooks, and we get a unifying process, a unifying force — something that helps a country. Is it to be denied that the sons and daughters we send to other Colonies do not help this country, and that those who come here do not help the country?

I think Mr. Sugrim Singh referred to British Guiana's space. Space is all right on the map, and potentially it is all right, but we need to turn that space into something worthwhile. We need to turn the potentiality into actuality and reality. Beyond all the space and the potentiality there is man, the most important aspect from the social and economic point of view, and I do not agree with the remark which some hon. Members have made — that British Guiana will be the dumping ground for West Indians. Dumping ground for human beings? I think those words were very much misplaced, and the expression very ill-conceived.

Mr. Sugrim Singh: I wish to withdraw it.

The Attorney General: Those human beings have aspirations to better their conditions, and they should be accepted here so long as they do not affect adversely the people of this Colony. I want hon. Members to bear in mind that the world's population is increasing by leaps and bounds. I wish hon. Members to realise that there is a greater desire, a greater yearning for improved conditions the world over. There is an aware-

[The Attorney General]

ness, a longing for betterment, and no longer can we talk of empty spaces, because there are, year by year, millions of mouths to be fed, more people to be cared for. Therefore, if we have open spaces, if we have potentialities and we need people, we must allow them to come and turn those potentialities into the actual and the real.

The hon. Mr. Jialal spoke about rice. I do not pretend to have either the knowledge or the experience of the Member for Agriculture (Sir Frank McDavid), the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Raatgever) or the hon. Mr. Jialal, but this I would say: that with the increasing population here and in other parts of the world, one of the greatest headaches, one of the greatest problems will be the provision of food, and in the next 25 years in this Colony we will have a million people. Bear in mind that our production today will probably just meet the demands and requirements of the time to come, unless it is increased. That is one of the problems that will face the world, and is facing it now.

The hon. Member asked: "Where is the money?" That is the point. If we stand as an isolated unit we will not be able to get money with the same facility and accommodation as when we stand as part and parcel of the Federal Government. The hon. Member knows that, and if he examines the Rance Report he will see that the first chapter deals with the question of real wealth. We talk very glibly about "Dominion status," but political independence must be based upon a strong foundation of economic strength. The hon. Member ought to know that even better than I do. It is not a question of present-day conditions. I think the hon. Member for Agriculture (Sir Frank McDavid) has reminded us, and if we have been following from time to time the position of the country, the picture

as presented in the Budget Statement, we would realise that for a long time British Guiana was under Treasury control. It was a grant-aided country and it is to certain factors, certain happenings—good economy and things of that sort—that we have been able to pass out of the difficulties of those days

I would remind hon. Members that in the last Estimates presented by the present Member for Agriculture, which he termed his "handing over Budget," he pointed to the fact that we had come a long way to the position in which he was able to present a Budget which revealed a satisfactory balance. But we cannot hope to develop and maintain a Dominion status without a sturdy independence, standing on our own feet — what the Rance Report calls real economic strength. We can only find our way to political independence by allying ourselves with those countries which have the same historical outlook and background, the same hopes and aspirations that we have, whose form of education and government is the same as ours in many ways.

There has been a lot of emphasis on our potential wealth. Hon. Members will recollect that the Robertson Commission referred to the difficulties which Nature had provided for this Colony. In paragraph 20 of their Report they state:

"20. The general economic picture therefore, is one of an unremitting and costly struggle against geographical and physical difficulties: of man pitting his energy and strength against unfriendly natural surroundings; of much success and some failure. In our enquiries in British Guiana we have found two very different accounts of the result of this struggle. According to one set of witnesses the present economic and social position shows triumphant success 'in the achievement of very real progress in the last 20 years and particularly during the past 10 years;' (Sir Frank McDavid in a speech in Legislative Council on 18th March, 1954); sea defences have been provided and large-scale drainage and

irrigation works undertaken; Georgetown, the capital has been transformed into a fine city with good roads, some noble streets and buildings and reasonably high standards of "amenity; rural areas have been provided with good potable water supplies through a system of artesian wells; and health conditions have been immensely improved by the complete eradication of malaria. On the other side of the picture many brought to our notice the struggle for livelihood in conditions of unemployment and under-employment: the squalor of much of the housing; the scarcity of agricultural land; and the apparent delays in dealing with these and other problems."

In paragraph 21 the Report goes on to state:

"It is, however, clear from its physical make-up that British Guiana can hardly be much more economically than a comparatively poor country (unless, of course, further mineral resources of really important proportions are discovered) and that only by heavy expenditure of capital and by continued hard work by the community as a whole will conditions generally be improved . . ."

I refer to that, Mr. Speaker, in order to indicate to hon. Members that they have been placing emphasis on something which is unknown — potentialities we do not know. There are lots of things to be done before we can get a full appreciation and assessment of what hon. Members have been emphasizing—bringing people of the small West Indian Islands here to take over the potential wealth of this Colony. The point I wish to emphasize is that much has to be done by hard work, and I am sure that with Federation you will be able to satisfy yourselves that the people who are brought here from the Islands are capable and willing to undertake hard work. I am suggesting that to turn some parts of this country to general economic advantage it will be necessary to have people who are prepared to get down to sheer hard work. I ask hon. Members to be generous enough to

concede that I am not pleading for the West Indies, but I am speaking in the interest of British Guiana.

Many a day, as we pass through the streets of Georgetown, we find men who should be doing a useful day's work begging for the price of a cinema matinee ticket. You cannot have it both ways. It is not only because there may be some unemployment, but it is also true to say that some people are "work-shy Johnnies." You may find that by bringing some of the people from other places you will develop, both by the experience and stimulus, a general Guianese spirit to put this country right at the top and in the forefront of the Caribbean area. I do not suggest that it will not take long, but that the speed will be accelerated, and the benefits become greater as the years go by. As a unit in the Federation the whole Federal Government will be involved, so that we would be working at a faster rate towards what hon. Members believe and hope for in the distant future — Dominion status.

The hon. Member, Mr. Sugrim Singh, talked about distance. It is perfectly true that the West Indies are islands, and that Federation has hitherto only been introduced inland *en masse*—Canada, Australia, U.S.A. Switzerland—but the greatest revolution the world has ever seen has been taking place during our time. The whole 20th century has been a period of continuous improvement and change. Some Members can recollect the days when the first plane was flown. Anyone going to England today can see the first plane that was flown. We have gone a long way these fifty-five years. We have planes now moving faster than sound. There is Television. Now the world has found an even greater potential—a potential of destruction, or a potential for development greater than it has ever seen. I speak of atomic energy. Hon.

[The Attorney General]

Members will recall the fact that the statesmen of the world are exercising their minds in regard to experiments that are taking place on its effect on future generations, but here we are in this Colony of 87,000 square miles forgetful of the changes which are taking place in the world around us.

The world is one universe and we are part and parcel of it. We cannot shut our eyes to those changes. The fact that the sea is separating us is no argument for objection to our participating with our brothers in the West Indian Islands and providing them with our open spaces. Mr. Speaker, I venture to suggest that this question of population pressure is one that hon. Members should bear in mind seriously. You can have pressure which breaks down the barriers, while some pressure causes explosion. I suggest to hon. Members that what affects Trinidad, Barbados, Jamaica and the Leeward Islands also affects us, and the time is ripe for opening our doors, opening our arms and our hearts, and receiving them with the same generosity and the same understanding as the leaders of those Islands did, but a few weeks ago, when they received our delegates in Trinidad. No one can deny that never in the history of the world has the extent of the truth "No man liveth to himself" been more manifested.

