

OFFICE OF THE PREMIER

TRINIDAD & TOBAGO, W.I.
PUBLIC RELATIONS DIVISION

PRESS RELEASE

Whitehall,
Maraval Road,
Port-of-Spain.
Telephone : 23141



Radio T. ✓
Radio G. ✓
Guardian 10/4
Evening News
Return 13/4
London Office
(distribution list)
Receipts

No. 103

9th April, 1962.

Attached is the text of a broadcast by the Premier on
Sunday, April 8, 1962, on the Draft Independence Constitution.

REPORT BY THE PREMIER ON THE DRAFT INDEPENDENCE

CONSTITUTION

Radio Broadcast, Sunday, April 8, 1962

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am very happy indeed to have this opportunity of reporting to you tonight on the Draft Constitution for an Independent Trinidad and Tobago which was published for public comment on February 20, 1962.

I would like first to deal with three criticisms of a general nature which have been levelled at the decision of the Government to publish the Draft Constitution for public comment.

The first criticism is that the Government had no mandate to decide to proceed to Independence rather than to continue in some form of Federation with some of the Territories included in the Federation that will shortly be dissolved. In this connection it has been argued that the continuation of the Federation was not an issue in the General Elections last December and that it was the Party to which I belong which refused to make it an issue. The argument continues that I had repeatedly pledged to consult the population after the Elections on the question of our attitude to the Federation.

It is, of course, a great pity that this concern over consultation of the population on the question of Federation now being displayed when the Federation is dead was so conspicuously absent when it was being conceived. But that is by the way. As I have more than once advised the citizens of the country, I had made it clear at the Lancaster House Conference, on behalf of the Trinidad and Tobago Delegation, that I would not accept the constitution discussed at that conference, and in fact that, at the appropriate time, I would recommend to the People of Trinidad and Tobago that they reject it - or they reject me. Our political opponents, on the other hand, openly proclaimed support for the Federation and tried to make it an election issue. I ignored both it and them.

The decision to federate was a decision by ten Territories and in respect of ten Territories. There had never been at any time any decision on or commitment to a Federation of nine Territories. The Jamaica referendum thus changed the whole situation. It killed the Federation of 10 Territories.

/There emerged

There emerged, however, a school of thought which argued that the United Kingdom Parliament could pass an Act to amend the Order in Council creating the Federation in order to allow Jamaica to secede while enabling the rest of the Federation to continue. Not only did I reject this as the purest nonsense. I also indicated that I would consult the population of Trinidad and Tobago in due course, after the elections, emphasising that such consultation would certainly not be by way of referendum. In other words if the Jamaican people were allowed, rightly or wrongly, to decide if they wanted to stay in the Federation or to secede, no power on earth except the people of Trinidad and Tobago would decide whether the people of Trinidad and Tobago would stay in the rump Federation.

The United Kingdom Government, no doubt so advised by its legal people, ultimately ruled that with the secession of Jamaica, the Federal compact, on which the people of Trinidad and Tobago were never consulted, was dissolved. There was therefore no Federation to which the people of Trinidad and Tobago could be asked to adhere, or about which they could be consulted. That was certainly no fault of mine. Whoever killed Cock Robin, I certainly did not. It was possible to start discussing a new Federation, but that was a horse of a different colour.

The decision to dissolve the Federation left each Territory in the relationship with the United Kingdom which prevailed before the establishment of the Federation in 1958. We obviously could not be expected to stand still. We of the governing party in Trinidad and Tobago have always made our stand crystal clear on independence. Either independence as a constituent unit of a Federation, or failing that independence as a single state. We have never swerved from that stand. We actually set a date. We had brought the Territory to full internal self government as a stage on the road to independence. We decided therefore, quite consistently and quite properly, that whatever happened independence would not be delayed any longer, independence was Priority No.1.

But we have been very careful to avoid insularity or isolationism. We are not going it alone. We have not rejected association with our Caribbean neighbours. We decided that any neighbouring territory could apply to join the independent unitary state of Trinidad and Tobago - and Grenada has already come to us to ascertain the precise terms of such association. We

decided further that we would work with any of our Caribbean neighbours to set up a Caribbean Common Market - and Surinam has already come to us and we are now exploring the possibilities of early action in this field.

The first criticism of our Draft Constitution, therefore - that, contrary to our pledges, we had sought no mandate from the people to sever our connection with the Federation - is baseless and without foundation in fact.

