

T H E
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
 OFFICIAL REPORT

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SECOND SESSION (1959—60)
 OF THE FIRST LEGISLATURE OF THE WEST INDIES,
 CONSTITUTED UNDER THE WEST INDIES
 (FEDERATION) ORDER IN COUNCIL, 1957.

8th Sitting

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

**HOUSE OF
 REPRESENTATIVES**

The House met at 2.30 p.m.

Prayers

[*Mrs. SPEAKER in the Chair*]

EMERGENCY POWERS BILL

To "make special provision for periods of emergency", presented by the Prime Minister and read a First time.

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960
 (Second Reading)

Order read for resumption of adjourned Debate [30th November, 1959] on Question [19th November, 1959] "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

Question again proposed.

The Prime Minister: I am afraid that I have to apologise not merely to the Opposition but to my friends and enemies who have chosen, in a way which has not really surprised me, to take the opportunity during my absence on a bed of sickness, thousands of miles away, to

condemn me on an accusation that I didn't even know about.

I had always thought that in every Territory brought up in British traditions the greatest felon was told beforehand what the charges against him were, and evidence was taken against him and then he was given an opportunity to defend himself. But apparently the way things are going on in West Indian politics today, we have got to the stage where if any person, and for whatever reason, wishes to attack a politician, he has only to make an accusation against that politician and that politician's erstwhile close friends will stab him in the back.

Dr. Radix: That is exactly what they did to you.

The Prime Minister: I want to hear all the remarks possible. When I have finished some people will put their heads in the sand and try to bury themselves. —[*Interruption*] — I did not hear what the hon. Member said.

Mr. Cargill: Nobody on this side of the House has said anything.

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, when I was in Australia I got a letter from Jamaica, one from Barbados and a cable from Trinidad and none of these three communications told me exactly what was happening. The Jamaica letter merely said that if I could possibly pass through Jamaica, I should do so and I would hear all the facts—that is all. The Barbados letter said: "There is a conspiracy afoot. You will need all your ingenuity to answer it". The cable, a long one, and more or less an official cable, said: "You are reported to have made some statements in North America which have been used against you in Jamaica and in other West Indian organs of the Press, and it will be a very good thing if you can get back quickly in order to answer it". The hon. Member for Surrey is laughing now; before I finish he won't laugh.

Mr. Hill: Won't you allow me to laugh?

The Prime Minister: Nobody is stopping the hon. Member from laughing now nor is anybody going to stop him from crying in another hour and a half. This is a democracy.

The point I am trying to make is that democratic processes did not take place last month. I don't know what has happened to the hon. Member. It may be that a very undemocratic thing took place in the hon. Member's country. I wouldn't be surprised.

If during my remarks I should say anything to cause laughter, I would ask hon. Members to remember that I couldn't be

more serious than I am today. Never in thirty years of public life have I felt more bitter and more conscious of the necessity of my speaking bluntly and plainly than I feel this afternoon.

I repeat, as my major premise, that in a British country the vilest man is told what he has done wrong. He is given a copy of the accusation the police have against him, he is given a chance of reading it, a chance of getting a lawyer to defend him, and if he doesn't like a lawyer he is given a chance to defend himself.

Dr. Duhaney: Except in Income Tax law.

The Prime Minister: Let Members take it that way. They won't take it that way by the time I sit down.

Only after a man is told what the charge against him is—I say bluntly and frankly that when I read this cable which is a long one—a whole foolscap sheet, dealing with several matters in The West Indies—I came to the conclusion that I might have been thought to have said too much about Chaguanas. That I did deliberately. I appealed to my audience in strong terms. In spite of what Mr. Domingo has written there were hundreds of people in a large room; invitations were sent out; a number of people came to show their interest in Federation. Most of them were West Indians, but a number of Americans were also there and I rubbed it in as much as I could.