People who think are realising the absolute imperative necessity of doing what they can to assist in the development of the world. Hon. Members will observe that the Marshal Plan, which was introduced for the purpose of assisting the Western Hemisphere, has now fulfilled its promise, and is now moving on towards the Asian countries, because it is realised that it is one world, and what affects one part of

the world must affect the U.S.A. Therefore, in reply to the hon. Member, Mr. Lec, who asked "where the money is to come from," I suggest that we join with the people of the West Indies, and we are not going to find that the F.A.O. and all those people who are looking out to help, will turn a deaf ear to the requests and requirements of this area. We have had the benefit of the guidance and assistance of technicians and experts who have come here to help us in our difficulties, and I am sure that there will be an acceleration of that assistance the moment we have Federation of the Caribbean or united advancement. I want to see British Guiana moving forward along the path it deserves, but it can only do so if we vote in terms of solidarity. Let us go forward, and we will not regret the decision which we make here today.

Mr. Speaker, I am coming to the end. There is something I would like to say, but I do not wish to prolong this debate longer than I can help. I said that there were suggestions that we should join up with French and Dutch Guiana, but I say that those countries have not the same outlook. Federation requires a similar outlook, similar institutions, similar language, and matters of that sort. The hon. the Deputy Speaker read yesterday a letter from our respected former Governor, Sir Gordon Lethem, for whom I have the highest respect. But the times have moved on. I remember very vividly in 1951 when Professor Harlow gave his address on British Colonial Policy in the R.A. & C. Society's Reading Rooms. Sir Gordon was there and spoke on the same theme. It is there recorded in the Society's Journal. What was his theme? The theme was the suggestion to join up the three Guianas and turn us over to a Trusteeship Council. I am sure that hon. Members will not agree

with that view. I respect Sir Gordon highly, but in the circumstances existing today in this Colony I have more respect for the view that we should join with the people of the West Indies. Some of our children go to school in Barbados, some go to Trinidad, and some of the children of those Islands come here. They grow together; they move about together. How can we do anything to stop what, I say, is the natural growth and development of the whole area? Is British Guiana a thing apart? I do not think so.

I think, too, that hon. Members will agree that the only way that we can quicken the movement is by giving a prominent lead ourselves, inviting the people to look in their own interest towards the objective. The hon. Member, Mr. Carter, said yesterday that after he heard the speeches of Members he saw the light. Hon. Members will remember in "Pilgrim's Progress" the expression "I see yonder shining light." Yonder shining light is the great nation about to be born in these parts and I hope hon. Members will never take it into their heads to do anything to hamper the success of this venture in the West Indies. Because if they do they would be affecting themselves, affecting their children and affecting the whole of this area.

I do not regard closer association with the other two Guianas desirable from the point of view suggested. We are, as I said in 1945, in the most strategic position in this area. As a British Colony on the mainland of South America, we have Venezuela on the one side, Dutch Guiana on the other side, with French Guiana farther East. We are Britishers and we should look towards our brothers in the Islands.

It has been said that there is distance between us. The hon. Member, Mr. Phang, knows as well as the world that Morahanna is farther away from George-

town than if he had been living in St. Lucia. I remember when the hon. Member was going off to the North West District for the purpose of his election to the Legislature, he was most insistent that he should get his symbol and colour in order to take them with him because, said he, "When I leave you will not be able to get me." It is not a question of distance. When Mr. Phang said we should not federate he was thinking in terms of the North West District. We will all be happy to see a Manganese Company coming in and operating there, but we cannot think only of the North West District. We are thinking in terms of British Guiana.

I agree with the hon. Member who said that we have no constituency, but we represent the whole Colony and have to do so sincerely and honestly. We have no special interest in any section or part of the Colony. Therefore let us seek and do with our hands and heart the best for British Guiana. I personally am imbued with the idea that we will not have to adduce much argument about seats in the Federal Parliament. That is a matter which will settle itself once we get down to work, and get down to an appreciation of what we stand for; what the people of this Colony need. Let us go forward as leaders and carry them with us.

Mr. Speaker, I am coming to the end of my contribution to this debate, but I would suggest to hon. Members that most important of all is the fact that we are bound together by a common language, common ideals, a common legal system, common institutions and a common understanding. There are many people in this country whose forbears came from the West Indies, and some of them have come from Barbados. Those people have given of their toil, their sweat, their thought and their energy in developing this land. Their bones lie here. Their children and

[The Attorney General]
grandchildren are all in British Guiana, and are Guianese. We have got the same problems to solve, the same difficulties to surmount, and while it is perfectly true that these Colonies are of different backgrounds, and the people are of various racial origins, we are indeed working out our own salvation, our own pattern, and the warp and the woof are being woven in the pattern of West Indian culture and West Indian life. With this warful feeling, rhythm of movement, richness of colour, genuineness for friendship and love in the Caribbean and in its history, there is indeed unity.

We are moving rapidly towards nationhood. That movement may be quickened by our own decision which we make today, and on which the happiness and contentment and well-being of future generations will depend. Let us co-operate, in the fullest sense of that term, in every form of activity and occupation—the leaders of trade and commerce and labour and agriculture. Let us stimulate the people of this country to put forth all their energies in the use of the resources at their disposal. Let us gather our strength, drawn from the people of British Guiana and the human resources of the West Indies. Let us move forward to the mutual advancement of the West Indies and British Guiana. Let us lay down the outline and the foundation, and the future will complete the building. The building, whose outline we seek to mark today, cannot come into being unless stone be laid upon stone. but we shall have the distinction, the proud distinction, of having worked well in our time and for our generation and those who will succeed us hereafter.

We are providing an example to the world. Our people of diverse races, brought together in varying circumstances, can be welded into a loving harmonious whole, and can dwell together

in peace, amity, and concord. It may well be that from these scattered Islands and out of this large tract of country there may develop a great lesson and a great example to all those countries where diverse races have to live and work together. It is a lesson of unity and of harmony, of respect and regard. British Guiana has often been referred to as the land of six peoples: we want it to be a land of one people, where we will attain the great ideal in which we can have a community where there is neither Greek nor Jew, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free; where we will think as Guianese and in terms of West Indian citizenship.

In the challenging and complex times in which we live, perhaps the most difficult problem is that of human relations, and those who are leaders of the people have a great responsibility to ensure the maintenance and growth of sincere brotherhood and good neighbourliness. From now on, let us resolve to be a land of one people: one in heart, one in aim, one in purpose, striving for the good of Guiana, the West Indies, indeed of the Commonwealth. Let us enlarge our horizons. As we discern the glimmer of the new dawn, let us move forward together to the brighter day—the day of West Indian nationhood. Here in British Guiana can we not see; can we not hear? Perhaps we may hear the true voice of Guiana in Frank Dalzell, a son of this land:

“Often I hear Guiana’s voice
Crying heartbreakingly in the death-still
night.
And that crying tortures me—frightens
me.
Casts upon me such a cloak of gloom,
That for restless hours, depressed beyond
imagination,
I lie and stare at the hooded darkness.
Wondering at that cry.
Often I hear my country’s voice,
Weeping distressfully at the legacy

Of empty years bequeathed our children,
 And that weeping prods me, goads and
 jars me,
 Till its deep passion breaks negation's
 spell,
 And my full-throated call to action bells
 the sleeping land
 To bright-eyed wakefulness."

Can you not hear the voice of
 Guiana? Will you not hearken?

Mr. Speaker: I think this is a
 convenient moment (4.30 p.m.) to ad-
 journ for tea. I will take the chair
 again in about half an hour.

5.15 p.m.—*Council resumed.*

Mr. Speaker: I propose to ask the
 hon. Mover to exercise his right of re-
 ply, unless some other Member wishes
 to speak.

Mr. Sugrim Singh: I crave your
 indulgence, Sir, to permit me to speak
 very briefly. I have not spoken before
 on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, you have a
 right to speak on the amendment, but
 I would ask you not to be long.