The second criticism of our Draft Constitution is that it should have been a bipartisan draft. In other words, we should not have drafted it ourselves and published it for general comment. We should have called in others to help us - some say the Opposition in Parliament, others a National Committee. Merely to state the criticism is to emphasise its absurdity. A Government's duty in such a matter is to elicit comments and observations. The way to do that is to give people something to comment or make observations about; previous experience in Trinidad has emphasised this, as I shall in due course indicate. It is sheer nonsense to criticise the Government for a procedure which is only commonsense, which is sound in principle, and which, as I shall indicate, has proved strikingly successful in practice.

The third criticism of our Draft Constitution is that, by fixing a deadline of March 31st for the submission of comments and representations, we did not allow sufficient time for study, discussion and comment. Here a comparison with similar constitutional exercises is obviously necessary.

On February 18, 1947 a Constitution Committee was appointed under Sir Lennox O'Reilly. An advertisement was issued on March 7 requesting citizens to submit memoranda. The deadline was fixed at March 31. The citizens were given 25 days to submit their views. Nobody seemed to have complained that the time was too short.

On January 17, 1955, another Constitution Committee was appointed under the Deputy Speaker, Mr. A. S. Sinanan. An advertisement requesting memoranda was issued on February 27. The deadline was fixed at March 31. The citizens were given 33 days to submit their views. Nobody seemed to have complained that the time was too short.

On November 21, 1958 a resolution was passed in the Legislative Council for the appointment of a Select Committee on Constitution Reform under the Speaker, Mr. E. M. Duke. The advertisement requesting memoranda was issued

on January 24, 1959. The deadline was fixed at February 25. The citizens were given 33 days to submit their views. Complaints were made that the period was too short. A new advertisement extending the period to March 31 was therefore issued on March 4. The citizens thus had a total of 67 days to submit their views.

What were the results of these efforts to enlist the cooperation of the citizens? Please note that the citizens had no draft on which to comment. They were merely asked to submit views, in vacuo, in the abstract.

In the 25 days allotted in 1947, the O'Reilly Committee received 18 memoranda. In the 33 days allotted in 1955 the Sinanan Committee received 23 memoranda, but the Committee considered that only seven of these were of any substantial use. In the total of 67 days allotted ^{in 1959} after an extension of 35 days, the Duke Committee received 10 memoranda.

In our case, we allowed 40 days for the submission of views. But the citizens were asked to comment on a detailed Draft Constitution. We printed 10,000 copies and fixed the price at 10 cents. We found it necessary to print a further 8,000 copies - 18,000 in all. We wrote to 268 organisations, sending 2 free copies of the Draft Constitution to each, inviting them to submit their views. The result is we received 84 memoranda from organisations and 52 memoranda from individuals in all walks of life, with 723 signatures. We received, in other words, almost eight times the number of comments the O'Reilly Committee received, six times the number submitted to the Sinanan Committee, and almost fourteen times the number submitted to the Duke Committee.

That is the comparative score, Ladies and Gentlemen. In 1947 - , 18 memoranda in 25 days. In 1955 - 23 memoranda in 33 days. In 1959 - 10 memoranda in 67 days. In 1962 - 136 memoranda in 40 days.

Our Draft Constitution covered the country. We put it in all Wardens Offices, in all book stores. Here are some incomplete and preliminary figures of circulation which will no doubt interest you.

Tobago	- 1000 copies
San Fernando	1539
Arima	500
Tunapuna	350
Blanchisseuse	200
Sangre Grande	400
Toco	225

Siparia	- 300 copies
Erin	200
Cedros	200
Point Fortin	200
Couva	200
Chaguanas	200
Port of Spain Wardens' Office and City Council	400
Fogarty's	1450
Muir Marshall	1300
Jeffers Book store	600
SPCK Book store	150
Sealy's Book Store	50
Cheong's Book store	200
Rhyner's Book store	75
Subscribers to the Royal Gazette	1300
Public Relations Office, Office of the Premier	1000

The Draft Constitution, Ladies and Gentlemen, was a best seller.

