

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES  
OFFICIAL REPORT  
[VOLUME 1]  
PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE  
FIRST LEGISLATURE CONSTITUTED UNDER THE  
BRITISH GUIANA (CONSTITUTION)  
ORDER IN COUNCIL, 1961

*3rd Sitting*

*Thursday, 9th November, 1961*

**SENATE**

*The Honourable Senate met at 2 p.m.*

*Prayers*

[**The President** *in the Chair*]

*Present:*

*Appointed under Article 47 (2) (a):*

**His Honour the President, Senator Ashton Chase**

**Senator the Honourable H. J. M. Hubbard**, Minister of Trade and Industry

**Senator the Honourable C. V. Nunes**, Minister of Education and Social  
Development

**Senator C. V. Christian**

**Senator M. Khan**

**Senator C. S. Persaud**

**Senator Christina Ramiattan**

**Senator H. Thomas**

*Appointed under Article 47 (2) (b):*

**Senator Anne Jardim**

*Appointed under Article 47 (2) (c):*

**Senator A. G. Tasker, O.B.E.**,

**Senator C. V. Too-Chung**, Vice-President.

Mr. I. Crum-Ewing—Clerk of the Legislature

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

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

### H.E. ACKNOWLEDGES SENATE'S THANKS FOR MESSAGE

**The President:** I have to inform you, members of the Senate, that the expression of thanks of this Senate to His Excellency the Governor for the Message he delivered on the occasion of the opening of the Legislature, was conveyed to him; and His Excellency has replied to thank this Senate for its expression of thanks in respect of that message.

## PUBLIC BUSINESS

### MOTION

## INDEPENDENCE FOR BRITISH GUIANA

"Whereas it is the inherent right of all people to administer their own affairs and to determine their own destinies;

And Whereas it is the declared policy of Her Majesty's Government to grant independence to their subject people;

And Whereas Her Majesty's Government has accepted the principle of independence for British Guiana;

Be It Resolved that this House requests Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies to fix a date during 1962 when this country shall become fully independent within the Commonwealth of Nations". (The Minister of Education and Social Development).

**Senator Nunes** (Minister of Education and Social Development): Mr. President, since the inauguration of the People's Progressive Party about 12 years ago, this Party has fought for the Independence of British Guiana. With your permission, I should like to quote one of the aims of this Party:

"To pursue constantly the goal of self-determination and national independence for the people of British Guiana."

This Party has not ceased in its struggles and its cries for independence of this country. Its cries have increased

in volume, and I am quite sure that there is no quarter of this Globe, in the corners of which these cries have not fallen.

On March 31, 1960, some effective form was shown to these cries in the acceptance of the principle of Independence by Her Majesty's Government; and the statement which, with your permission, I should read says:

"Her Majesty's Government accept the principle of independence for British Guiana. On the assumption that constitutional changes are introduced as a result of this Conference, then if at any time not earlier than two years after the first General Election held under the new Constitution or upon it being decided that the West Indies Federation should attain independence, whichever period is the shorter, both Houses of the British Guiana Legislature pass resolutions asking Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to grant independence to British Guiana. Her Majesty's Government will early thereafter call a further Conference to consider when it would be practicable to implement this request. Provided that the new situation caused by the decision that the West Indies Federation should attain independence would not be regarded as giving grounds for considering any change in the then operative British Guiana Constitution until it had been in effect for not less than one year."

If we should examine this statement very carefully, we would find that constitutional changes have been introduced as a result of this Conference. To be precise, these changes were introduced on June 27, 1961. The statement goes on:

"... If at any time not earlier than two years after the first General Election held under the new Constitution or upon it being decided that the West Indies Federation should attain independence, whichever period is the shorter . . ."

First of all, the operative word has been "decided" and, as far as we know, a decision was taken on June 16, 1961, at the London Constitutional Conference which stated that the West Indies Federation would attain Independence on

31st May, 1962. Again, I repeat that the operative word, in the context of this, is "decided." And if we are to refer to the concluding clause "whichever period is the shorter", then we will, obviously, see that the shorter period has been the nearly five-month period which has just elapsed. It seems, therefore, quite in order for both Houses of the British Guiana Legislature to pass Resolutions asking Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to grant Independence to British Guiana.

I have been informed that the Lower House—the Legislative Assembly—has already passed its Resolution, and this Motion now seeks to have this House—the Senate—pass the other Resolution. To continue:

Her Majesty's Government will early thereafter call a further Conference to consider when it would be practicable to implement this request".

I shall only emphasize the word "early".

There follows the provision:

" . . . that the new situation caused by the decision that the West Indies Federation should attain independence would not be regarded as giving grounds for considering any change in the then operative British Guiana Constitution until it had been in effect for not less than one year".

We all know that this Constitution came into effect on June 27, 1961, therefore, the fixing of the date, which we have requested to be done in 1962, will fall even within the provisions of this statement from Her Majesty's Government.

This Motion, which it is my privilege to introduce, I think, is quite simple and non-contentious, and I think there is no need for me to say anymore but that whatever has been stated here is what this House is trying to comply with and will comply with. I should, however,

like to make a few statements to allay the fears which others on both inside and outside of this House, may have. I emphasize the word "may". It may not be so.

My Government accepts the principle, for British Guiana, of Independence within the British Commonwealth of Nations. My Government stands for the fundamental rights which have been enshrined in the Constitution which now gives effect to the present political situation in British Guiana. My Government also stands for a policy of active neutrality, seeking aid from any source, but without limiting the sovereignty of Guianese. My Government also accepts socialism, but it emphasizes — and with your permission I should like to quote from the Manifesto of the People's Progressive Party for the 1961 General Election:

"There will continue to be room for private investors. Industries will be organised in a number of ways—privately, co-operatively, publicly and by a combination of these".

It, therefore, stands to follow that while we accept socialism, there will be a mixed economy, even in the period of an independent Guiana.

Now, I should also like to refer to page 2 of the hon. the Premier's Report to the Legislative Assembly; and here I quote the Premier's own words:

"I believe ideally in the nationalization of all the important means of production, distribution and exchange. This will ensure a fairer distribution of a country's wealth than any other system. But I also have to recognise things as they are. While I reserve our right, as any sovereign nation does, to nationalize whatever industry we think should be nationalized in the public interest we have explicitly stated that we have no intention of nationalizing the existing sugar and bauxite companies. These companies today dominate our economy, but British Guiana is still largely underdeveloped".

[SENATOR NUNES]

2 15 p.m.

Mr. President, this Government also stands for the development of a truly Guianese nation. There are other points which must be thought of when planning for an independent Guiana. For example, we have to think of a name for this country of ours, a national flag and a national anthem, but these points will receive consideration as early as possible.

Of the 35 elected representatives of British Guiana's 35 constituencies, 31 are in favour of Independence. I believe we can accept this information as true in that the P.P.P. and the P.N.C., who are represented by 20 and 11 members respectively, are in favour of Independence for British Guiana. Having earlier recited Her Majesty's Government statement, I find, as I said previously, that this Motion is simple and non-contentious. I therefore have pleasure in moving that —

"Whereas it is the inherent right of all people to administer their own affairs and to determine their own destinies;

And whereas it is the declared policy of Her Majesty's Government to grant independence to their subject people;

And whereas Her Majesty's Government has accepted the principle of independence for British Guiana;

Be it resolved that this House requests Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies to fix a date during 1962 when this Country shall become fully independent within the Commonwealth of Nations."