Mr. Sugrim Singh: I wish to say
 at the outset that I do not propose to
 extend much further the duration of this
 debate. I shall briefly make a few points
 on the amendment. I am going to adopt
 the metaphor used by the Attorney-Gen-
 eral, and I want to say this: that funda-
 mentally there is every justification for
 Members of this Council who have
 spoken on this motion to accept this
 amendment. Put it this way: I
 have always asked this Council to
 reason with me, and I ask it again.
 At this late hour, whatever may
 be the views of Members, I can assure
 them that our position here is that we
 are going to play good cricket. I have
 listened here to some well-made speeches
 —I think, without resorting to hyper-
 bole, some of the greatest speeches I

have heard in my life. But there is a
 distinction between rhetoric and logic.

I have been completely swept off
 my feet, I must confess, by the elo-
 quence and rhetoric of several Members
 who have spoken in this Council,
 especially the hon. the Attorney Gen-
 eral; and having to speak immediately
 after him gives me a feeling of weak-
 ness, I must confess. But these few
 minutes I have will give me some amount
 of fortitude to make my points, and I
 promise I shall not be more than 20
 minutes in making them.

Up to this moment the Interim
 Government has done a very good job,
 and we have "turned the corner". It is
 my experience, and I am sure that of
 other people, that we have been
 gradually turning to the track which
 this Government and all true Guianese
 would like to tread. This motion is, in
 my opinion, putting the cart before the
 horse. That is our difference in this
 debate. The motion seeks to get an ex-
 pression of opinion by the Council and
 suggests that we should then proceed
 to bargain and to obtain certain
 terms which would be brought to
 the people for their endorsement or
 ratification. The amendment says, in
 effect: "Let us consult the people: get
 their promises first."

I will pose a question for this
 Council. Suppose, for the sake of argu-
 ment, this Council expresses an opin-
 ion in favour of Federation, and in
 due course efforts are made to procure
 those conditions which we would like to
 have. Suppose we do our best to obtain
 those conditions and we bring them to
 the people; then through universal adult
 suffrage, a commission—in which I have
 no confidence — or anything proper,
 constitutionally, the people say "No"?
 What would be the position then? Would
 we go outside the wishes of the people?
 I must say that quite a few people in
 the outlying districts of the Colony have

[Mr. Sugrim Singh]

not yet had a working grasp or some momentary knowledge of this matter of Federation—what are we going to get, and what is going to be our position. I say without fear that I challenge the G.I.S. to show me one occasion on which they have put the case for the Opposition. This debate has done a lot of good, but where do we go from here? Suppose this Legislature says “Yes” in its wisdom, and the people say “No”?

An elected Legislature which ceases to have the confidence of the people has to go out of office, but our position here is different. When the Royal Commission which came to this Colony recommended universal adult suffrage for this country the Press said that the people here were not fit for adult suffrage. The result was that although we had the best Constitution in 1928 we were left behind, and our sister Colonies in the West Indies went forward on adult suffrage and made their mistakes. The working class people, the peasantry of this Colony, felt that those in authority were trying to deny them that important constitutional right, and capital was made of it by those who ostensibly sought their help, and who said: “They have denied you universal adult suffrage; we are going to fight for it.” Whether in fact they did fight is another matter. A great deal of the support which was given to subversive people in the last election was due to this argument: “We have fought for the right which you now have, to exercise your vote. Now that you have got it, it would be ingratitude if you support anyone else.”

I wish to say clearly that although some of us have expressed our views against Federation, this Interim Government is leading this country into Federation, but I shall not be a party to it.

I shall not lend kudos or support to any movement in this Colony to attempt to disrupt this Government after this Council has properly accepted this motion. So there is no question of any reactionary movement of any sort. I am the head of a very important organisation which happens to be of a religious character. It is quite easy to go outside and incite the people by telling them things that are false. It should be our duty (and I am sure every Member of the Opposition feels the same way) to put both sides of the case as we see it. The word “reactionary” was used, and reference was made to the question of divided loyalty. I claim, as every Member of this Council does, to be a British subject. I have the greatest regard for justice and the law, as we know it. I know of no democratic system which says that we must glibly accept things that are thrust down our throats, and that has induced me to stand up here and give my views on the other side.

Who is to decide this issue—the Legislature or the people? If this were an elected Legislature with a mandate from the people to lead this country into Federation there would have been no necessity to go back to the people on the question. Without a mandate on Federation I am urging that by passing this motion today we would be putting the cart before the horse. That is my view, for which posterity may condemn me or praise me, but I stand firm. I must say that while I admire the forensic fury, the oratory and eloquence of the various speakers, I have heard nothing to convince me that the procedure which is being adopted is the correct one. I maintain that it is putting the cart before the horse.

Mr. Speaker: Haven't you seen that done in actual practice? I have

seen mules and donkeys tied behind carts.

Mr. Sugrim Singh : One last point and I will take my seat. Let us look at the picture if we go into the Federation. I will accept the suggestion made by Sir Frank McDavid and suppose that we are given "X" seats in the Federal Government. Those seats would have to be filled by election on the basis of universal adult suffrage. Within 12 or 18 months, according to what I have seen in the Press, Federation may be an accomplished fact. If we accept Federation it would mean that within that time this country would be called upon to elect 8, 9 or 10 representatives in the Federal Government. The people of this Colony would be asked to exercise their right to universal adult suffrage by voting to elect our representatives in the Federal Government, while in the case of our own Legislature we are to mark time for four years. I have never heard of a more astounding anachronism throughout the British Commonwealth, for in one breath the people are told they are competent to elect representatives to a higher body—the Federal Government—and, in the same breath, that they are incompetent to elect representatives to their own Legislature. Let us be consistent. If we are satisfied that the people of this Colony are competent to exercise their votes on the basis of adult suffrage, let us throw open the gates.

I hope Members of this Council and my numerous friends in the West Indies will appreciate the stand Members of the Opposition have taken. It is "not that I love Caesar less but that I love Rome more." It is not that I do not cherish the association with my West Indian friends, but that this Col-

ony means more to me. I again seek sanctuary in the words of Macaulay :

"And how can man die better than by
facing fearful odds;
For the ashes of his fathers and the temple
of his gods."

Rev. Mr. Bobb (replying) : We have come to the last stage of this historic debate, and it is my duty to exercise the privilege accorded to me to reply, not to everything that has been said, but to follow the practice which has been used in this Council and all similar bodies. That gives me the opportunity of rounding off the debate, answering questions that have been unanswered, correcting false impressions, and recapitulating the arguments against as well as the arguments for the motion. Beyond that, Sir, I shall do no more. Let me at this stage, however, pause to join with the hon. the Attorney General in according to you a deserving tribute for the manner in which you have conducted this debate, interspersing it, as you have done, with a free modicum of wit and humour, and giving us that inspiration which only your long experience and your interest in the future of the country could have given.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank those who have spoken so forcibly and so well in support of the motion as it stands. I cannot do that without being equally generous to those who thought it was in their interest, and in keeping with the dictates of their conscience, to offer what they have developed in this debate as a strong Opposition. When I think of the Opposition today and many years afterwards, the first person whose name will leap to my mind will be the hon. Member, Mr. Sugrim Singh, not only because he has established the reputation here as a speaker who could hold the Council for seven hours—a tremendous oratorical feat—but because he was the first person to whom I spoke about that motion. I have asked him whether he would

[Rev. Mr. Bobb]

permit me to refer today to the conversation we had, and I have his consent. I spoke to him about the motion and asked him whether he would be good enough to lend support and to second it. I would not have done that unless I had known him well enough to expect him to answer in the affirmative. I could not have done that but for the fact that for 27 years we have been moving together. We have stood on debating platforms together and we have watched each other's progress. We know each other's outlook generally. I felt, when I approached him, that I was not merely approaching a friend but approaching a gentleman whose views were very much like my own, and I felt, in advance, happy in the prospect that he would say "Yes". It turned out that he gave me an answer which was stronger than an affirmative; he said:

"I shall not second the motion. Ask somebody else to second it, but I shall surely support it with all the energy at my command. Very good motion."