No book or document has ever sold in Trinidad and Tobago as the Draft Constitution has sold. Here are the details:

Fogarty's - every single one of the 1,450 copies sold

Muir Marshall - every single one of the 1,300 copies sold

Tunapuna - every single one of the 350 copies sold

Point Fortin - every single one of the 200 copies sold

Couva - every single one of the 200 copies sold

Chaguanas - every single one of the 200 copies sold

Jeffers Book store - every single one of the 600 copies sold

Sealy's Book store - every single one of the 50 copies sold

Cheong's Book store - every single one of the 200 copies sold

Warden's Office, Port of Spain - every single one of the 200 copies sold.

In addition to these large sales in Port of Spain, Ladies and Gentlemen, no fewer than 5,180 copies were sold over the counter of the Government Printing Office.

In other areas in the country, sales were remarkably good, even though all the copies were not sold out. The facts are:

In Arima, only 17 copies remain unsold out of 500

In San Fernando, only 120 copies remain unsold out of 1530

In Erin, only 10 copies remain unsold out of 200.
In Cedros, only 15 copies remain unsold out of 200
In Siparis, only 2 copies remain unsold out of 300
At SPCK Book store, only 33 copies remain unsold out of 150
At Rhyner's Book Store, only 9 copies remain unsold out of 75.
The the Town Hall, Port of Spain, 118 copies remain unsold out of 200
In fact, Ladies and Gentlemen, in only **four** areas in the country
was the supply of the Draft Constitution obviously far in excess of the
demand.

These four areas are:

Tobago - 1,000 copies supplied, 300 sold
Blanchisseuse - 200 copies supplied, 17 sold
Toco - 225 copies supplied, 46 sold
Sangre Grande - 400 copies supplied, 125 sold.

Is it surprising, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the reports which have
reached us from all over the Territory indicate uniformly that no Constitution
in the history of the Territory has ever been discussed as this Draft
Constitution has been discussed everywhere? The hallmark of an educated
society is the desire of its people to be educated. One of the principal
indices of culture in the modern world is the number of libraries and book
stores, the number of books sold and read. The people's response to the
Draft Constitution underlines the pledge given in the speech from the Throne
of His Excellency the Governor last December to work for the development of
an educated democracy.

Who responded to the Cabinet's invitation to submit memoranda? I
am sure you will find this breakdown of the memoranda instructive:

1. Churches and Religious Organisations - His Grace the Archbishop of Port of Spain
His Lordship the Bishop of Trinidad
Sanatan Dharma Maha-Sabha
Tackveeyatul Islamic Association
Federal Council of Evengelical Churches
Council of the Knights of St. John of the
Archdiocese of Port of Spain
Central Council of the Holy Name Society
Anjuman-Sunnat-Ul-Jamat Association
Chapter of the Holy Ghost Order
Synod of the Presbyterian Church

- 2. Economic Organisations
 - Chamber of Commerce
 - Junior Chamber of Commerce
 - South Chamber of Commerce
 - Agricultural Society
 - Manufacturers Association
 - Businessmen's Association
 - Employers' Consultative Association
 - Petroleum Association and Sir Patrick Hobson
 - Fishing Industry Association
 - Fire Insurance Association
 - Sugar Manufacturers Association
 - Trinidad Commodities Association
- 3. Trade Unions
 - National Trades Union Congress
 - Seamen and Waterfront Workers' Union
 - Civil Service Association
 - Teachers' Union
 - National Union of Government Employees
 - National Workers Trade Union
 - Airline Supervisors Union
 - Electricity Supply Staff Union
- 4. Civic and Cultural Organisations
 - League of Women Voters
 - Coterie of Social Workers
 - Friendly Society Movement
 - Credit Union League
 - Trinidad Football Association
 - Trinidad Cricket Council
 - Port of Spain Soroptimists Club
 - St. Mary's College Union
 - Girl Guides Association
 - Success Village Working Council, Laventille
 - Unique Literary and Sporting Club, Sangre Chiquito
- 5. Professional Groups and Organisations
 - Incorporated Law Society
 - Association of Certified and Corporate Accountants

5. Professional Groups and Organisations
 - Retired Teachers Association
 - Group of Professional Engineers
 - St. Mary's College Principal and Staff
 - Trinidad Group of Incorporated Secretaries
 - Secondary School Teachers Association
 - Association of Principals of Assisted Secondary Schools
 - Bar Council
 - Association of Professional Engineers
 - Nursing Council
 - Federal Association of Draughtsmen, Builders and Associates
6. Public Service
 - Director of Audit
 - Judiciary
 - Committee of Permanent Secretaries
 - Fire Services Association
 - Chief Technical Officers
7. Communal Organisations
 - Indian Association
 - Indian National Congress
 - Hindu Youth Association
 - Partition League, Couva
8. Local Government Bodies
 - Port of Spain City Council
 - Association of County Councils
 - Association of Village Councils
9. Political Parties
 - People's National Movement
 - Democratic Labour Party
 - African National Congress

In addition to these numerous and varied organisations, many memoranda were submitted by individuals or groups of individuals. One memorandum came from London, another from Switzerland. One memorandum from one of the economic organisations is 29 typewritten pages in length. The 136 memoranda represent 432 pages of comment.