**The President:** The question before the House is, "That this House requests Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies to fix a date during 1962 when this Country shall become fully independent within the Commonwealth of Nations."

**Senator Khan:** Mr. President, beg to second this Motion, and request that my right to speak be reserved.

**Senator Thomas:** Mr. President, hon. Members of the Senate, we are now debating a Motion asking Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies to fix a date for discussing Independence for British Guiana — Independence for a free Guiana. We would like to have political and economic Independence which I believe is a vital necessity for this country and will bring progress and prosperity. I will quote thus:

"After World War II, Britain started giving independence to the then Colonial Territories, such as India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Ghana and so on."

That being so, as it has already been said by the Minister of Education, from the inception of this movement, the P.P.P. told the people that only by Independence we would be able to improve conditions. I have to say that, for British Guiana, Independence was long decided at the last Conference. Our last speaker has mentioned that already.

I believe that anything the House of Assembly has decided is in agreement with the Majority Party in the Government and also the P.N.C. I say that there is nothing wrong if this Senate does the same. Members of the Party which is the P.N.C. are worried concerning proper safeguards, but I want them to remember that it was the P.P.P. that insisted on having full rights inserted in the Constitution — I refer to the Bill of Rights. The same Party has declared that when the time comes for us to have full Independence, it would incorporate safeguards for every Guianese in this country in this Bill of Rights. No one need be afraid; there will be full privilege for any foreign investor to come here and invest his money, and it will be a credit to the people and the Government of British Guiana.

I will say in conclusion that Independence therefore is only a matter of time, so that Guianese people will be able to steer their own destiny and

plan for progress and prosperity not only for the present generation, but for the generations to come. They will be able to have such an opportunity, if we get more revenue not only for primary schools and secondary schools but, possibly, a university.

Mr. President, I would say that this Motion should be supported by every loyal Guianese. That being so, I would ask the President and the hon. Members here, and then everyone would see it wise, to support this Motion.

**The President:** Would any other Senator like to speak on the Motion before the House? If no other Senator would like to speak —

**Senator Jardim:** Mr. President, in standing to oppose this Motion, I want it to be clearly understood that I and my Party are not opposing it on the principle of Independence, but on the question of 'Independence now'. We are basing this opposition, firstly, on the fact that this Motion is a contravention of an agreement signed by both Dr. Jagan and Mr. Burnham. Secondly, that Government has no mandate from the people to seek to move this Motion. Thirdly, that we are not economically independent and cannot therefore be politically independent.

I want to refer to the Report of the London Constitutional Conference — the Report of the British Guiana Constitutional Conference held in London in March, 1960, to which Senator Nunes has referred. Far from this Motion being in line with the findings of this Conference, it is in contravention of it. I should like to read the section which deals with this matter which has already been read to this House. I quote:

"Her Majesty's Government accept the principle of independence for British Guiana. On the assumption that constitutional changes are introduced as a result of this Conference, then at any time not earlier than two years after the first General Election held under the new Con-

stitution or upon it being decided that the West Indies Federation should attain independence, whichever period is the shorter, both Houses of the British Guiana Legislature pass resolutions asking Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to grant independence to British Guiana, Her Majesty's Government will early thereafter call a further Conference to consider when it would be practicable to implement this request. Provided that the new situation caused by the decision that the West Indies Federation should attain independence would not be regarded as giving grounds for considering any change in the then operative British Guiana Constitution until it had been in effect for not less than one year."

The operative words are "if at any time not earlier than two years after the General Election held under the new Constitution or upon it being decided that the West Indies Federation should attain independence, whichever period is the shorter, both Houses pass resolutions asking Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to grant independence to British Guiana." Provided that not less than one year of self-government elapses between that decision and this Motion being moved.

This Motion, on the contrary, is being moved long before two years have elapsed since our General Election and long before one year of self-government has elapsed since the decision to grant Independence of the West Indies Federation. It is therefore in contravention to the agreement signed by Dr. Jagan and Mr. Burnham at the London Conference. If there were any justification for this agreement to be contravened, my Party and I would see no reason to oppose it, but there is no justification whatsoever. No Party won a mandate from the people to seek Independence now. The People's Progressive Party, it is true, raised the question of Independence in its manifesto, and the answer from the people was a vote of 42 per cent. Furthermore, this 42 per cent. is not representative of a cross-section of the people of this country. Mr. Burnham himself said at Bourda Green on Sunday, October 15, 1961:

[SENATOR JARDIM]

"What did Jagan do? He depended on race and racial hatred to win."

The *New Nation* had this to say in its editorial of Friday, 20th October, 1961:

"The People's Progressive Party between 1957 and today has built up its political following by exploiting to the fullest the doctrine of Apanjaat — or racial exclusiveness".

The editorial continues —

"Having won his way to power with this double-edged tool, Dr. Jagan now calls for peace, love and unity".

Mr. Burnham admits that race won the Election. He admits by implication that his own vote was racial, and yet he is pretending that on this vital issue of 'Independence now' he can speak for 41 per cent. of the electorate. In his Party's manifesto there was no question of 'Independence now'. But Mr. Burnham has carried his absurdity even further — he supports the Motion for 'Independence now', but is hedging it about with demands for safeguards and guarantees of individual rights. He demands that for the Constitution to be amended under Independence, a referendum must be held and carried by two-thirds of the electorate — by 66 2/3 per cent. of the people.

In the light of this proposal it is interesting to follow Ghana's experience in Constitutional amendment. In February, 1957, there was a last-minute compromise on Ghana's Constitution, under which 5 Regional Assemblies were to be set up and the Constitution was to be changed only by a two-thirds vote in Parliament and in a majority of the 5 Regional Assemblies.

In December, 1958 — 1 year and 10 months later — the Ghana Government passed the Constitution (Repeal of Restrictions) Bill to permit alteration of the Constitution by a simple majority in Parliament and without consulting the

Regional Assemblies. And Mr. Burnham asks for safeguards and guarantees. His stand on the question of Independence is completely equivocal. Either you are absolutely certain that the country is ready for Independence and you are prepared to take the consequences of that certainty or you are not. You do not ask for Independence in one breath and in the other hedge it with safeguards and guarantees. There are no safeguards and guarantees.

In the light of the experience in Ghana, it is clear that no safeguards and guarantees can be written into any Constitution. If you ask for safeguards and guarantees, you are admitting, tacitly and implicitly, that you are uncertain of the consequences of Independence now.

2.30 p.m.

My Party is uncertain of the consequences of 'Independence now'. The London Constitutional Conference has accepted the need for internal self-government. Both Dr. Jagan and Mr. Burnham signed the Report of this Conference. The Elections have proved that no mandate has been given to the Government with its minority vote of 42 per cent in the Election. Mr. Burnham himself has stated that the elections were fought on race, and that by implication Independence now was not an issue.