I knew that it was the only possible answer the hon. Member could give me, and this honourable Council is at liberty to draw its own conclusions. The only interpretation I wish to put on it is that if in the lengthy speech the hon. Member has made I were convinced that he was expressing views which accord with his whole outlook and background, I would be a very happy man. But I have been forced to think on some occasions that he elected to go on the Opposition only to have an opportunity to put the other side of the question. I think he has done that in this debate, and the correctness of my judgment is borne out by what he has said—that whatever may be the decision of this Council on this motion he will do nothing to interfere with whatever action may be taken later on in order to have that decision implemented.

So I feel very happy to be associated with him in this particular debate, but since he has elected to go over to the Opposition and to bring forward some points which he thought vital and important; and since his illustration of those points will very likely leave in the minds of the people of this country an impression quite different from that I would like them to have; and since he has further attempted to strengthen that impression by his most recent remarks in speaking on the amendment, I have to ask the indulgence of the Council to permit me to address my remarks first of all to some of the things he has said. Beginning at the end, I would like to refer to the statements that have just fallen from his lips.

Speaking on the amendment, he reminds us—in his own way of putting it—that the people do not know enough of Federation; that the amendment seeks to get an opinion of this Council, and that this Council will have to take further action to discover what terms may be more acceptable, and then go to the people. Now, it takes quite a great deal of perspicacity to discover any such thing in the amendment. It takes a great deal of foretelling to divine, even when the hon. Member, Mr. Luckhoo, proposed the amendment, that that was in his mind, for he himself never said so. I think my hon. friend did the Mover of the amendment a disservice when he tried to put a construction on it which is far from what the Mover has put. The Mover, like the amendment, has never suggested that a certain opinion will be sought in this Council, and from that point important action will be taken by this Council in order to bargain for suitable terms, and then go back to the people to tell them what terms have been obtained. That is not stated in the motion, nor is it said anywhere in the amendment. I humbly suggest to the hon. Member, Mr.

Sugrim Singh, that he has failed completely to understand, reflect and interpret the spirit of the amendment, and so he has not done any service to his own cause. If anything at all, he has strengthened the case for presenting the motion, inasmuch as he has given me an opportunity to repeat what it should not have been necessary to repeat.

What the motion is asking is this—an opinion having been obtained in this Council among these legislators who, as has been already pointed out, are in deed and in fact representatives of the whole Colony, that the Governor be approached to take steps to ascertain public opinion. Between the decision of this Council and the action of the Governor there is no suggestion of going to the several units of the proposed Federation to bargain for seats. I hope what I have said so far will completely remove the impression which, I think, is a mistake—one my good friend has created towards the end. I shall have also to refer to his second point.

It is true that it is the constitutional practice in a Federal Government of the kind envisaged, that the representatives should be elected on the basis of adult suffrage. My hon. friend has assumed that there will be such an election to the Federal Government without an election to this local Legislature. I see in that statement of view how his mind works, and I think it is a very skilful way of trying to underline the possible judgment of some people who would want to say, "How is it that we are thinking of the higher Legislature, the higher Government, that we want, on the basis of adult suffrage, to send representatives to that Government, and at the same time, under the Emergency Regulations, we are prevented from having local general elections?" The answer to that he knows himself, and I do not think he wishes anybody to remind him.

Coming to the general question, we have heard it said over and over again that there have been second thoughts—second thoughts not only by those who have come over from the opposing stand which they took years ago, but also by those who were in favour then and now are not in favour. I mention this because, apart from what happens here, according to the nature of the debate we have to be careful as to what the public is given to believe. One of the gentlemen who have confessed to second thoughts is the hon. Member, Mr. Lee, and at the same time he has asked "Why is it necessary to re-open the question of Federation after the Council in 1952 decided against it?" I think, Sir, that the answer is provided in his own words. In 1952 my hon. friend was speaking on the motion, and I was very interested to discover that not only was he a strong believer in Federation, but he was also a strong believer in those things which he condemns now. During his speech before this honourable Council, reported in *Hansard* of Wednesday, 16th January, 1952, Mr Lee made a very valuable contribution on this question. In the course of his remarks he had this to say—column 800:

"We are of the opinion that political federation with Dominion status would bring economic development for the British West Indies, but the term of such a federation must be so arranged that the parties to the federation would appreciate and fully recognise the needs of the various units. But if Jamaica, or any of the other units, desire to have an advantage over British Guiana we should not enter into any federation with the Caribbean Colonies even with Dominion status. History has proved that where Dominion status has been granted to British countries and its importance has been realized, those countries have progressed. I am not saying that there are not odds against the British West Indies. There are great odds, but the various units must think as a whole and not have an insular outlook."

I suggest that therein we have one of his many statements in favour of Federation, and he has very usefully

[Rev. Mr. Bobb]

provided for this Council a record of other statements of equal force. I do not want to weary this Council by reading them out. All of these add up to one thing—that he himself had very strong views in favour of Federation. He also had very strong views against any attempt to suggest a division among the peoples in this country, and he deprecated the idea that anything should be done to set one race against another. I was very disappointed, after having read his speech of 1952, to hear him refer now, as he did, to the possibilities of an African Dominion. A dialogue took place in this Council at that time between himself and Mr. Debidin. Then he was the defendant of any such attempt to inject into the people of this country ideas of racial division. I hope by now the hon. Member is fully conscious, whether his position is against or for Federation, that that line of approach is not only very undesirable but will do harm to the large issue of Federation as well as to local affairs.

I said at the opening that I would use this opportunity to correct some impressions that are being formed and which, unfortunately, are being made full use of outside. One of these is that British Guiana, if this motion were accepted, would be in a position to go begging the West Indies to enter Federation. It has been noted that the door was left ajar, and it cannot be repeated too often that the position of British Guiana is not, and will not be that of a beggar. When British Guiana elected to stay out of Federation its position was clearly understood and appreciated — that if at any time it elected to join the Federation the way would be open. It is using a right, not begging for an indulgence. This suggestion is a very humiliating one, and is one which I hope all Members will try to erase from the minds of our people, because it seems to me that that is one sure way of prejudicing their opportunities of understand-

ing all the issues which they will have to consider at a later stage.

There have been suggestions that the Islands would prove to be a source of poor material for the development of this country, if and when a Federation of the British West Indies and British Guiana comes into being. I do not desire to dwell on the false notion, save to say that we have to bear in mind that Trinidad and Jamaica, like the other Islands, have shown their ability to produce legislators who are able to think on a regional level, and, in the words of the hon. the Deputy Speaker, he himself has proved their competence to deal with regional matters without partiality to the country of their origin. That having been clearly explained, I do not think it is necessary for me to harp upon the underlying falsity of that statement, but I do want to add a more or less personal note by saying that it has been my fortune to deal with many of the people of the Islands, and I have lived in some of the Islands for some time. I have also lived in British Honduras. That is why I can understand British Honduras not wishing to participate at this time. I have never had any reason to doubt the ability of our neighbours in the Islands to rise to the demands of Federation.

As a matter of fact, I can tell of young men from British Honduras and the British West Indies who have met at the Caenwood Theological College where I was in training for the Ministry, to discuss this very subject, and of the willingness and freedom with which it was discussed. That is something which very much heartened me, because there you had an opportunity of seeing some of the promising men of these territories examining the whole situation, the broad picture, and giving judgments which could only show that they were capable of leading their people on big questions.

I have always been a pro-Federationist. I have never been anything else. Saying that brings me to the point which the hon. the Attorney General suggested I might want to speak upon. There have been suggestions in this Council, in the Press and elsewhere, that this motion is not mine: that I had been used to bring this motion before this Council. The whole suggestion is so naive and elementary that I think the best thing to do is to treat it with the contempt it deserves. If that suggestion were to persist, I would have to infer that it is felt that I am unable either to put my thoughts down reasonably and convincingly, or to appreciate the thoughts of others which have been put down reasonably and convincingly.