I am not going to get up and listen to just what was said; I am not going to stand up in Woodford Square and say what the Premier of Trinidad says about

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

Chagaramas. But I entirely agree with him that the Americans should come out of Chagaramas. I rubbed it in because in that audience I saw people with whom I had discussed the matter last year. I knew what their attitude was. Their attitude was, bluntly, "Why do I want the Americans to come out of Chagaramas when they are going to have to pay more Income Tax if a base is built somewhere else"? So I rubbed it in and when I heard from The West Indies I thought I was being accused of having overdone the Chagaramas issue. Imagine my surprise — when I learnt the truth. I didn't even hear it in London; in London the West Indians who spoke to me knew very little but when I got to New York I heard that I was supposed to have attacked Jamaicans and to have said they were illiterates; I was supposed to have said that Trinidadians prefer to sing calypsoes than do this or that.

Let me say that this is something I constantly say about Trinidadians and calypso. I have said it in different parts of this world. Not even when I say it in Trinidad has any attack been made on me. And there wasn't a soul, not even Trinidadians in New York, who didn't roll with laughter when I said it, by way of a joke, to enliven the dull moments. Even when the hon. Member, the super after-dinner speaker, the Member for St. Mary, speaks there are dull moments. I have heard hundreds of speeches in my life, but I have never heard better after-dinner speeches than those of the hon. Member for St. Mary when he is speaking on supposedly serious subjects. But

not even the Member for St. Mary can make a speech without a dull patch.

I repeatedly talk about Trinidad calypso to students of Universities, in London, here in Trinidad, in New York and all about. Everybody takes it for a joke. Looking at the hon. Member from Middlesex, I think that if he were on this side he would remind me of one expression which I should use: Who are my accusers? I am going to try to stick as much as possible to what was said by the hon. Member for Portland — that's a long way behind God's back. I presume. My trouble is that all my life I have not been able to help seeing the funny side of things, and when I see the funny side of things I forget that God has made us all but that He should never have made some people who have no sense of humour.

Mr. Joseph: Don't criticise God.

The Prime Minister: A man who hasn't got a sense of humour should not live. Mr. Speaker, where are my accusers, as the Member for Middlesex would say?

I went to Paris in 1948 as an alternative delegate to the United Nations. I made a speech that has been so often misquoted that I have ceased to worry about what my critics say. All I said was that we did not want Russia or Czechoslovakia or anybody else to speak for us. I used the phrase, "Too many cooks spoil the broth". And I said that we in The West Indies were going to fight the Colonial Office alone. That statement has been said by my opponents to be a defence of the Colonial system. Foremost among those opponents were Mr. Reginald

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

Pierrepont and Mr. Richard Moore, both of whom are avowed Communists. They have, on occasions, told me they were being shadowed by F.B.I. agents because of their Communist activities. And anything I say that looks like an attack on Russia is sufficient for them to want to cut my throat. Every now and then Mr. Reginald Pierrepont sends a bulletin to all the West Indian Press. He said, among other things, that I had appeared for a white man who shot a black man, and imagine my being made Prime Minister of Barbados! He said I have always defended this, that and the other.

He is the man who started this. I have not told you the position about Mr. Domingo. I have met him. I have been to his place in New York. I have copies of his pamphlets. I suppose most of us have. He is violently anti-Federation. Therefore, anything I should say, especially affecting Jamaica, he would hit at.

I must tell this House that even today I have to try to work up sufficient energy to read the newspapers. I have all the copies of the *Gleaner* and the *Trinidad Guardian* at home. Frankly, I have not been able to work up sufficient enthusiasm to read letters from Mr. Domingo or the articles which appeared in the *Gleaner* of October 23rd.

In New York he was sitting at one time just a few yards from me. I saw him, and I knew him. And I will repeat the point I was making very seriously, that is, that some people apparently very close to me in New York are violently against our attitude to Chaguaramas.

Here is the point I was making: I used this phrase: "You here sitting before me who are West Indians should join in the fight to enable us to get Chaguaramas. It is true the Capital did not come to Barbados, but having come to Trinidad, let's get Chaguaramas". That was the whole of my speech. But everywhere in my speeches, I made a joke. I said we Bajans have to work or we starve. The Trinidadians have not. They prefer to use a guitar or a quattro rather than a hoe.

But, Mr. Speaker, I added that the St. Lucian does not have to work either. Everything is paradise in St. Lucia. You lie down under a tree and fruit drops in your mouth.