Added to all this are the economic realities of Independence. The first step the Government has taken has been to rush abroad to ask for help — help to the extent of \$413 million. I believe that in Trinidad, on his way to the United States, Dr. Jagan mentioned the figure of \$500 million. This is money that we need, but what is this demand for money but an admission of economic dependence? Marxist philosophy asks the very important question: "How can a man be free, in the political sense, when in the economic sense he is unfree?" How can we be independent when our Government admits, by its own actions, that our

economy is totally dependent on help from other countries? When Ghana was given its Independence there was a surplus of £50 million built up from its cocoa exports. When India became independent it had a vast sterling balance in London after the War, on which the Indian Government could draw to support itself and its new-found Independence.

To take this further, Independence costs money, and we have none. Our assets are debts, deficits and money-losing Government industries. We have to ask for money from abroad. Where are we going to find the money to pay for things like diplomatic missions, High Commissioners in all the countries of the Commonwealth—India, Pakistan, Ghana, Australia, New Zealand, Canada? Where are we going to find the money to do these things? Where are we going to find money to pay for representation at the United Nations? Where are we going to find the money to pay for the training and the high salaries of the people we will need; the cost of housing, equipment, travelling, the expanded Civil Service that we will need at home? Where are we going to find the money? And what about the cost of defence under Independence? Are we going to be unique among nations, in that we will stand naked and defenceless when already in the south of our country, people from another country are coming in and nothing effective is being done about it? We have on the west of us a country which is claiming that a part of this country belongs to it. Are we going to be defenceless, or are we going to have some sort of defence? A fighter plane costs \$5 million; a regiment at least as much or more. Where are we going to get the money for them all?

It is for all these reasons that I am opposing this Motion. Firstly, that the Government is going back on an agreement which it signed — that there should

be a period of self-government for two years after the August Elections, or at least one year after the decision was reached on the West Indies Independence, and that during that time no measures should be taken to affect the *status quo*; and that the two Houses of this Legislature should pass a Resolution asking for Independence after these periods of time had elapsed—not before. Secondly, that there is no mandate from the people of this country to change the agreement, because the election was won as a result of racial division in this country. Thirdly, that the cost of Independence now has not been examined, and we have no money to meet that cost.

In the Legislative Assembly debate on this Motion the leader of the United Force (Mr. d'Aguiar) moved an Amendment that a referendum should be held to ascertain the will of the people on the question of 'Independence Now'. I cannot move such an Amendment here, because I have no seconder in this House. However, I should like to point to a precedent in this country's constitutional history. In 1914 a referendum was held to determine whether the then Constitution should be amended. In Georgetown alone 1,005 electors voted for the amendment; 96 voted against. Since "Independence Now" means an amendment to our present self-government Constitution, the Government would have historical precedent behind it in going to the people to ascertain their will on the question of "Independence Now." Why are the Government and the People's Progressive Party not prepared to do this? In the prayer that is read at the opening of these Sessions there are some lines from Tagore which read:

"...where the mind is without fear  
and the head is held high, and where  
words come from the depth of truth."

Let us go to the people and ask for the words that will come forth from the depths of truth.

**Senator Tasker:** I welcome this Motion and I do not share the anxieties of my hon. colleague, Miss Jardim. I do not share her interpretation of the paragraph from the Report of the London Constitutional Conference which has been dealt with by both herself and the hon. Minister of Education and Social Development, Senator Nunes. I should say in explanation, that it seems to me that the wording of the Motion before the Senate is entirely within the spirit of that paragraph. Nor can I get enthusiastic about this continued demand for a referendum on the subject of Independence. I agree that one can draw many conclusions and many lessons from the recent General Election, but I would have thought that one thing which was abundantly clear, and was made clear on repeated occasions by leaders and other spokesmen of both the People's Progressive Party and the People's National Congress, was that they both intended to pursue full Independence at the earliest possible moment. I have been in no doubt whatever about that as an individual elector, and it seems to me that, having had Elections so very recently, and with these two Parties having obtained over 80 per cent. of the votes cast, it would be pointless now to go back to a referendum on the issue of Independence. In other words, I feel that it is entirely reasonable to assume, in the light of those very recent Elections and of the part that the principle of Independence played in the elections, that the Government of the day has in fact a mandate now to endeavour to achieve Independence as soon as it can.

On the other hand, I think the hon. Senator, Miss Jardim, has drawn attention to certain very important issues which must be considered and must be solved before Independence can become a reality. She referred to the question of money, and made considerable play of the considerable sums that are required to support an independent country. She

is quite right. There is obviously an emptiness about an Independence which comes with penury or with begging for aid; it is, in fact, almost a form of prostitution. Where I disagree with her, however, is that I do not believe that the hard facts — and God knows they are hard enough — of our economic and financial position of themselves make Independence impossible. What I do believe is that those hard facts put a very heavy responsibility indeed on the Government and the people of this country to sort out those problems, look the facts in the face, and get the priorities right before anyone goes to London to ask for Independence, which we all know is there for the asking.

I make this point because I think it would be most unfortunate if, say, Her Majesty's Government, in negotiations on Independence, were put in the position, as they very well may be, taking a responsible view, of drawing attention to problems which should be solved here before any delegation goes. I personally would be very sorry, in the light of Her Majesty's Government's clear statement of policy and principle on this issue of Independence, to have it suggested later that the United Kingdom was endeavouring to hold back Independence for British Guiana because it was pointing out certain areas in which we were unprepared for Independence.

I say, therefore, that the most urgent need in British Guiana today is to recognize the burdens and the responsibilities that Independence will bring. They are not only financial, though the financial burden will be heavy. Senator Jardim has referred to some of them. Defence obviously could be a major issue, if Guiana needs an army, a navy or an air force.

2.45 p.m.

I would have thought that she needed nothing of the sort; but then, it depends on an appreciation by the Gov-

ernment of what will be the position of British Guiana when fully independent. After all, one result of this is going to be the removal of the presence, so to speak, of the United Kingdom forces, which will no longer be here and even if you put that at something like a frigate called *Troubridge*, or a company of soldiers at Atkinson field, it is, nonetheless, a symbol of rather more substantial resources available in reserve.

I make this point because, were any of our neighbours to have a desire to attack us, there must obviously be a distinction between the defence of British Guiana as at present and of Guiana as an independent country. Are we prepared to shoulder the burdens that that will entail? But defence, after all, is only one important, but still one aspect of the problem. In some countries it has developed considerable prestige value. I do not think Guiana would approach it in the same way. I hope not. I think that we, as a people, are very much more mature and intelligent in these matters. But what about the other problems?

Senator Jardim cited the problem of representation. Here, again, prestige plays a large part. What are the priorities? Have we got them right? Are we planning, at the present moment, for the use of our resources, as a nation, to the fullest extent — for the deployment of our human and natural resources for the maximum development of this country, in the short term as well as in the long term?