I feel no sense of inferiority, and while modesty demands that one should say as little as possible about oneself, I would like it to be remembered that as a native of this country I am entitled to think and to express my opinion as freely as anybody else. But I have always used this as my guide: to consult with those from whom I can gain something of value to myself, and not to ignore the suggestions of those who are able to offer anything valuable, whether they may be high or low. I do not wish to belabour this point, but I wish this Council to understand that I am personally fully aware of the magnitude of this issue: that I take full responsibility for what I do or say, and that I have never at any time been converted to Federation.

When I went on the election platform I supported Federation, and as a candidate for the Ministry I supported Federation. So I feel that any suggestion as to my being used to carry out a measure by Her Majesty's Government is quite beside the point and should never have been considered.

There are one or two other points to which I would like to make reference. It has been suggested that if we pursue what this motion is asking to have done, it is possible that the subversive elements among us would take charge of the Federal Government so far as British Guiana's elected representatives are concerned. But that opinion seems to clash with the view previously expressed by the same side. They have definitely argued in favour of the sovereignty of public opinion, and if the sovereignty of public opinion is to be maintained, I wonder by what stretch of the imagination, and by what use of logic could it be regarded as the correct thing to delay the work that we are trying to do now; to delay taking the steps suggested, just for the sake of some people who are unable to judge the rightness or wrongness of our action — indeed because of some fear. I prefer to think that here is one matter in which we should all be concerned with doing the right thing at the right time, and let the people judge.

It was said on several occasions during the debate last week in this Council — and I have seen it in an article published during the debate last week — that the supporters of this motion appear to be in favour of the allocation of six seats to British Guiana. I wish that when this debate ends there will be no doubt in the minds of the people of this country as to what this motion is trying to do. There are some portions of the Rance Report which are valuable, but we are all agreed that on the question of representation, we are not satisfied with six seats — a point ably and forcibly clarified by the Attorney General. We had no particular delegation from this country to the Conference. We had no say in the allocation of seats.

I would like to go on to another question which has been repeatedly raised in this Council, and I am repeat-

[Rev. Mr. Bobb]

ing it because I would like the greatest emphasis to be laid upon the true position. If our people are continually thinking that West Indians are going to be dumped into this country and will prove to be unstable, it seems to be forgotten that it would not be a matter of a man just picking up his grip and trunk and making headway for British Guiana. I cannot conceive of the Federal Government allowing a trek of that kind. There must be some orderly settlement, and that settlement would not come unless it is going to be one of some advantage to British Guiana. As I have said earlier, I have lived among those people, and I know it is going to be a surprise to us when the time comes — and I know surely it will come — that the people of the West Indies coming here will prove themselves to be most desirable settlers.

My good friend, the hon. Member, Mr. Sugrim Singh, managed to use the *argumentum ad hominem* cleverly, bringing in not the issue but the man. In speaking about the possibility of people like Mr. Albert Gomes being Prime Minister. I do not see anything wrong with Mr. Albert Gomes being Prime Minister, or somebody from B.G. for that matter — Mr. Sugrim Singh himself. When he spoke I was reminded of something I came across not so long ago, and it does apply to what the Member said. It was a comment on a book being advertised, "Animal Farm" by George Orwell, which said :

"This brilliant satire on Communism is the latest title to be added to this popular series. The animals on a farm drive out the owner and administer it themselves; but soon disaster sets in, and a reign of terror replaces the glorious revolution, with the pigs firmly in control. One slogan only remains on the farmyard wall: "All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others?"

We think of having everybody on equality, yet in our hearts we want some to be more "equal" than others. I

am sure our West Indian friends are people like ourselves, with common interests. On this score I wish to differ completely from my friend, Mr. Macnie, who in his otherwise brilliant and convincing speech, said there was no community of interest between the people of the West Indies and ourselves. In matters of religion, language, customs and outlook —

Mr. Macnie : I did not say there was not. I said there was a lack of much community of interest.

Rev. Mr. Bobb : Thank you, Sir. There was a lack of community of interest.

Mr. Macnie : A lack of much community of interest.

Rev. Mr. Bobb : "Of much community of interest." I submit that there is a considerable amount of community of interest, and that cannot be gainsaid. I know, and the hon. Mr. Macnie will agree, that travelling difficulties have been in the way of our people meeting oftener and knowing one another better, and that is the reason for this apparent aloofness. Why is it we see so few people from Trinidad here, and British Guianese in Trinidad, St. Vincent, Barbados and so forth? To my mind there is only one answer : it is the common poverty of all these territories. It is something which the Federation hopes to remove from the pages of British Caribbean history.

Speaking about transportation leads me to remark on something which the Opposition made use of. It was stated that while we were contributing to the Inter-Caribbean Shipping Service a sum of £1,000 the ship had not condescended to come to British Guiana. I would like, with your permission, Sir, to crave the indulgence of the Council to read some portions of the Minutes of the Finance Committee meet-

ing at which that matter was presented, and at which most Members were present. Those present were the Financial Secretary, the Member for Agriculture, Forests, Lands and Mines, the Member for Local Government, Social Welfare and Co-operative Development, Messrs. Smellie, Gajraj, Tello, Raatgever, Lord, Ramphal, Phang, Macnie, Carter, Correia, Bobb, Rahman, Miss Collins, Mrs. Dey, Dr. Fraser, Lt. Col. Haywood, Mr. Jailal and Mr. Sugrim Singh. At that meeting the Chairman, the Financial Secretary, said that:

“An Inter-island Shipping Service had been one of the important decisions of the last meeting of the Regional Economic Committee. He had hoped that the report of the meeting would have been received in the Colony for circulation to members, but nothing had come to hand. The Service now approved had a long history but he would endeavour to give an outline of its main facts for the information of members.

“Since the withdrawal of the Lady boats the Chairman explained that communications between the smaller Eastern Caribbean Islands had been inadequate and had left much to be desired. When an inter-island shipping service was raised in 1952 by the Shenfield Report, this Colony had intimated it was adequately served by existing services and was not interested in participating in a service which called either for a subsidy or a guarantee of cargo. It was however a matter of vital importance to the little islands, and through pressure by them the matter was taken up by the Regional Economic Committee. The matter reached the stage in 1953 where tenders were called for and were considered at a meeting attended by Mr. Chase who re-affirmed that this Government was not interested . . . In March of this year this Government re-considered in the Colony's long-term trading interest its earlier decision of non-participation, and offered to participate subject to the subsidy which would be required and the approval of the Legislature. It was at this point the matter came up at the last meeting of the Regional Economic Committee held in June, which was attended by Sir Frank McDavid as the Colony's representative, with Major Bernard, Chairman of the British Guiana Shipping Association, and himself as advisers.

“Barbados first spoke, and intimated that as the service would be of no benefit to that Island, its Government was not prepared to support it. All other Colonies supported. Our delegate spoke last. Sir Frank said that his difficulty was that he did not know whether the other Governments desired British Guiana to be included in the Service. He had seen from the savingsgram from the Secretary of State that British Guiana's inclusion would make the ‘turn round’ too long and would attract losses; but if the participation of the Colony was desired he would be prepared to recommend that British Guiana should join in the Service. He made it clear that British Guiana was not in need of the Service but in the interests of regional co-operation he was still prepared to recommend a token contribution even if the ship did not call at Georgetown. The announcement was applauded.”

Later in the Minutes of Finance Committee it is recorded that the Chairman stated:

“Barbados' final decision was indeed a happy ending, and although it was true that the Service was not essential to British Guiana the integrity of the shipping interests of the Colony had been preserved, and what was greater, the token contribution was a constructive gesture of goodwill well worth the price. The offer had completely dispelled a gathering feeling of suspicion and distrust of the Colony's good faith in the matter of regional co-operation, and he hoped that Finance Committee would endorse the stand taken.”