Mr. Joseph: That is why Bousquet is so big. But what about Dominica?

The Prime Minister: I do not think the Member for Dominica knows whether she is junior or senior. She is probably both. But she had to explain my use of the term primitive. Dominica is primitive, and it should remain primitive. You don't want another Bermuda in The West Indies. You want to carry the tourists to a place like Dominica to see primitive places.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is the sort of speech I made in New York. And you have three Communists who would give a lot to make much of it.

There are two or three newspapers that always attack me in The West Indies. As soon as a man is in politics he must realise he is going to get a lot of blows and that things will be said about him which are not true, even from a newspaper that can-

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

not find money to defray costs and damages to be paid to a solicitor.

I have always been told that it is no good skinning a flea just to get its skin. I ask, what is the good of suing a newspaper that cannot pay £50 in damages?

I wish to say to this House, Mr. Speaker, that if there were the slightest truth in the foul and filthy libel spread about in Jamaica and elsewhere, it would be the duty of this House—I don't know what the law of Trinidad is—to call upon a Justice-of-the-Peace and a doctor, to have a Board of Lunacy over me. If anybody, let alone the Prime Minister, seriously says anything ill about any Unit, he should not just be fired as a Minister but incarcerated in a mental home.

Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

The Prime Minister: That "hear, hear!" sounds suspicious, as though the hon. Member means it.

I say again that nobody but those three people could possibly have misunderstood what I was saying; and Mr. Richard Moore was one of them. When I went into the room—I had come in a little late—the Chairman said something and everybody got up except Mr. Richard Moore; and of course that was just to show what he thought of me. From then on he attacked both the Chairman and myself.

Let me come specifically to Jamaica. I really cannot help putting my foot into it. The hon. Member for Portland tried his best to read the handwriting of the

hon. Member for Surrey. I used to be told that one cannot possibly read a doctor's handwriting—not only because a doctor wrote dog Latin, but because he generally wrote badly—but I did not think that the hon. Member for Surrey's handwriting was so bad.

Mr. Hill: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I wrote no speech or inspired the speech of any Member, and if the Prime Minister continues to make these false allegations in reference to me, I am going to invoke all my rights with all the vehemence at my command. I warn him in this House.

The Prime Minister: The Minister on my less immediate right, Sir, watched carefully what was going on and it was he who called my attention to what was going on. If the hon. Member had been suffering from fibrositis he would have had to be carried out, he turned back so often to prompt the Member for Portland.

Mr. Hill: How much more untruthful would the Prime Minister get? Because I am warning him, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to invoke my full rights in this House. It is a lie!

The Prime Minister: That is unparliamentary!

Mr. Speaker: You cannot say that the hon. Member has told a lie. You must therefore withdraw it. You may tell him so outside of this House but not in here.

Mr. Hill: I withdraw it, Sir, but he has told the grossest terminological inexactitude in his life.

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

Mr. Afflick: I do not expect anything better from the Prime Minister after his reprehensible behaviour last night.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, all I said was what I was at first told. I was not watching; but after I was told I turned to the Minister of Trade and Industry and drew his attention to what was going on. Sometimes it was sufficiently loud that we were able to hear the exact words being used. But, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to prevent the hon. Member for Surrey telling another Member to say something; but the fact remains that we were watching out for it.

Hon. Members (Government Benches): True, true, true!

The Prime Minister: I am not going to be long, Sir.

Mr. Hill: Speak the truth!

The Prime Minister: I come now to Jamaica. Sir, I was asked about uniformity in educational matters. I am sorry now that I did not bring along the written questions with me. I had them because, when the meeting came to a close, I had before me the written questions from Mr. Domingo and Mr. Richard Moore, and I put them in my pocket. I always make it a point never to destroy anything that may some day be useful. They asked me what about uniformity in educational matters and this was my answer: "Uniformity is, strictly speaking, impossible". You will agree with me that the religious views of Barbados and St. Kitts are very low — the people believe in low church practices; they hate even the thought of incense.

Hon. Member: Incense!