In the field of education, several comments have been made by Ministers of the Government recently on the possibilities of a University, or University College, or a Liberal Arts College for British Guiana. Much to be desired. Greatly to be desired. But have we got the priorities right? Looking ahead to the formative and the most important years

of our Independence, should we not start by paying more attention to primary and secondary education? Certainly, a Liberal Arts College would help us; also, a University would help us in the long run, but can we afford to do this as a priority? Are we making the maximum use and the most economical use of the educational facilities available in the region and further afield? Are we recognizing sufficiently the fact that, by virtue of geographical circumstances we are somewhat remote and tend, therefore, to become a little inbred and parochial-minded?

I think one of the great advantages the University College of the West Indies provides, for instance — whether in Jamaica or in the faculties in Trinidad — is the opportunity for increasing numbers of Guianese to travel abroad and mix with others. It produces a cross-fertilization of ideas and experience which can only benefit this country. One of the problems, of course, is that not all come back. Too many of the best young Guianese go abroad and stay abroad. Not only those who go to pursue studies or other intellectual activities, but skilled craftsmen who, even today, are still jumping on aircraft to go to the U.K. before the curtain comes down on migration.

Some, of course, are going in order to equip themselves more fully in their chosen trade or profession, and then return to practise that trade or profession in British Guiana. One of the most encouraging days I have ever spent in my life was just under a year ago, when I spent New Year's day in London with a young Guianese who wants to be a master craftsman in the field of carpentry. And he was quite clear about what he was doing in the United Kingdom. He was going to become a first class carpenter, so that when he came back he could open his own business and do well the work which he knew was being shab-

[SENATOR TASKER]

bily done now. I hope he keeps it up and will be a success. But these cases are all too few.

We are seeing, more and more, this drift away — this feeling that Guiana has too little to offer, the outside too much. It is not wholly fair, but I think it is true; and that is why I endorse wholeheartedly the views expressed by the Premier and other Ministers on the really vital need for national unity and a national approach. And all that I am endeavouring to do is to suggest that one of the most constructive jobs that Government can do today — the most constructive job — is to give a clear, positive and unequivocal lead in the planning of priorities for Independence.

We have heard a great deal of talk. I believe that Independence is coming very rapidly. My concern is not to hold it back, but to try to ensure that we are fully competent and fully organized to accept the burdens and responsibilities of it when we achieve it. This, it seems to me, must be the main responsibility of Government. The Government, after all, is mandated to run the affairs of this country. The Government has brought forward this Motion, which has gained considerable support in the other House and can be expected to gain it here. But this is not enough. In this country we are, all of us, too easy-going with wishful thinking: and I, for one, would be much happier if I saw positive evidence of clear planning and of clear priorities. After all, in the last analysis, any country, any nation, must depend primarily on four main things.

Firstly, on the quality of its political leadership. Does it have the political leadership that can win and retain the imagination and support of the majority of the people?

Secondly, what are the natural resources of the country? Here, as we know only too well, we are relatively poor in our natural resources. Guiana is not an easy country to develop. It is going to be an uphill battle. Do we fully recognize this, and are we prepared to accept the burdens and sacrifices that this will entail in an independent Guiana?

Thirdly, the country will depend largely on the resourcefulness and imaginativeness displayed by all in commerce and industry — the commercial lifeblood of the country. I have been very glad to hear what the hon. Minister said this afternoon, repeating his Government's attitude towards business in general and private enterprise in particular. I believe devoutly that private enterprise can contribute enormously to the future of British Guiana. I think it would be crazy to try to do it any other way. We need more friends and allies. We want more capital, not less; and Heaven knows there is plenty of scope for all.

Finally, I would say a country must depend on the essential resourcefulness and productivity of its people — not only in the commonly-accepted sense of the productivity of the labourer, the artisan, the man in the workshop, the factory or the field; but also on the productivity of all areas of society, and not least in the field of public administration. Senator Jardim referred to the need for an expanded Public Service as one of the added burdens of Independence. She is right. It is not only an expanded Public Service, it is also a more efficient and more economical Public Service which is needed.

3.00 p.m.

Are we prepared to recognize these hard facts? Are we prepared to pay the price — the blood and sweat and tears — of this uphill battle? Personally, I have no doubt whatever about the answer, be-

cause if the answer were any other than yes, then this Motion would be empty words, and I do not believe it is. But I urge the Government to seize this opportunity now to say in unequivocal terms, in very clear terms, precisely what the planning and the priorities are going to be for our economic and social development. Let us spell it out and let the people know the truth. Let the people realize what it is going to cost in effort, and how much worth-while it is going to be.

**Senator Too-Chung:** Mr. President, dependence is the strongest bond of human society; mankind was made dependent on each other. Every one of us cannot be equal or independent. Some of us must rule and teach, and others must learn and obey. We shall always have with us the strong and the weak, the young and the old, the ambitious and the lazy.

But colonialism is finished. Other countries have been granted their Independence and we must be, so to speak, in the fashion. Every true Guianese patriot wishes Independence for this country. The principle has been accepted, and we believe that it is the declared policy of Her Majesty's Government to grant us Independence so that we can have control of our own affairs and be subordinate to no other country.

Independence will be the greatest event in our history, and, when Her Majesty's Government considers that it is practicable to relinquish the reins, I shall be as happy as any other supporter of this Motion which is before us. A youth looks forward to the day when he will become a man and may be able to tell his father: "I shall do as I please." He puffs his chest and experiences a wonderful feeling of power and freedom.

With Independence we shall certainly determine our own destiny. But what is our destiny? The people have

not been educated to be independent; they have not had the opportunity to think about the burden of Independence and the difficulties and dangers of standing alone. Are we strong enough to stand on our own legs and be really independent of others? Will Independence in 1962 bring any benefit to the people of Guiana? Political Independence gives power to the Government, but it does not provide work or relieve unemployment. We should endeavour to become wealthy and strong by our own sweat, and prove by example and precept that we are ready to undertake heavy responsibilities.

The country needs economic expansion, and we are begging for help to carry out development work. Having agreed on the principle of Independence, it is important that the transitional period should not be too brief. I would just warn the Government that we must carefully and intelligently weigh the problems before us and plan intelligently and purposefully.

**Senator Persaud:** Mr. President, I rise to support the Motion because of four reasons. Firstly, independence or freedom brings out the best in man; slavery the worse he is capable of. Secondly, freedom promotes human progress; slavery debases and then destroys it. Thirdly, freedom ensures security, whereas subjection imperils it. Fourthly, because freedom develops a man's mind and character, whereas slavery does the opposite to it.

So, Mr. President, it is the duty of mankind in British Guiana to make it a happy place that we may live in unity. As usual the motto of the colonist is to divide and rule. It is happening in British Guiana at the present moment. Infiltrators are trying to infiltrate and divide us that they may rule for a longer period. We were born at a splendid and most envious time, and the generations that will come after us will envy us for

[SENATOR PERSAUD]

what we are going to do. Ours is the age of struggle—struggle after freedom. The peoples of the world want to live a dignified life, and they are fighting for such a life. No one can say that people nowadays cannot govern themselves. That statement has been reduced to a myth. I will give you a little information about the Colonies and what has been happening to them. After five hundred years of rule in places like Angola, Portuguese Guiana, and even the territory of Jamaica for 289 years, the colonists have tried to prove that they are making life happy for them. But go and examine those places and you will find misery, lawlessness, forceful taking away of lands, exploitation of the farmers, famine, ignorance, and yet they want us to believe that they are helping them.