The Minutes further record:

“Mr. Raatgever stated that he was the original delegate of the Colony on the Regional Economic Committee, and while he doubted whether any material benefit would be derived, he was prepared to support the contribution.

“Mr. Ramphal said that he was a supporter of Federation and welcomed the suggestion that the Colony should take part. He considered, however, that the Colony should contribute its full share of the cost of the scheme even if the vessel did not come to British Guiana.

“Sir Frank McDavid who was the Colony's delegate to the Regional Economic Committee's meeting, said it was hoped to inaugurate the Service in January, 1955, and explained that the other Colonies were

[Rev. Mr. Bobb]

quite satisfied with the Colony's participation on the basis proposed, and read to the Committee details of the ship which was to be used. He urged the Committee to approve of the proposals.

"After discussion the Committee unanimously approved of the proposal that the Colony should participate in the Inter-Caribbean Shipping Service on the basis proposed, and make a token contribution of \$4,800 per annum from 1955 for three years."

That was a unanimous decision, and in view of that I think the hon. Mr. Sugrim Singh will agree that his observation was not fair—that the ship had not yet come to British Guiana. He was fully aware of all the circumstances, and he voted for that figure on the basis and the understanding that the present arrangement would be normal practice.

Mr. Sugrim Singh: On the question of the shipping service, my friend knows that there was no voting in Finance Committee. I may not have objected, but there was no question of supporting it by voting in Finance Committee.

Rev. Mr. Bobb: What I read were the Minutes of the meeting of Finance Committee, and it was a unanimous decision after a long discussion. My friend also remarked that the Government Information Services had not presented both sides of the picture in this matter of Federation. I have read issues of the *British Guiana Bulletin* and it seems to me that their line of approach was to publish, as far as space would allow, the speeches of Members in this debate. I do not think that the *Bulletin* has itself presented the points for and against Federation, but that is not what I want to deal with. I want to refer to an earlier remark by the hon. Member which might give the public the impression that the Government Information Service was partial in a matter of this kind. He was referring to the partiality of the BPI which was the predecessor of the GIS.

Mr. Sugrim Singh: There is a distinction between partiality of the G. I. S. and its not giving the opposite side. My friend's remarks might create the impression that I was accusing the G.I.S. of being partial. I did not say that. What I did say was that, in a way, they have done remarkably well in this debate, but nowhere in their publications have I seen where they have attempted to put the case of the Opposition. That is what I said.

Rev. Mr. Bobb: Well, Sir, I hold in my hand a copy of "Blueprint for a British Caribbean Dominion," a collection of ten broadcast reviews of the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee given by the Public Information Officer. The Information Officer spoke in a radio broadcast of an interview between himself and an ardent Federalist who was evidently taking the opposite point of view, and a conversation between them ensued, as recorded on page 22 of the publication—

"My friend, I need hardly say, is an ardent Federalist. And this conversation between us started when I asked him how he would propose that British Guiana should make good the two to two and a half million dollars (this is the 1950 figure—the 1940 figure is much less) it will have to surrender to the Federation as its contribution of one-fourth of its customs revenue. Those who are against British Guiana's joining the Federation do indeed regard this as the unanswerable question—or at least, the "sixty-four dollar question." How will British Guiana make good the 2—2½ million dollars? I am under the impression that it is a profitless approach to these Guianese to ask them if British Guiana's taxable capacity is indeed at present exhausted; if all the kinds of taxation invented by men have indeed already been tried in British Guiana; if they have really never heard of such taxes as a sales tax on imported goods and so on. Not that the Government, so far as I am aware, has the slightest intention of introducing this or any other kind of new tax; this is merely the sort of idea that keeps cropping up in the conversations that are going on during the current controversy; and as I have said, it does not seem to me that anti-federal-

ists are to be persuaded by these suggestions; they do not react well to them at all. I was therefore more than a little interested in my friend's more constructive approach, which was, basically, that the 2—2½ million dollars of our customs revenue should be regarded as an investment in a gigantic credit union which would improve our own borrowing powers, our territorial income, and our taxable capacity.

"I put these two points of view to you—and as Mr. John Carter is suggesting in the motion of which he has given notice—it is for every one of you listeners to judge, particularly those of you who can vote and make your judgment independently, basing it on your own adult powers of reason and on your own immortal conscience. It is fair for me to say, however, that the Report which I am at present reviewing does urge that it is in a Caribbean Federation and in a Caribbean Federation alone, that British Guiana will be able at any early date to invest in this manner and share the benefits of such investments..."

I have quoted this section to show that this is typical of the whole tone of the broadcast which the Information Officer was endeavouring to put to the country at that time. The point of view in the document was very closely associated with Federation then, and one cannot read that document without concluding that he has presented the matter in a most impartial manner.

There is one other matter on which I would like to make a few comments before I go on to the more positive side of the motion. I am going to refer to this because it is also something that is being discussed among people outside of this Council, and it is fair for the supporters of the motion to have their views given the same measure of publicity and emphasis as the other side. The hon. the Deputy Speaker, in referring to the Oils and Fats Agreement, stated that this country was buying margarine at 8 or 9 cents per lb. more.

Mr. Raatgever: Six to eight cents.

Rev. Mr. Bobb: I accept the hon. Member's correction—6 to 8 cents per lb. more for margarine

than the price at which it can be obtained elsewhere. That was the result of an agreement made at a Conference. I would like to know whether it is a fact that the hon. the Deputy Speaker did not know at the time when the recommendations of that Conference came to this country, that the figure decided upon was reached in order to protect a local product. The principle of protecting local commodities is followed in several parts of the world. There is no need for me to enlarge on it, but in order to protect the copra industry, and incidentally the coconut industry, this Agreement was reached on a regional basis.

Mr. Raatgever: If I may just reply to my hon. friend, this Colony does not export copra, or margarine, or lard to any West Indian Island, so I do not see how the Agreement can protect those industries. The people of British Guiana have to pay more for the imported article from Trinidad. It raised the price of copra in British Guiana against the housewife, because the price of imported oil was increased. Mr. Chase was then Minister for Trade and Commerce. It was put at a much higher price than this Colony can produce it. We have to pay more for coconut oil, so this Agreement was no use to the people of British Guiana. I opposed it tooth and nail when the delegate came back to this Colony.

The Financial Secretary: That is quite wrong. The Oils and Fats Agreement is very valuable to this Colony.

Mr. Speaker: I must ask hon. Members to refrain from expressing their opinion on the merits or demerits of a decision arrived at by the signatories to an Agreement. The hon. the Deputy Speaker is opposed to the Agreement, and urges that one of the disadvantages is that by reason of the decision of this regional conference the price of oils and fats, or the fusion of both, has been increased. I suppose importation had been allowed which should not have been allowed. But does it assist us in the federal structure? Let us forget this da-

[Mr. Speaker]

cision. We must not anticipate what the decision of the Federal Government may be. At the moment it is not necessary. It is purely hypothetical, and I must ask hon. Members not to pursue it. Many people are eager and willing to contest whatever inference you may draw.

Rev. Mr. Bobb: Thank you very much, Sir. But as I said, whatever was the intention of the hon. Member, the impression outside is such as to prejudice the average man against Federation, and I am now seeking to correct that impression.

Now, I want to come to the positive side of the argument for Federation. I feel I should adopt the school teacher's method, because I have been a little surprised at the frequent references made in and out of the Council, that we do not know what we are to gain by Federation. There has been so much said by the supporters of the motion as well as by those on the other side, that one could hardly listen to those speeches without concluding that there is a very definite advantage in this motion being accepted in this way, and a very definite advantage in a Caribbean Federation with British Guiana.

So I would like to develop two points before I close. The first is that all these committees, organisations and agencies which are now working at regional level are, in my opinion, pre-Federal structures. That is to say, taking them all together, they have paved the way for nothing short of Federation. Having gone so far, it does not seem to me that we can go backward. We have the services of the Regional Economic Committee, the University College of the West Indies, the Trade Commissioner and the rest. The next logical step, surely, is for some organisation to be created at regional level at which all these independent organisations may become the constituents of a strong, powerful federal arrangement.