I believe, therefore, Ladies and Gentlemen, that you will all agree with me that the time allowed for submitting comments was not too short, and that the diligence displayed by thousands of citizens in this exercise, whether their

views are good or bad, right or wrong, reflects the greatest credit on our community. I say this notwithstanding the reports that have reached us of individuals running around the place soliciting signatures to criticisms of the Draft Constitution even when, as the collectors admitted in reply to queries, they had not read the Constitution.

I believe that you will also agree with me, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the only criticism that can be levelled against the Government in this exercise is that it has made a Draft Independence Constitution available to more citizens than has been the case in any other country, and that, as a result, many thousands of persons who, in other countries, have not been afforded the opportunity of expressing their views on the constitution of their independent country, have been so afforded this opportunity in Trinidad and Tobago as a result of the deliberate policy of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago.

We now have to decide what to do with these memoranda. It is obviously necessary to collate the comments on the various sections of the Constitution, and this has now been completed in the Office of the Premier. You can well imagine what a large exercise it is to collate 136 different sets of comments involving 438 pages. And in this connection we would obviously want to send the collation and copies of all the memoranda to all the organisations and individuals who responded to the Cabinet's invitation. This will be done during the course of this week.

The question now arises as to what happens when every commentator receives all the comments and the collation of all the comments. Members of the Cabinet had from the very beginning considered this question. The idea that found favour with us was that we should get together the various commentators in a special meeting. We have now seen the nature and the quality of the response. Our intention therefore is to call a special meeting of representatives of the organisations together with the individuals who submitted comments, and before that meeting to send out the collation of the comments, copies of all the documents received, and any further comments that may still be submitted.

One very special reason for this procedure, apart from the courtesy to the commentators and the significance of such a meeting in the context of community comment on a national issue, is the fact that it would allow the commentators to consider whether there is anything they wish to add to their

comments, or to subtract from their comments, in the light of -

- a. the obvious divergence of views shown by the comments, and
- b. any explanations that might be given in respect of certain apprehensions expressed.

Let me explain this in a little detail. I wish to make it quite clear however that it is not my intention to express now agreement or disagreement with any particular comment. I have many opportunities and forums where I can do that. I am concerned merely with explaining to the people of Trinidad and Tobago the situation that arises when the commentators disagree. Take one example. Commentator X criticises the Draft Constitution on the ground that it does not provide for the automatic acquisition of citizenship by people not born in Trinidad and Tobago but resident here for several years. Commentator Y, in his turn, criticises the Draft Constitution on the ground that it threatens to impose on people not born in Trinidad and Tobago but resident here for several years a citizenship of Trinidad and Tobago which they may not desire to acquire. In other words, both commentators criticise the Draft Constitution. But both can't be right. Here is an obvious case where a meeting of minds, after X has seen the comments of Y and Y has seen the comments of X, may be of particular value. And it is in such a meeting that it will be possible for the Government to understand the nature of the amendment, if any, that may be necessary.

From the standpoint of providing an opportunity for explanations that may not have been within the knowledge of the commentator, a meeting of the sort that we are proposing also has special value. Let us consider for example the criticism of the Draft Constitution, which has come from several sources, that it places too much power in the hands of the Prime Minister, tending to set up a dictatorship under the guise of democracy.

Let us forget for the moment that this is not how dictatorship emerges. It would be possible in such a meeting as I am proposing to indicate that the particular powers included in the Draft Constitution are precisely the powers that are found in the Constitutions of such recently independent countries as Nigeria and Sierra Leone, to give only two examples.