War has been declared on colonialism and no free-thinking man of this age should appear in any audience and say "I am for colonialism". He should be set aside as a crook of the highest order. For the past 50 years in the Belgian colonial territories and in the Congo the population has been reduced. Why? Because of starvation and disease for half of a century. Yet they want to prove to us that they are helping them. They may put up a few schools or build a few airfields, but that is merely for exploitation and to enable them to carry away the nation's wealth.

When the hon. Premier was making his points in the Legislative Assembly, the hon. Member for Georgetown-Central was trying to preserve his right to exploit others by asking the Premier to quote from Ghandi and so on. Such persons should be exposed. The hon. Member for Georgetown-Central formed a company and offered shares to the public. Now 89 per cent. of the shareholders own 33.3 per cent. of the shares, and 10.1 per cent. of the shareholders own 36 per cent. of the shares. The d'Aguiars monopolize the whole situation. May I quote, Mr. President —

**The President:** From what?

**Senator Persaud:** From extracts from the Deeds Registry to show to whom the shares are being allocated. I quote:

P. S. d'Aguiar	114,392 shares
D'Aguiar Brothers, Ltd.	60,000
Kathleen d'Aguiar	10,000
Philomine Margaret d'Aguiar	2,000
M. d'Aguiar	1,000
Isabella d'Aguiar	1,000
V. d'Aguiar	1,000
M. d'Aguiar	1,000

Eight d'Aguiars monopolize the business. They have a right, as exploiters, to be against Independence. He made several contracts. On Contract No. 1 he bought a large portion of land and sold part of it to the brewery for \$40,000. On Contract No. 2 he gets \$2,400 per annum as the Managing Director of this firm. On Contracts Nos. 5 and 6 the sum of 36 cents is paid to d'Aguiar Brothers, Ltd. on every gallon of beer sold. In 1958 they sold about 900,000 gallons of beer and collected \$325,000. This is a man who feels that we should live the same life and allow him to exploit the people. Those are the people who are afraid of freedom. Yet he asks the hon. Premier to quote from Mr. Ghandi. I would like him to hear this quotation from Mr. Ghandi:

"You will not be deceived by the specious argument that India must not be made sober by compulsion and that those who wish to drink must have facilities provided for them. The State does not cater for the vices of the people. We do not regulate or license houses of ill-fame. We do not provide facilities for thieves to indulge their propensity for thieving. I hold drink to be more damnable than thieving and perhaps prostitution. Is it not often the parent of both? I ask you to join the country in abolishing the liquor shops. 'If I was appointed dictator for one hour for all India, the first thing I would do would be to close without compensation all the liquor shops.'"

3.15 p.m.

I would like him to hear that. He claims to be a true Christian, and I would like to quote from the Holy Bible. from Habakkuk.

**Senator Jardim:** To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Would you please give a ruling whether this is in line with Article 31(3) of the Standing Orders? Clause (3) reads:

"Every Senator shall confine his observations to the subject under consideration . . . ."

**The President:** I will allow the speaker to proceed.

**Senator Persaud:** The truth hurts. Habakkuk has only three Chapters—the first Chapter has 17 verses, the second Chapter has 20 verses, and the third Chapter has 19 verses. This is in the second Chapter, verse 15:

"Woe unto him that giveth his neighbour drink, that putteth thy bottle to him, and maketh him drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness!"

That is what is happening today in this country. These gentlemen have the brains; they know how to pull money out of the ordinary man's pocket and to become millionaires. We are going to declare war on such things. In this independent country which we have in mind it will not be that some people will work from morning until night and cannot make ends meet, while others sit in a chair reading newspapers and collect so much money at month-end that they can hardly spend it. I am not against the individuals; I am against the system, and we are going to change the system. In my remarks I mentioned Jamaica. May I quote also what is happening in Jamaica? This is from *Time* magazine of August 4, 1961, page 18:

"Jamaica classically suffers from too little wealth and too many people. After 289 years of British rule and 45 years of

limited self-government, only 7% of the island's 1,700,000 people have an income of more than \$840 a year. The other 93% exist on a bare subsistence level, many of them virtually outside the money economy, sleeping on banana leaves in miserable hillside shanties or in the hulks of wrecked cars in city junkyards."

This is 289 years of British rule in Jamaica. The same thing is actually happening here, and many people when approached say "We have no money."

I will give in a nutshell, from past history, how much money has been spent in war and lives. During the 17th century France spent 64 years at war. If you ask them why they keep people in these colonies they say "We want peace, and we want to educate them." During the 18th century France spent 52 years at war, and during the 19th century she spent 32 years at war. War casualty list numbers (American figures) 10,469,710, excluding civilian populations. In the 1914-1918 war about 1,700,000,000 people were involved. War casualty list claimed 37,508,686 victims. World War II casualty list—44,835,196. Total dead they say were 22,960,000; number wounded 34,400,000. Korean war — United Nations Report, August 7, 1953 — United States and allies casualty list was 455,000. The late U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, declared that the "Communist armies have sustained about 2,000,000 casualties, and of the 10,000,000 people of North Korea 1 out of every 3 died."

The 19 years of the Napoleonic war cost U.S. \$15,000,000,000. Up to 1914 there was at least \$40,000,000,000 spent to destroy life. World War I cost \$337,980,579,667. On July 1, 1946, there was still \$15,000,000,000 of World War I debts unpaid. The cost of World War II ran into terribly big figures, more than U.S. \$1,160,991,463,984. The Korean War cost the United States upwards of \$20,000,000,000 (seven months

[SENATOR PERSAUD]

before the war ended). These billions were strictly the direct cost in Korea itself. There is no money to develop the colonies, yet so much money is being spent to destroy lives.

Let us examine how that money could have been spent. The price of one heavy bomber could have built a modern brick school in more than thirty cities. The cost of aircraft destroyed in the second World War and the Korean and Indo-Chinese wars was enough to have easily built hospitals fully equipped for any emergency throughout the world. The money spent on ammunition could have supplied the world with modern highways. The money spent on tanks could have equipped farmers everywhere with trucks and tractors to till the soil. The millions of people hungry for wheat and rice could have been fed at the cost of the fighter planes junked or destroyed during the last wars. The cost of a single destroyer could have built homes to house at least 8,000 people. Homeless ones could have been housed and slums cleared for the price of ships sunk in battle. During the past 3,366 years of recorded history there have been 3,134 years of war and only 232 years of so-called peace. Yet they say "We have no money to develop the colonies".

I think the time is ripe now and, as the Premier rightly said, we will be going to the West first and will be asking for money. We wish, for the benefit of the West, that they pour some of that money into this little colony of just half a million people to make them happy, and I agree that should they say "No", we have to seek money elsewhere. There are other places; there can be no question about that. I have a little book here entitled "How The Soviet Union Helps Economically Under-developed Countries". India received one billion rupees, and countries like the United

Arab Republic, Afghanistan, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, Iraq, Yemen, Nepal, Ethiopia, the Guinean Republic and several other countries are helped without any strings. It is not our intention to be a satellite of any country in the world. We want to be free and to think as free people.