The Prime Minister: I am merely saying some things that are factual. I am not criticising Jamaica, Dominica or St. Lucia as being strictly Roman Catholic. They insist on a Roman Catholic education. I said this in addition: that Barbados might be only 24 by 12, but there are 600 miles of good roads. As a Barbadian, with all the modesty I can command — I can claim that the best roads, bar none in The West Indies — are to be found in Barbados. We have spent perhaps too much money on our roads — excellent roads! No child has too far to go to catch a bus and get to school.

Mr. W. B. Williams: No hills!

The Prime Minister: Jamaica is mountainous. Jamaicans have got to travel miles to get to school, therefore you find fewer children in schools than is the case in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I did wrong to call Miss Chapman's name, but I was asked about the percentage. I said that I had no figures: that I had not only been Premier of Barbados but Minister of Education also, and had the educational figures of most parts of the world; figures for Europe, and figures for The West Indies, and I knew that the percentage of illiteracy in Barbados was less than anywhere else in the Caribbean area, but I did not remember the exact figures. At the time the only thing I could remember was an article written by Miss Chapman which said fifty-one per cent. I did not only quote that figure but I gave my source for it. At the time I could not be accurate even as far as

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

Barbados is concerned. I know that it is only one per cent of the children of school age. I even went further and promised that when I returned to The West Indies I would get the correct figures and send them on to the Chairman who would pass them on to those gentlemen. That is all I said. I even made the excuse for Jamaica saying that the high mountains made it difficult for transportation and I could not expect that the children would be able to get to their schools without much hardship. But here it is — these three Communist gentlemen have never forgiven me for what I said in 1948. I did not remember the hon. Member, or else I would have quoted him as the fourth. Because there was a time when he was a Communist. He has apparently seen the errors of his way since he has been fired from the P.N.P.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member says that I am like him — an old parliamentarian, and that I sometimes make mistakes and sometimes forget; that when I speak in the House I cannot reply to attacks; but now that he is attacked by me I am asked to keep quiet. The hon. Member did not attack me personally, he attacked me through his mouth-piece who sits behind him.

Mr. Hill: That's not true.

The Prime Minister: I know it, and at least half a dozen people over here know it. I pity him greatly. A Marxist in the middle of a Faseist body. What else can you expect?

I think I have covered all the points — the two things that I am told I am guilty

of : saying that Trinidadians like calypsoes better than they like work — and I would like to ask the hon. Member for "Nowhere", "who wants to work if he can avoid working?"

Mr. Bryan: You wouldn't be asking that — I come from somewhere and I thought you would remember that last night I made myself very emphatic. None of these low gibes will ever get me, Sir. I can parry any.

The Prime Minister: It is so easy to get the hon. Member on his feet! After this House is finished with its business and you talk to him outside, he is like a lamb. He tries to make a point when he is talking here but after that he folds up. If he hadn't folded up he wouldn't be where he is now. He is expended.

Mr. Bryan: Expended enough to stretch you last night. If you want that sort of thing to go on in this House you know I have a lot of it.

Mr. Speaker: Is that a Point of Order?

Mr. Bryan: I am just behaving like the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker: I am surprised at that behaviour from you!

The Prime Minister: If the hon. Member had been behaving like the Prime Minister he would still be in a Party. But nobody is listening to him, except that when he talks you have to hear, as he speaks so loudly.

Hon. Members must remember that those on this side of the House have red

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

blood in their bodies and that when you sit over there and make rude, offensive remarks, because we are quiet, don't you believe that we are not going to hit back some time or other. You don't always hit back straight away but occasionally when you provoke us we are going to reply, and we are going to reply as long as the electors of The West Indies keep us here. And it will not be April 22nd anytime, but 1963 and after 1963 another five years !

Hon. Members (Government Benches):
Hear, hear !

The Prime Minister : Mind you, I have no doubt that in 1963 the hon. Leader of the Opposition will be leaving those benches to sit over here . . . —[*Interruption*].