It is a question of love having gone so far, the time has come now for a marriage, and I believe that the statesmen of the West Indies and British Guiana who have laid the foundation for the future in the work of these Commissions, have done so with credit to themselves and to their territories; and any action of ours to slow up or reverse this natural process will bring us under condemnation by generations to come.

We have common problems, common human origins, common aspirations, and common need for protection not only against battlements and instruments of warfare, but against the more dangerous weapon of destructive ideas. We have a common language and characteristics, common religion and social outlook and, regrettably, a common level of poverty—and these make a total union necessary.

I want to recite, as far as I see and have been able to glean from the speeches of other supporters, what are the gains of Federation. "What are we to get from Federation.?" As I said, we all have heard what the gains are, but, lest we forget, I have elected to tabulate them so that those who read hereafter may easily read, mark and inwardly digest.

The first and, shall I say, the most important gain, as I see it, is Caribbean nationhood. And where do we go from here? Our population being constituted as they are, the only thing which will benefit all these territories is nationhood.

Second — joint action in external and economic matters.

Third — a single agency which can speak and act with authority and full knowledge, at short notice, for the region in a wide field of activities, of which trade negotiations are only the most prominent example, and this is referred to in the Standing Closer Association Committee Report at page 15, paragraph 19.

Fourth—a quicker and surer way of each unit achieving political independence. This can only be secured, I admit, after economic stability and administrative experience have been obtained.

Fifth—economical large-scale planning, and the obtaining on easier terms of the financial aid necessary, through a regional outlook and the acceptance of the concept of regional solidarity.

Sixth — British Guiana's industrial and trade position would be secured and enhanced through federation by the application of capital, by immigration and by the right use of the resources which should attract and stimulate enterprise.

Seventh — Federation is the only means of carrying forward the inter-territorial outlook which higher education in the West Indies for West Indians is rapidly cultivating, and to which even the much-needed reforms in elementary, secondary, academic and social education could give meaning.

Eighth — the fulfilment of all agencies and services now organically unrelated in any master plan for the development of each and all the units of the Caribbean.

Ninth — freedom of movement as will be provided by the Federal and unit governments will break down the insularity, pettiness and lack of real co-operation and genuine appreciation of the worth and capabilities of the average West Indian and Guianese, which is one of the sorest handicaps to the development of the area. Many Guianese wandering in a foreign land will return with rejoicing, for--

“Breathes there a man, with soul so dead
dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land!”

And now I come to the tenth and last point, and that is a speeding up of British Guiana's all-round development.

The aggregate value of the points in its favour will be more beneficial than we can now predict.

If anyone were to ask me which was the greatest developmental idea of our present time I would not say it was capital, much as I know we need it. I would not say immigration, much as I know we need our land spaces to be occupied, but I would say that because of those very benefits which have been enumerated in the course of the debate, and because we are living in a world in which we are so closely drawn together that the affairs of one people are the affairs of others in this small world, the biggest development idea for British Guiana is Federation. Federation, well thought out and constructed on true foundations, is going to give full and equal opportunity not only to the potential material resources of this country, but its potential human resources as well.

I regard this opportunity to discuss this motion as a great one, for I believe that after such an exhaustive treatment of the subject those who had doubts will again have second thoughts. I believe that when the history of this country is written in the next quarter of a century, what we do here will occupy a most important place in its pages. No one with foresight, no one with love for the people of this country would dare to suggest that legislators of today are wrong in seeking to obtain an opinion that British Guiana should join the Federation; that the question of its participation should be re-examined; that the Governor should be invited to take all necessary steps to keep the country in touch with what is proceeding, and that public opinion on this important subject should be ascertained. No one can say that we have wasted time. It may be, Sir, as has happened in previous years, that we have missed our opportunity. It may be that some who in all earnestness now fail to see

[Rev. Mr. Bobb]

the urgency with which this motion should be dealt with, may become converts to a new and more progressive opinion. But, in the meantime, let me crystalize in one sentence what, in the opinion of others, including myself, this Caribbean Federation, involving British Guiana and the British West Indies, means. I put it in this way: It is a beacon to a perplexing Caribbean situation; it is God's gift to this generation and the next. Shall we take it?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, I should like to express to you my deep appreciation of your generous tributes to me for the manner in which I have presided over this debate. It is now very many years since I was privileged to attend and gain my first experience of the House of Commons. It is very nearly 60 years ago since I sat for the first time in the public gallery of the House of Commons in 1895. It was an experience not only for me but for all those who were present that day. The Conservatives were in power and there was a large Liberal representation. There were also representatives of the Irish National Party and several Independents. If I have shown any qualifications to occupy the position of the Speaker of this Council I would attribute them to the lessons I learnt while I had the privilege of making myself familiar with the atmosphere of the House of Commons. I have gone there on many occasions since, during my visits to England, so that whatever measure of success I have achieved in presiding here is not purely accidental.

This Council has been engaged in considering a most momentous question. Any change in a country's Constitution is important, but a change which superimposes a Federal Constitution on the existing Constitution of the Colony is of vital importance, affecting the future policy of the Administration, and to some extent the existing control of our own affairs. The position of the Speaker

in a Legislature is sometimes like the lot of a policeman—not always a happy one. It may not be generally known that no motion can be introduced in this Council unless it has my approval, and from my decision there is no appeal. I am gratified to know that, having examined this motion, I came to the conclusion that it is in order constitutionally, and that it imposed on me a duty which I hope I shall never regret having discharged.

I have risen principally to make a few observations. The greatest care has been taken to see that the contributions of Members to this important debate are being accurately and faithfully reproduced. I shall take care to see that that is done, and I invite the assistance and co-operation of Members in the revision of the *Hansard* reports of their speeches, which will be submitted to each and every one of you.

My reason for doing so is that I was present in the House of Commons along with Mr. A. R. F. Webber, who is now dead, and Mr. H. C. Humphrys, then elected Members of our Legislature, when the Constitutional Instruments came up for adoption, introduced by the then Secretary of State for the Colonies. That decision had been preceded by the appointment of a local Commission. Hon. Members will excuse me if I mention that the personnel of that Commission comprised Mr. (now Sir Crawford) Douglas-Jones, who was then Colonial Secretary of this Colony; Mr. Hector Josephs, who was then H.M. Attorney General of this Colony; Major Bain Gray, who was then Director of Education—three ex-officio Members of the Legislature—Mr. W. M. Shields, who was one of the Attorneys in this Colony of Messrs. Davson & Co., and a Member of the Executive Council as a nominated Member; and the other members of the Commission were myself and the late Mr. R. E. Brassington, both elected Members of the Legisla-

ture. I listened with rapt attention while H.M. Secretary of State for the Colonies was introducing that motion for the adoption of the Report. He stated that the Report was the unanimous decision of the elected Members of the British Guiana Legislature. But there were only two such persons on that Commission qualified to be referred to in that way—Mr. Brassington and myself—and I had submitted a short Minority Report.

The circumstances which led up to the change of the Constitution and the Order in Council of 1928, are well known. That decision was adopted very largely by reason of its being, as was stated by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, a decision unanimously agreed to by wholly-elected Members of the Legislature. In the Report of this debate, with the exception of the three *ex-officio* Members of this Council, whose official designations will appear in the *Hansard*—the hon. the Chief Secretary, the hon. the Attorney General and the hon. the Financial Secretary—and, perhaps, the Rev. Mr. Bobb's may be included, and, possibly, to some extent Lt.-Col. Haywood's, it will not necessarily be appreciated, on reading the *Hansard* reports, how valuable the contributions made by Members were, unless some idea of their identity and status is also included. It is important, I think, that those responsible for the examination of the reports should have an opportunity of knowing that the opinion expressed by a speaker has been made by one whose personal status in this Colony cannot be questioned.