Many lies have been told about the Soviet Union. Great men, went there and saw they were all lies. The hon. Member for Georgetown Central (Mr. d'Aguiar), with his red herring of "quote Nehru, quote Gandhi", would not like to hear a quotation from Nehru. He would hate it. This book, "Glimpses of World History"—and its author is Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru—on page 232, letter 71, says:

"There could be no real freedom without economic freedom, and so long as poverty remained. To call a starving man free is but to mock him. So the next step was the right for economic freedom, and that fight is being waged today all over the world. Only in one country can it be said that economic freedom has been won by the people generally, and that is Russia, or rather the Soviet Union."

Twenty odd years ago those people won economic freedom, and they are out presently to help the whole world without strings, political and economic. I see no danger, if the West should refuse to develop this country, in our going to the Far East, or to the countries there, and asking for help. It is clearly stated in this little book, "Soviet Union—Faithful Friends of the Peoples of the East" —

**The President:** Who are the publishers?

**Senator Persaud:** It was printed in New Delhi. On the cover are photographs of Mr. Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, the President of India and Mr. Khrushchev.

**The President:** You say it was published in New Delhi. Who are the publishers?

**Senator Persaud:** Soviet Land Booklets. These are a few words by Mr. Khrushchev on the cover:

"Our sympathies, the sympathies of the Soviet people, have always been and will always be with the peoples who battle for their independence, who fight their country's enemies and defend their freedom. Our people naturally abhor colonialism. We shall always be with the peoples who have not yet freed themselves from colonial tyranny. We shall always be with the peoples who battle to consolidate their political independence and to achieve economic independence."

So, before taking my seat, I only wish and pray that the Western countries do all that can be done. We are a little country here with big land, a sleeping giant, British Guiana, with all the resources. Send money to allow us to develop the land and let the people live in peace and harmony.

3.30 p.m.

May the light of reason; may fair-play and lasting comradeship dawn to close these unsavoury episodes in the history of British Guiana. Long live the militant people of British Guiana. Long live the peaceful people of British Guiana. Long live the People's Progressive Party and the founder and leader of the People's Progressive Party, Dr. Cheddi Jagan.

**Senator Khan:** Mr. President, it is indeed a very great privilege for me to say something in relation to this most important measure which is before us today. Undoubtedly, history will have it recorded that it is the P.P.P. which has evidently championed the cause of Guianese freedom, here.

This afternoon, however, I have had two surprises, one of which I was expecting, but the other, although a surprise, it was a pleasant one. On the one hand, we have heard some fantastic

reasons given by Senator Jardim for opposing this Motion. Two points raised by the Senator were that we do not have a mandate from the people, and that she and her Party are very uncertain of the consequences of Independence. These are, indeed, two fantastic reasons for opposing freedom for any people anywhere in the world.

On the other hand, we have Senator Tasker, who has, indeed, conceded, after this long but unsuccessful race, that freedom should not be denied the Guianese people. I am very, very much surprised that Senator Tasker has, indeed, conceded this principle; and from what he has said he has given us a clear indication that the future of Guiana indeed spells well.

We have, undoubtedly, made it very clear on several occasions — in 1953, 1957 and 1961. We have never kept our views or any of our plans secret. In 1953, we stated, clearly, in the manifesto of the P.P.P., what our views were in connection with Independence for Guiana. In 1957, we emphasized it fully; and in 1961, it was even clearer. We have made it also clear, what the economic position will be and what are our plans for the development of the country. Senator Nunes referred to the programme of mixed economy which we have set out in our manifesto, and this should be a clear indication of how the Government intends to set British Guiana on the real road to prosperity.

It is, indeed, fitting for me to say that the time has come when we, in Guiana, should realize and develop a national conscious feeling for our own country. We should not wish to be tied, any longer, to the apron strings of the Colonial Office. For how long will we be subjected to these embarrassments, detractions and economic ills we are facing in our country? We want to solve the problems in the country, and

[SENATOR KHAN]

it is clear we will never be able to do this unless British Guiana is made free, politically. This Motion, therefore, is fitting; and we are looking forward to see, in the face of the many bold statements which are being made by the Colonial Office, that British Guiana will become free on the same date as is set for the freedom of the West Indies Federation.

If we look around the world, what do we see? All over, everybody is crying out for freedom; and just fancy, in this twentieth century, we have sensible Guianese just trying to debar freedom for their own people.

There is only one other aspect to which I would like to refer before taking my seat, and that is the question of racial division. Senator Jardim referred to this and said that this was responsible for the members of the P.P.P. and P.N.C. winning their respective seats. We have, undoubtedly, had a clear indication of what the last elections were: and if it is necessary, on behalf of the P.P.P. we can assure, and we have done everything to assure, everybody, both inside and outside of the House, that this question of racial division will no longer exist so long as the P.P.P. remains head of the Government in the future. We have stated, quite clearly, our position and what we intend to do; and we have said time and again that unless the two major races combine with the other sections of the community—join forces—we will not be able to make Guiana a happy place. The indication which was given by the P.N.C. in the Lower House is a good one for the future of Guiana. It spells well for the future of our country, whether it is under internal self-government or fully independent.

**Senator Hubbard:** Mr. President, there is very little for me to reply to on behalf of the Government. Nevertheless,

I find myself under difficulty because the only Senator in opposition to this Motion is Senator Jardim; and chivalry enjoins that I should be gracious to the lady, but prudence counsels that reaction must be flayed wherever it shows itself. I shall try to walk between chivalry and prudence and not lean too heavily on either side.

3.40 p.m.

Senator Jardim tells us that she is opposed to this Motion, principally, on four counts. She said that the Government had received no mandate from the people to proceed from our present state to Independence. She said that the timing of this Motion was a contravention of an agreement entered into at the London Conference last year. She said that she and those for whom she speaks could not feel assured of a comfortable life in an independent Guiana. Finally, she said that Independence was a costly thing, and we do not have the money to support it. Those are the main arguments adduced, and, I shall endeavour to confine myself to those arguments, though I will necessarily have to bring in a few minor points to underline what I am going to say.

First of all—no mandate. It seems to me that the people who say there is no mandate for Independence from our people are Rip Van Winkles who have not yet awakened. As Senator Tasker has pointed out, Independence was one of the issues at the General Election. As a matter of fact the Party which Senator Jardim supports or which supports her—I am not certain on the point—was at pains to threaten the electorate that if the P.P.P. succeeded in winning the Election one of the horrors that British Guiana would have to face was the prospect of Independence under a P.P.P. Government. The P.P.P. won the Election. The P.N.C. supported the P.P.P.'s stand for Independence, and there was no illusion in

the minds of those who supported the P.N.C. on the question of Independence. One knows that the P.N.C. will, at times, be one thing and then another, but on the question of Independence the P.N.C. has been consistent both at the Election and after the Election. I think we can dismiss the argument of no mandate as being groundless.