The Prime Minister : I don't think there is any more I can say. I have endeavoured to be mild and quiet. I have endeavoured, but it is difficult to be mild and quiet when you know that three of your worst enemies have caused all this stupidity. There is a Mr. Ernest Wake-land — I hope he is not in any way connected with any Member of the Federal Parliament — who has written a lot of tripe. I saw so much of it that I couldn't read it. I saw some of it in the *Gleaner*. I have one here with me — "Unable to see benefit of Federation". This is the *Gleaner* of 7th November.

Mr. Hill : Read it.

The Prime Minister : Read all this tripe ? I am not referring to the remarks of the hon. Member before me. I can

say "tripe" of anybody as long as it is not a Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I would not have taken any notice whatever of this except to say this — and I regret very much to say it because it will act like an atom bomb. I came back to The West Indies and I heard certain things. I made enquiries only to get rumours confirmed as being something more than rumours. Let me say this : I have been in politics and public life for thirty years. I always boasted that nothing takes me by surprise. I cut out all illusions when I was much, much younger — twenty years ago. But I have heard one or two remarks and I have seen them in print. I have enquired and have been told that they are true. Some of you have a habit of firing Mr. Manley at me, but let me say quite bluntly that Mr. Manley is the Chairman of the West Indian Federal Labour Party, just as Professor Laski, without ever having a seat in the House of Commons, used to be Chairman of the British Labour Party. Nothing more. He does not pretend that he has any right to dictate to us and he doesn't dictate to us. I keep saying it. He isn't even a back-seat driver. He is on the pavement watching a car go by. All this talk about our having to listen to what he or the Premier of Trinidad says, is sheer undiluted nonsense, and it is the last resort of people who have no argument and who think they are going to be funny by throwing things like that at us.

A Party has got to get together and agree on general principles, no matter who is head or non-head. That is only

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

organisation. Having agreed on your principles, you have a Prime Minister, you have a Cabinet. They are entrusted with the duty of running the Government. If there is anything that you haven't promised the electorate in your manifesto at election time you get together and consider it and you say, "we must do so and so". If back-benchers do not exactly like what the Ministers are trying to do they should go to the Ministers and ask them what is the meaning of this Bill that is being presented. You can't run a democracy otherwise. You must have the support of your whole Party to what you are preaching. The whole Party of course means the majority because there may be one obstreperous person. It doesn't exist over here and sometimes I think there are two obstreperous persons over there — three, but one has not come in this afternoon — who want to dictate to the whole Party. That is impossible in any democracy. The minority might be right and the majority might be just idiots, but as long as they are in the majority they are entitled to come here and say "this is our policy". Let me pay the Opposition this tribute : there is a great deal of discipline on the other side, whether or not, to use the words of the hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, they are allowed to think otherwise. Just before he sat down he threw that at me — "If the Prime Minister will allow them to talk". Often the Prime Minister wished they wouldn't talk so much, far from trying to stop them. That is purely from the point of view of time. If we are going to be here until February, let all of us talk. To suggest

that Government back-benchers can't talk, is not even a good after-dinner remark.

Let me say now, as regards what I have just referred to, that I cannot conceive of Mr. Manley, with his intelligence, with his knowledge of parliamentary practice and procedure, attempting to tell us, "You have got to do this and you have got to do the other". I am being very careful of my language, Sir. If what is reported is true—and I have not seen any contradiction—I have to say "God preserve us from our friends". For if without the slightest intimation to me, he, has, as reported, said "so and so", it is in truth a conspiracy, and I repeat that I know that it is a conspiracy to fire me. The stupidity of it ! Mr. Tovares doesn't begin to know what is the meaning of a Ministerial system and the position of a Prime Minister.

Hon. Members (Opposition Benches) : Not on this side of the House.

The Prime Minister : You get up and say we must change leadership. Because the horse is not pulling the cart you don't destroy the cart and the horse. I would much prefer to be a horse with a broken leg and struggling with my cart and I would hate to feel I am a quadruped with long ears that listens to free speech rumour and makes no attempt to know if it is true. Let me take an instance—suppose I heard the rumour that the hon. Archdeacon Lennon was guilty of poisoning a member of his congregation, you think I would condemn him without first finding out the truth about it ? You tell me I would not take steps to see why

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

that was said? Just tell me that. I would not condemn a man without knowing the facts or giving him a chance to reply to the rumour. I would not do that to a single Member over there.