Let me give one concrete illustration of the specific value of such a meeting. One of the economic organisations expresses its alarm over the

implications of the power recommended for the Prime Minister of appointment and dismissal over what the organisation describes as such plinths of a democratic society as

1. The Chief Justice
2. The Director of Audit
3. The Public Service Commission
4. The Police Service Commission
5. The Judicial and Legal Service Commission
6. The Boundaries Commission.

How would the meeting I propose view this alarm? Take, first, the Chief Justice and the Judicial and Legal Service Commission. It can be explained to the meeting that the provisions in the Draft Constitution correspond precisely with those of the Independence Constitutions of Nigeria and Sierra Leone. But the meeting will also see, from the memorandum submitted by the Judiciary, that where the Judiciary makes out a quite reasonable case about tenure, suspension and retirement, Her Majesty's Judges, whom the economic organisation is so anxious to protect from political interference, are absolutely silent on the question of appointment and on the question of removal limit themselves to a proposal that the advice of the Chief Justice as well as of the Prime Minister should be sought where a Judge other than the Chief Justice is involved.

Take now the question of the Public Service Commission and the Police Service Commission. The Draft Constitution proposes exactly what prevails in Nigeria and Sierra Leone. And lo and behold, the Civil Service Association, the watchdog of the interests of civil servants, says not a word in protest against the method of appointment, but in a reasonable memorandum submitted to the Cabinet, argues powerfully about the composition of the Commission. The economic organisation wishes to protect the Public Service from political interference. The Civil Service Association, on the other hand, while legitimately opposed to favouritism and nepotism, calls for even more protection from the civil servants themselves and oppose the appointment to the Commission of any one who has held public office until after the expiration of three years from the date on which he last held public office. Neither the

Permanent Secretaries nor the Chief Technical Officers say anything to support the criticism of the Draft Constitution made by this economic organisation. The Police Association submitted no memorandum; presumably it does not support the view of the economic organisation.

The economic organisation seeks to protect also the Director of Audit from the Prime Minister. The Director of Audit, however, raises legitimately, the question of title and his responsibility under the Draft Constitution as compared with his present responsibility under the Exchequer and Audit Ordinance. The provision in the Draft Constitution exactly reproduces the provision in the Sierra Leone constitution of 1961.

The economic organisation seeks to protect the community from the powers proposed for the Prime Minister in respect of the Boundaries Commission. The provisions in the Draft Constitution, however, are precisely the provisions relating to the Electoral Commission in Nigeria and Sierra Leone.

I believe, Ladies and Gentlemen, that you are now in a better position, from this single example of one precise criticism by one organisation, to appreciate the value as well as the importance of the meeting of commentators such as I have outlined it.

On the basis of these fears, substantial or insubstantial, of entrusting to the Prime Minister the powers proposed in the Draft Constitution, various suggestions have been made either to transfer some of these powers to the Governor General or to have them exercised after consultation with the Leader of the Opposition. One proposal goes so far as to suggest the appointment of the Members of the Judicial and Legal Service Commission by a panel, two of whom are to be elected from a number of economic and professional organisations, with one member to be nominated each by the Archbishop of Port of Spain and the Bishop of Trinidad.

The sort of meeting that I am now discussing would be an appropriate place to consider the point that nobody seems to understand - and that is, that the essence of an Independence Constitution in the Commonwealth is not only that the Governor General as the Head of State has no powers at all, but that the Governor General is himself appointed by the Queen on the advice of the Prime Minister. To suggest therefore a discretionary power in the hands of the Head of State as a means of removing it from the hands of the head of Government is

an obvious invitation to disorder, apart from a constitutional impropriety, in the community.

Explanations on other vital issues raised by the commentators would help to clarify some of the apprehensions that have been stated. For example certain suggestions that have been made tend in the direction of repealing existing laws which have been on the Statute books for years without any protest. One obvious example is the law imposing restrictions on subversive missionaries, that is to say not on missionaries carrying out educational undertakings, but on people propagating subversive doctrines under the cloak of religion.

Some commentators have proposed amendment of the Constitution in respect of its entrenched provision by way of referendum. Possibly they had made this proposal before the Secretary of State for the Colonies in a recent debate in the House of Commons explained on March 26 that the referendum was not in accordance with traditional British procedure. But a meeting of all the commentators will provide an opportunity for explaining the use of the referendum in other countries in the Commonwealth in particular. Where the referendum has really been applied in constitutional matters it has been in a federal context. When used in a unitary state or in a unit of a Federation it has been rather restricted to such precise questions as the control on sales of liquor or the hours of opening of shops selling liquor or military conscription - certainly not for constitutional amendments which are likely rather to be taken up at general elections; certainly not, as one commentator proposes, for selecting the Governor General from a panel proposed by the Sovereign.