I consider, therefore, that the personal status of each and every Member of this Council should be mentioned—just as in the *Hansard* Reports of the House of Commons the constituencies the Members represent are named in the Reports. Sir Frank McDavid, for example, is an ex-Financial Secretary

and Treasurer of this Colony with a long and distinguished public service to his credit. Can anyone deny that he is entitled, as a native of this Colony, to say: "During my official service I have come into contact with all classes of the community"? In a similar position is Mr. Cummings, a practising barrister-at-law. The Deputy Speaker is a member of the commercial community, an ex-Member of H.M. Executive Council and an ex-President of the Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Ramphal is Commissioner of Labour. Mr. Phang is a merchant and is entitled to say what public opinion is in the North-West District, where he has resided for many years. Mr. Macnie is an Executive of the Sugar Producers' Association and an ex-Colonial Secretary of the Leeward Islands. Mr. Correia has long been a successful businessman in the interior of this Colony. Mrs. Dey is an ex-Schoolmistress and a Social Worker. Are they not representatives who can express public opinion as a result of their voting?

Then we have the hon. and gallant Member, Col. Haywood, whom we are proud to have with us. He is the only Englishman in this Council, with the exception of the hon. the Chief Secretary. I am sure we all listened with interest to his very illuminating and valuable contribution to the debate. Is he not entitled to have his opinion respected, after his long residence in the Colony and his arduous military service not only here but abroad? Mr. Sugrim Singh is a barrister-at-law. Mr. Jaïlal is an expert on rice, a much travelled man and a man of imagination and brains; Dr. Fraser, formerly a Government Veterinary Surgeon, who has given a clear, calculating analysis of what is required in this country, especially in the rearing and improvement of cattle, can express an opinion for and on behalf of the people he has met in the practice of his profession, and those among whom he

[Mr. Speaker]

now resides in the Corentyne District of the Colony; Miss Collins is a Social Worker; Rev. Mr. Bobb is a popular clergyman; Mr. Carter is an ex-Leader of a Trade Union; Mr. Luckhoo is one of Her Majesty's Counsel and at present the Mayor of Georgetown; Mr. Lee is a barrister-at-law, and an old legislator, who comes daily into contact with the people. Both he and Mr. Phang are, as their names indicate, members of the Chinese section of the community. Mr. Tello is a Trade Unionist, and Mr. Gajraj is a Director of a mercantile company in Georgetown. Capt. Smellie is a respected merchant, as was his father before him for many years; Mr. Farnum, a man who has had a varied career in the North-West District, is a Company Secretary and Chairman of a Union of Local Authorities, and Mr. Kendall is an old legislator representing the town of New Amsterdam, the ancient capital. Mr. Lord, who is an ex-Commissioner of Lands and Mines and a member of a very large family, has travelled all over the Colony.

I wish to emphasize that unless those particulars appear in *Hansard* the same mistake may be made in the appraisal of the value of Members' contributions. It is with that idea that I wish to impress upon all of you the value and importance of an expression of opinion from Members of the Council. You represent a large body of public opinion. You are entitled to the same respect being paid to your opinions—as I see it—as that shown to an editor of a newspaper, and in saying so I sincerely mean what I say.

As to the number of resolutions in the Rance Report which were constantly being referred to, I would like to remind hon. Members of Monsieur Clemenceau's cynical comment at the first meeting of the League of Nations when

President Wilson submitted his celebrated Fourteen Points for discussion by the Assembly. Speaking in French, he said, "Why fourteen resolutions? The good Lord only submitted 10 for our guidance in the future."

I am going to put the amendment to the vote, and then, according to constitutional practice, submit the original motion. Before I do so, however, I would remind Members of a well-known philosophical observation made years ago by a well-known writer who offered the following advice:

"I find that the great thing in this world is not so much where we stand but in what direction we are going. To reach the desired port we must sail sometimes with the wind, and sometimes against it; but we must sail and not drift, nor lie at anchor".

If Federation is going to be adopted, I know and feel it instinctively that the contribution by the people of this Colony can be immense. The possibilities offered by its vast area, its agricultural potential and its strategic position on the mainland of South America, are factors that cannot be ignored, and I express a personal note in suggesting that we should be allowed, when ready to do so, to enter through the 'front door' and be welcomed into the Federal building with the highest possible status being accorded to this Colony for the reasons I have already given.

I shall now put the amendment. The question is, that the words, "that British Guiana should join the Federation and" appearing in the tenth and eleventh lines of the first paragraph, and the whole of the second paragraph, be deleted.

The Chief Secretary: Sir, may I ask your ruling as to the form in which the question should be answered? There seems to be no agreement as to whether it should be "For" or "Against" or "Aye" or "No." On the last occasion

there was some diversity in the replies which led to some confusion. I do not care which form is used, so long as Members use the same form.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is being put to the vote first, after which the motion will be put. Those in favour of the amendment will say "Aye", which is the parliamentary form we have always used. It means "Yes". I cannot understand why there should be any difficulty about Members saying "Aye" if they are in favour of the amendment, and "No" if they are against it. I notice that although I have said that before, there are some Members who say "Yes". It would be far better if Members said "Aye" and so become accustomed to that form. (*The Clerk consults the Speaker.*) The Clerk has pointed out to me that on the Division List there are the words "For" and "Against." Of course the acoustics of this Chamber are bad, and I think it would be better if those who are in favour of the amendment would say "Aye" and those against say "No". I will now put the question that the amendment be adopted. Those in favour will say "Aye", and those of the contrary opinion will say "No".

I think the "Noes" have it.

Mr. Luckhoo: Division, please.

The Council divided and voted:

For *Against*

Mr. Sugrim Singh	Mr. Jallal
Mr. Macnie	Lt. Col. Haywood
Mr. Luckhoo	Dr. Fraser
Mr. Phang	Mrs. Dey
Mr. Lee	Miss Collins
Mr. Raatgever—6.	Mr. Rahaman
	Rev. Mr. Bobb
	Mr. Correia
	Mr. Carter
	Mr. Ramphal
	Mr. Lord
	Mr. Tello
	Mr. Gajraj

Mr. Smellie
Mr. Farnum
Mr. Kendall
Mr. Cummings
Sir Frank McDavid
The Financial
Secretary
The Attorney
General
The Chief
Secretary.—21

Mr. Speaker: The result of the division is: there voted for the amendment 6, and against 21. The amendment is not carried.

I will now put the motion. The question is that the motion be adopted. Those in favour will say "Aye", and those of the contrary opinion will say "No".

I think the "Ayes" have it.

Mr. Lee: Division, please.

The Council divided and voted:

For *Against*

Mr. Jallal	Mr. Sugrim Singh
Lt.-Col. Haywood	Mr. Macnie
Dr. Fraser	Mr. Luckhoo
Mrs. Dey	Mr. Phang
Miss Collins	Mr. Lee
Mr. Rahaman	Mr. Raatgever. —6.
Rev. Mr. Bobb	
Mr. Correia	
Mr. Carter	
Mr. Ramphal	
Mr. Lord	
Mr. Tello	
Mr. Gajraj	
Mr. Smellie	
Mr. Farnum	
Mr. Kendall	
Mr. Cummings	
Sir Frank McDavid	
The Financial Secretary	
The Attorney General.	
The Chief Secretary—21.	

Mr. Speaker: The result of the division on the motion is that 21 Members

[Mr. Speaker]

voted in its favour and 6 against. I declare the motion to be carried.

Mr. Lee: May I ask, Sir, that a verbatim report of this debate be sent to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Mr. Speaker: Where else do you think it will be sent? Do you think it will remain here?

Mr. Lee: It is not usually sent, but on this occasion I am asking that it be sent.

Mr. Raatgever: I would like to support that request. I think it is very necessary.

Mr. Speaker: I will now adjourn this Council *sine die*.

Council adjourned at 7.25 p.m.