Mr. Cargill: Except me.

The Prime Minister: I would not have the energy to confound either of these two Members and the last two people I would hang for are the two of them.

You don't accept an accusation against your Friends and Colleagues and condemn them. The greatest villain unhung is entitled to be told what the accusation against him is. I do not intend to say any more on that, Sir, because the less said the better.

There is no difference of opinion in the W.I.F.L.P.

Hon. Members (Opposition Benches): You don't know. Wait till he comes back from Monos.

The Prime Minister: If some hon. Members know of a division, I don't. Perhaps the hon. Member over there has paid someone

Mr. Joseph: You still have doubts enough to feel that they can be bought?

The Prime Minister: This is what I have to say. For good or ill, this Parliament made me Prime Minister. Nobody, not a single soul, not even my wife is going to tell me how to run, in combination with my Colleagues, this Government.

Hon. Members (Opposition Benches): What about the Premier of Trinidad?

The Prime Minister: Every Prime Minister has to know how his Colleagues feel. He must go with the group that goes with him. He would be an idiot to do otherwise. I have not so far found in my Colleagues any feeling that they are unwilling to run this Government in the way a parliamentary democracy is run. There is not the slightest unwillingness to work with me.

Mr. Joseph: What about last night?

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, the only thing I have to say about last night is that there is a little eighteen cents pamphlet on Parliamentary procedure that I would commend to hon. Members opposite. If they feel they can't afford to buy it, tell me and we over here will get the copies for them.

I sit down here and so long as I have the honour to be a Minister, let alone Prime Minister, I am going to attempt to put the Federal Government on the same footing that the other members of the Commonwealth have put themselves. I had been asked, while I was in London, by my own son who works on the Caribbean Series of the BBC to make a statement on this crisis business and I refused. I refused because, as I said, I did not know. What I want to do above all things, is to restore to English people the attitude they had to us last June. Last June, we were in London, these two hon. Members can bear me out, and the feeling in London towards The West Indies Federation was that we had done a great job. But that

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

attitude does not exist now. I found that out last month when the *Times* carried an article and when they came to me. I had the *Daily Despatch*, the *Daily Express*, the *Telegraph*, the *Times*, all asking me what is this crisis in The West Indies. I refused to answer.

Mr. Cargill : What about the *Gleaner*?

The Prime Minister : If I said what I thought about the *Gleaner* it might be said that I am casting aspersions against all Jamaica. I would like to see the Deputy Leader of the Opposition starting a new *Gleaner* so that some of us on this side would be able to stop living off our gardening and chauffeur allowances as he put it, as we would be able to get a couple thousand pounds from suits against the *Chronicle*.

I hope that everyone on both sides of the House will say no matter what is the state of things during elections time or after elections, that The West Indies are determined to succeed, and work to that end. That is the point I made in London and I asked the Press to emphasise that. I said it even when I was about to get on the plane and I asked them to print that there is no country in the world that has been made into a Federation that has the intention to succeed as we in The West Indies.

The newspapers . . .

Mr. Joseph : Like the *Torch*!

The Prime Minister : The hon. Member who just spoke is a twin brother to the Editor of the *Torch*.

I appeal to the Opposition as much as to Government Members — tell every single person who asks what we have done — tell them that you believe as a truth that in the early days, the United States, the Australian, the Canadian and other Federations had all these problems and these difficulties and nevertheless they succeeded. In 1867 Canada started and even up to today they have not yet solved all their problems. They still have Quebec. Their Federation still works and we here in The West Indies can make ours work.

There is one thing I have to add — one of the things I said while discussing education was that religious differences mean nothing to us in The West Indies in our determination to succeed, be it Hindu, Muslim, Jew, Roman Catholic or Protestant, and I begged all the newspaper people who came to me to write that down if they want to help The West Indies, and I now beg the Opposition and Government Members to do the same.

Mr. Sinanan : What are we going to do with the agnostics?

The Prime Minister : An agnostic is a person willing to learn.

Hon. Member (Opposition Benches) : How about the Government side; are they not willing to learn?

The Prime Minister : They are the apostles.