And it is emphatically in such a meeting that one great practical difficulty can be considered. It deals with appointments to the Senate. Some commentators have proposed the Jamaica pattern, with only two types of senators, the majority appointed on the advice of the Prime Minister and a minority appointed on the advice of the Leader of the Opposition. The question now arises whether the community is to embarrass or insult the third category of persons at present included in the Trinidad and Tobago Self-government Constitution, persons representing the economic and religious interests. The Government refused to associate itself with any suggestion that, within two months of the appointment of these citizens by His Excellency the Governor after the issue had been debated for five years in the community, the system should be changed before

anybody had had any opportunity to assess the value of what constituted an innovation on our part in such a question. If the community wishes to change it, that is another matter.

If now the present arrangements are to continue, then the question immediately arises as to whether the Governor General can properly have a discretion in this matter. Remember that the Governor General has the most limited discretion in an Independence Constitution - for the obvious reason that he acts in every issue on the advice of the Cabinet and is appointed by the Queen on the advice of the Prime Minister of the independent country.

In this connection we would have to consider the variation proposed in certain memoranda that the present allocation of senatorial seats between Opposition and economic and religious interests should be modified to give more to the Opposition and fewer to the religious and economic interests, as well as another proposition that the Governor General in making his appointments of people representing religious and economic interests must be required to consult not only the Prime Minister but also the religious and economic interests involved.

One other general point I would like to refer to tonight. It concerns the Chapter in the Draft Constitution entitled - Protection of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms of the Individual. The Government has always been aware of the difficulty of so expressing these rights as to satisfy everybody, and in previous constitutional discussions has taken the stand that the individual rights should not be written into the Constitution but that they should be incorporated in a Preamble to the Constitution. The memoranda that we have received on the Draft Constitution confirm the Government's assessment of this question. Apart from the fact to which I have already adverted, that many of the sections to which objection has been taken are themselves enshrined in laws on the Statute books for several years, the present difficulty is that everybody wants his personal prejudices or beliefs written into the chapter, whilst some seeing the difficulty when the rights are expressed precisely and in writing have proposed that we should fall back on the Canadian precedent and merely state the rights in general terms. The Canadian precedent however deals with human rights and fundamental freedoms. Our Draft deals with individual freedoms, which explains the omission of the freedom of the press. In other

words our Draft tends to follow what appears to be the more modern tendency to write into the Constitution the protection of individual rights and freedoms, and the whole chapter has derived its inspiration from the recent constitutions of countries like Malaya, Nigeria and Sierra Leone.

A meeting of organisations and individuals such as I am now discussing would also be able to consider the proposals that have been made regarding proportional representation and in fact racial representation, that is to say, a revival of the old idea of the communal vote which was proposed in Trinidad as far back as 1920. There are those who would like the Trinidad and Tobago Independence Constitution to be patterned on that of Cyprus, which means that the constitution will emphasise and in fact establish sharp lines of division between the various racial groups. All that I can say tonight is that I would far prefer to have the Government of Trinidad and Tobago accused of not dividing up the community into racial groups rather than have it accused of constitutional provisions which would establish a Negro President and an Indian Vice President of a Republic with a fixed proportion of seats or places to the various racial groups in the Cabinet, in Parliament, in the Judiciary, in the Police Service and in the Civil Service. As far as I am concerned, that way madness lies.

There are several other important issues raised in these memoranda. One gentleman would like us to change the name Trinidad and Tobago. One organisation would like us to transfer the capital from Port of Spain to Caroni. Some want us to be a Republic, to abolish the post of Governor General, and to substitute a President. Just why, at this stage, we should be asked to abandon the British tradition and substitute the American, or the American modified as in India, is not clear. I hope nobody believes that that will save money or time. Several memoranda would like to have a Preamble inserted in the Constitution. One reminds us of the need for protection against a mad Legislator or a mad Senator.

Several ask for the extension of human rights or individual rights from the political sphere to the economic sphere - the right to work, the right to social security, equal pay for men and women doing equal work and so on. And many of the memoranda ask for the inclusion of some reference to God in the Constitution. I hope every one listening will understand that the omission of