The second argument that the timing of this Motion is a contravention of the London agreement is surprising. I should not have imagined that a citizen of a dependent country would come before fellow-citizens and argue a case for the Metropolitan power which holds the freedom of these people in its hands! What if the timing of this Motion is indeed a contravention of an agreement signed in London or signed anywhere else? It is the right of any people to be free, and to demand freedom is not a question on which time limits can be set. All that agreement can mean is that the United Kingdom Government may not desire to have the question of our freedom opened before a certain date. But, surely, it must at all times be up to us to have the question of our independence pushed, pressed and struggled for in our time — not in the time of those who hold us in bonds. I therefore dismiss that argument, and I feel that in dismissing it I will have the support not only of sentimental people, but of rational people who like to put their faces to the sun and let the shadows fall behind.

Then there is the question of the confidence of Senator Jardim and those for whom she speaks. They are fearful that, in a free and Independent Guiana, tomorrow may not be as bright as today. I will concede that, probably, for Senator Jardim and those for whom she speaks, tomorrow in an Independent Guiana may well not be as bright as today — certainly not as gloriously bright as the yesterday which we have buried for ever.

To illustrate my point I should like to refer to something that happened in the Constitutional Commission which debated the Constitution and produced the report which forms the basis of the Constitution which we are now working. While we were discussing the Constitution, the Leader of the P.P.P., Dr. Jagan, proposed a Motion that the new Constitution should have enshrined in it a Bill of Rights. I would have thought that on such a proposal, so eminently desirable, there could be no question of a debate and it would have been accepted. Unfortunately, the Chairman of that Commission insisted that it was an important Motion and could not be discussed at once without notice being given of it.

3.50 p.m.

I reflected and, after reflection, came to a conclusion. I said to the Chairman of the Commission: "Mr. Chairman, you are perfectly right; this is an important proposal; it is the first of its kind that has ever been considered in a Constitution-making body in these parts, and I agree that it should be held up until everyone has had a chance to think it over." I also said: "Sir, in this Committee we have heard a great deal of talk about freedom for minorities, about the rights of minorities, but this proposal is not a proposal to safeguard the freedom of minorities or the rights of minorities, and in that respect it is a very far-reaching departure, because in this country there has always been freedom for minorities—for certain minorities. There have always been rights for minorities, for certain minorities, and this is a proposal that the freedoms and the rights which now reside in minorities should be made total — that everybody should have the same freedom to walk without fear. In that respect I said "It is important; let us leave it."

At the next meeting what happened? A Member came forward with a proposal that the Motion should be ruled *ultra vires* as being outside the powers

[SENATOR HUBBARD]

of the Constitutional Committee. The Member who proposed that Motion is a member of Senator Jardim's Party. He was elected on a United Force ticket and now sits in the Legislative Assembly as a spokesman of that Party. Therefore, it is not surprising, not in the least surprising, that Senator Jardim should come forward and suggest, as she has done, that she and the people she speaks for fear that in an independent tomorrow they may not have as happy a life as they now have, or as they have had yesterday. I concede that that fear is justified. For the mighty to descend and walk among the lowly is a great condescension indeed. It is tolerable when it is merely a condescension, but it is insupportable when it is a condition of life.

Then Senator Jardim said that we should not support Independence because we have no money. This is, of course, the old story of the hen and the egg. She mentioned the sterling balance which the Indian Government had as a colony and the reserves which the Ghana Government had as a colony, and which do not exist now. It may be that Senator Jardim has not been a colonial, because her lack of confidence in tomorrow suggests that she has lived in a separate world and is quite unaware of the realities of our life as colonials. We have not had money, and our colonial state has not given us money. — What our colonial state has done is to take away what we had — not to give. That is why we want our Independence.

Ghana and India had sterling balances. When India was freed those balances were frozen. Certain impositions were made before those balances could be freed. Certain impositions are being made upon us also, but when we are free we make decisions for ourselves; not for any power standing above us. That is the first advantage of freedom, and it is an advantage which can be

translated into dollars and cents, into pounds sterling or into almost any international currency — the effect of your freedom. So that the lack of money, rather than being a barrier to Independence becomes the reverse once you have gained your Independence, because when you are independent people will help you, because you stand on your own. When you are a colony you are somebody else's charge, and they must look after you out of resources they do not intend to use.

So that is a little contradiction. If you have felt colonialism then you will understand these things; you will appreciate them, but, of course, if you have lived remote from the stream of life and in the rarefied atmosphere of a narrow section of the community, then it is perfectly clear you do not appreciate these things. The granting of Independence only means that you have to work for yourselves. You do not get it because you were born to it, or because you can go and have it discussed at a little cocktail party. That is not the kind of thing that happens now.

So that really what we have to answer is answered very shortly and, I think, very comprehensively. However, there have been questions raised on which I think I would do well to say a few words. One of the questions raised was the question of defence. Senator Tasker spoke at some length on the question of defence. Defence of a small territory today is quite a different thing from what it was even 15 years ago. The world today is seemingly more divided politically than it has ever been in its history; seemingly, I say, because there are more opportunities for making play of that division than had existed previously.

Of course we have had revolutionary periods in the past when divisions were as firm and as strong as now, but at no time in history has it been the case that war, as an instrument of policy, must be ruled out. In that particular I think

mankind has reached a higher state of maturity than he ever did before. He has now made himself such super weapons that he cannot fire with safety anything more deadly than a toy pistol that is pointed at anyone else. And so in the circumstances of this real world in which we live, the question of defence for a small people is not the intolerable burden that it used to be. It was not many years ago, for instance, that Egypt lost every battle and won her war. Similarly, although we shall require some armed forces in an independent Guiana, we certainly will not need the massive armaments which independent nations have traditionally required throughout their history. Defence is a problem. It is a dollars and cents problem. It is a psychological problem; but, like all the problems that we face in this country, it is not insurmountable nor is it insupportable.

**The President:** Before you pass on to the next point, which you propose to make, I think this is the time at which we should adjourn for tea. The Senate will now rise for half an hour.

*Sitting suspended from 4.03 p.m. to 4.30 p.m.*

*4.30 p.m.*

*On the resumption*

**Senator Hubbard:** Mr. President, when the sitting was suspended, I was moving from the negative to the positive side of our discussion. I had referred to the fact that we are living in a day which is very different from that which existed, say, even 15 years ago, and in that context I had dealt with the question of our defence. I now wish to deal with other aspects — the more positive aspects — of the position we shall enjoy as an independent nation.

As I said, the world is, politically, seemingly more utterly divided than it has ever been before; but, on the other hand and outside the field of politics,

the world co-operates today on a scale which would not have seemed possible before World War II. Scientists, educators and technicians of all sorts get together from year to year in different places. They examine the questions, which to people like ourselves — the poor people; the struggling people; the undeveloped people — are questions of life and death, and they give, generously — those who can afford it — to the solution of those many problems. Just as we are reaching our independence in a period when resort to arms is not a means of settling international questions, so we are reaching our independence in a period when discussion and the exchange of information is practised on a very wide scale for the benefit of peoples all over the world.