Mr. Speaker, I must thank the Opposition for accepting my remarks in the spirit in which they were taken. This is exactly what happened in New York, but for these three birds!

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

When Mr. Moore passed up a question to me, "How can you a Barbadian, how can the Prime Minister say that Barbadians are the most intelligent people?" I replied that I said that every now and then. I know that I am wrong to make that remark because it is so obvious. The remark caused laughter.

Mr. W. B. Williams : What about industry?

The Prime Minister : When I was asked by Mr. Domingo, I told him "You are probably right; I was quoting Mr. Chapman. I have not got the figures at my finger-tips; I will get in touch with The West Indies and will let you know what the recent figures are".

When Mr. Moore made the remark about Barbados, I probably created the greatest amount of laughter by saying, "None of you would suspect that Moore is a Barbadian". And when I added, "God forbid that I should ever lose my sense of humour" — just as you have accepted my speech this afternoon —

Hon. Member (Opposition Benches) : Who says we have accepted it?

The Prime Minister : The hon. Member cannot accept it because he has got to go and ask the Member in front of him what his reactions should be. I have no doubt that about this time tomorrow night when the hon. Member has lectured to him, he will come back and say whether he accepts my remark or not.

Mr. Speaker, I again say thanks to the Government Benches for realising that I was not such a fool as to go and draw

odious comparisons between one Territory and another. I hope my Friends behind me wouldn't feel hurt if I say that I feel I have as many Friends on the opposite Benches as I have here, but they are shame-faced to walk across the House and sit down here.

Mr. Sinanan : It is quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Prime Minister is in good form this afternoon. Frankly, I need not have heard an explanation from him today stating that what he said was obviously said with his customary sense of humour. I even suspect that part of what he said was taken out of its context.

Hon. Members : Hear, hear!

Mr. Sinanan : Frankly, Sir, I was astonished when I got to New York to meet a number of people who are very devoted to Federation, a number of West Indians, who gave me the impression that some sort of revolution was taking place in The West Indies; and I was even more shocked when I got down here to find out what was supposed to have sparked this controversy.

But I wish to address this House on the question of stability so far as the outside world is concerned, because I felt terribly let down when, on my way home, in every country where I stopped I made sure — just as the hon. Prime Minister did and other Members of this House have done and will do in the future — to point out to our friends abroad that although we have Latin American countries that seem to settle their business by force, although we are surrounded by Latin American countries that seem to

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

believe in settling their business with bullets, we in The West Indies, moving on to the status from British West Indian islands to a Federation and ultimately to Dominion status in the Commonwealth, have always presented stability in Government.

One thing that will do this Federation a considerable amount of harm is the impression that there is every anxiety to topple a Government because people believe that one or two injudicious remarks might have been made.

But what my hon. and learned Friend did not do—and I appreciate his position in the matter—is to point out to this House that we on this side never advocated his removal nor are we likely to be so inclined in the future unless something extremely serious arises which at the moment we cannot foresee.

It is not always that one would like to pat one's self on the back. I am sorry that the Minister of Social Affairs is a little way off, but I hope she will hear what I am saying because at the opening of this Parliament in the Red House, hon. Members will remember that the Opposition laid down its policy for the five years to come. The Minister of Social Affairs lamented the fact that the speech was strewn and bedecked with so much Tory language—although I have been told that in my absence she had adopted the Tory language of the greatest of all the Tories, Sir Winston Churchill, though I understand her quotation was not strictly accurate.

Mr. Speaker, what we said then we say now. We faced the West Indian Nation

as a Party. My hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister faced the West Indian Nation leading his Party. We fought with the definite understanding that one Party would form the Government because of numerical strength, and that we would form the Opposition.

So far as we are concerned on this side of the House, the hon. Gentleman leads the Government, and we will respect him as Prime Minister of this country. I wish to tell him and his Colleagues, that in spite of the badinage that goes on here, in spite of the fact that we claim the right to pulverise this Government as much as possible, we have always said in Party caucuses across the way, that the hon. Gentleman is Prime Minister of The West Indies and we will respect him inside and outside of this Parliament.