The Soviet Union and the United States of America became deadlocked in the United Nations General Assembly on Berlin and other issues, with great bitterness but, at the same time, we find Russian and American scientists co-operating to protect their own peoples and peoples all over the world from the dreaded scourge of polio. We find that on the grandest scale possible, scientists and agriculturists from all over the world get together to end starvation. In the developed countries, super bombs, shells and tanks are the dreaded engines of death. In our little back water, remote from the cold war, the dreaded engines of death are minute little viruses—minute little germs — and the inability to produce enough to keep our people from starvation. The world today, therefore, is a place where, behind the terrible facade of armaments and political division, all mankind is spending a great deal of time in trying to do the very things which we want to do; that is to say, to lift the lowly and raise the general standard of living.

Just a short while ago, the Premier and I visited North America and stopped in at the United Nations headquarters;

[SENATOR HUBBARD]

and there we sat and held discussions around the table with men from many nations—men from the East, men from the West—working together with one single objective—the objective of providing technical assistance and help to countries and places such as ours. That is the positive side of our independence. The scale of the help will, naturally, be greater to an independent under-developed country than it can possibly be to an under-developed country which is the ward of one or other metropolitan power. The world position, therefore, is propitious in that we need not fear our neighbours as we would have had to fear them years ago. The world position is propitious in that the help which would have been unavailable long ago is now present, willing and anxious to come forward to our aid.

What are our prospects in the economic field? This is one field about which there is great argument. It is not like the argument in Voltaire's "A man of 40 Crowns" — an argument which is empty. It is an argument which is full and charged, and the question "how do you go about bringing these developments to pass?" is a question which is the subject of lively debate all over the world.

We have had with us, since our inception as a colony, the system which is commonly known as private enterprise. I remarked just a few days ago that our experience with the working of that system has not been a happy one. I remarked, however, that we are standing upon the edge of a new age and there is every indication that the methods and the aims, today, are not the same as they were long ago. We feel that an enlightened private enterprise, playing a progressive role, taking the needs of the community into account along with the needs of the owners of private capital, can play an important role in our own development. This Government is resolved to allow

private enterprise to play its role in the development of this country. We are, nevertheless, conscious of the fact that we have been waiting for close on 150 years for private enterprise to industrialize this country, and we are not prepared to wait another 20 or another 150 years for the job to be done. And we feel that public capital should be employed to attain this end.

Quite recently, the Government acquired the Demerara Electric Company, which was private enterprise. It is now public enterprise; and I am glad to say that under public management that undertaking was able to carry out a complete review of wages and salaries at all levels, correcting anomalies where they existed. For instance, we found that cashiers taking \$½ million, nearly, in cash every month were paid as little as \$165 per month. We have been able, substantially, to increase emoluments like that; and I should like to say that these revisions were taken without pressure from the employees, and that the employees and management were able to take into account the needs of the undertaking, the needs of the public who are the owners, and the needs of the workers themselves. Notwithstanding this, we have been able in that undertaking to effect very considerable savings on management account, and having made all these disbursements of expenditure, we have spent less on management than was the case under private enterprise. The secret is very simple. Private enterprise has a way of creating expenses which defeat income tax.

4.45 p.m.

In an undertaking like that everything is bought through a parent organization abroad, so that the purchaser here is never brought face to face with the supplier — it goes through a third party who receives a commission on everything purchased. That adds up to tens of thousands of dollars at the end of

the year. Having moved in and stopped that, and having put ourselves face to face with the suppliers, we are able to cut all these expenses out and have money to recompense our employees adequately, fairly, and still save something on the management bill. So that efficiency in that undertaking — management efficiency — is at a higher level than existed before the Government took over.

We feel that it is possible to employ public capital to advantage in the creation of industry in fields which are not sufficiently attractive for private enterprise, or where private enterprise is reluctant to go. We feel also that it should be possible for private enterprise and Government, jointly, to capitalize undertakings and to fill our industrial voids; but against all these we must bear in mind the fact that we have a small population. We are less than 600,000, and to set up manufacturing industries or heavy industries just to satisfy the needs of a small number of people is a hazardous undertaking.

We feel that it is first necessary for us to set out to secure markets for things like wood pulp, cellulose, plywood and manufactures of forest products, aluminium products, etc., and then, perhaps, tie up the question of the markets with the supply of the industrial equipment so that we will have an interest on both sides in the maintenance of the undertaking. That is one of the lines that we hope to pursue, and I am sure we will succeed.

You will readily understand that our ability to support the costs of Independence will depend upon the extent to which we are able to expand our economy and create wealth right here in British Guiana. We are fully aware of this, and our efforts are being directed in this field. I, for instance, am fully conscious of the fact that if anything happened tomorrow outside our country which prevented oil from reaching here, everything would have to shut down in,

perhaps, a week. I am resolved, and in this resolve I am supported wholeheartedly by my colleagues, to end our dependence on outside sources for a base to power our industry and our life. We shall pursue two fields: hydro-electricity and oil. I am advised that there is oil in British Guiana. Our problem is to find people to find that oil for us. In the past, I am afraid, the people who have searched for oil in British Guiana were people who did not want to find it. We will employ people who want to find the oil. May I say, in all chivalry, to my Senator friend that she may take that as being one of the positive advantages of even so limited a state as internal self-government.

Mr. President, I think that I have said enough, not to read a lesson, but to leave a few pointers along the road to progress. I would just like to admonish those of us who are here and others everywhere in this land that the effort, which Senator Tasker correctly saw as being necessary to take us forward, will have to be forthcoming. I have no doubt that it will willingly be rendered, because I can see already that our new status has provided an irresistible stimulus to our people to think and act maturely. It is my regret that the leaders of our people, in some instances, are not as far forward as our people themselves, but time and history write eloquent epitaphs to leaders who fail to lead. I have no doubt that in British Guiana the rich volume of eloquent epitaphs to failing leaders will be further enriched by those now being earned by leaders who read but cannot learn.

**The President:** Honourable Senators, the Question is, "That this House requests Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies to fix a date during 1962 when this Country shall become fully independent within the Commonwealth of Nations." I shall put the Motion to the Senate, those who are in favour say "Aye"; those who are against say "No".

*The Senate divided: Ayes 9, 14th November, 1961, when the Second Reading of the two Bills, which were read for the First time at the last meeting, will be moved*

*Noes 1. as follows:*

<i>Ayes</i>	<i>Noes</i>
Senator Too-Chung	Senator Jardim—1.
Senator Tasker	
Senator Thomas	
Senator Ramjattan	
Senator Persaud	
Senator Khan	
Senator Christian	
Senator Nunes	
Senator Hubbard—9.	

**The President:** I declare the Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT AND PENDING BUSINESS

**Senator Hubbard:** Mr. President, I now move that the Senate be adjourned to three o'clock on Tuesday,

#### HOURS OF SITTING FOR NEXT MEETING

**The President:** The Senate is adjourned to the 14th November, 1961, at 3 p.m. The hours of sitting on that occasion will be 3 p.m. to 5.30 p.m. and, if necessary, we shall reassemble at 7.30 p.m. and continue until 10 p.m. Hon. Members, the Senate will now stand adjourned.

*Senate adjourned accordingly at 4.58 p.m.*