But what the Prime Minister did not say—I suppose cannot say—I will say. I hope that people who occupy the Benches opposite will cease their intrigues against their own Prime Minister, and that the sooner they realise that their loyalty is to this Parliament and to this Government and not to any Territorial Governments, the better for all of us. We make this broad, general statement in the hope that no one will be so misguided over there as to force us to be specific.

Hon. Members (Government Benches):
Be specific.

Mr. Sinanan: Mr. Speaker, we have heard, and I have read in the newspaper that there was a conspiracy against the Prime Minister—not a conspiracy by hon. Members over here.

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

Hon. Member: In the newspaper!

Mr. Sinanan: A newspaper is not always irresponsible.

My hon. Friends opposite ought to know that sometimes when a newspaper comes out in headlines there is always a tittle of truth whispered to that newspaper by people who want to create trouble. We have sufficient experience in public life to know that. It is so obvious that if the detractors of the Leader of Government want to grasp at anything against him a statement made in jest which all of us make—I exchange the same kind of fun and the same humour with Members on this side of the House; we talk about Jamaica in the same way that the English and Scots make their own jokes.

What is this anxiety of those who have been working for months against the Prime Minister?

We wish to put on record that this side of the House is prepared to be a responsible Opposition, that we are going to attack this Government everytime we feel, and as long as we feel that the Government should be attacked; that we will keep them on their toes, and will file question after question, and Motion after Motion. Consequently, I am afraid the hon. Member would have to listen to many more of the brilliant speeches of my hon. Friend from Surrey.

This Government is going to be challenged all the time by the Opposition, but not with the desire to disrupt or to em-

barrass Government or to replace their existing office-holders.

Mr. Speaker, I have always enjoyed listening to my hon. Friend, the Member for Montserrat. I am sorry he is leaving now, although I understand there is an alternative Member. He played on the fact that the Member for the Eastern Counties had had some differences with his Party. What has amazed me is that nobody asked the hon. Member how it is he is deserting his Government with such rapidity. It is not a good sign. I expected some sort of explanation from him.

Mr. Bousquet: He is only following Lightbourne.

Mr. Sinanan: Mr. Lightbourne left to fight a general election in Jamaica.

Mr. Belinfanti: He is going to be the Chief Minister of Montserrat.

Mr. Sinanan: Then, I accept that explanation. If he is leaving to be the Chief Minister of Montserrat, I can say no more.

Mr. Speaker, the only other point to which I wish to make reference is the statement by the Deputy Speaker of the House. He said that, in his opinion, the Inter-Governmental Conference had failed. And, frankly, Sir, I was about to come to the same conclusion in the last days of the Conference. But, on further reflection, I felt the Conference did not fail, and in a number of ways, most important of which is that at some time or another the outstanding political leaders of The West Indies had to meet, rather than to be firing salvos in their separate Terri-

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

tories. It is a good thing they met because, consistent with the aspirations of the people of The West Indies and the responsibility of the leaders, the fact that everybody said that Federation is in danger will make them take a more sober approach to the problems and they will rededicate themselves to the entire concept of Federation. If this comes, I think the Conference would have done a considerable amount of good.

Hon. Members will allow me to say that it is not always that the newspapers pursue a correct line. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that a considerable amount of harm — what I am saying might be considered very undiplomatic of a man in public life, but I believe the success of the Federation is more important than the success of the individual — I would say, in all sincerity, that a considerable amount of harm has been done to this Federation by the newspapers in The West Indies. I would say to this House, as I suggested to my hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister, that some heart to heart talks will have to be held with the Editors of the newspapers in the Caribbean, because the outside world looks to this Federation with anxious and sympathetic eyes. The outside world marvels at the fact that we are fighting an uphill battle and that we are trying to federate a group of scattered islands. If we succeed it will be the greatest tribute and we would have to carry the organs of public opinion with us

Even at the risk of being castigated by the newspapers, I would suggest that they check and re-check their stories instead of making anxious and hasty attempts for headlines and dramatics.

Mr. Speaker, I was not here for the entire debate, but I think it is obvious, from the atmosphere I saw here, that while tempers were rising there was still that respect for the dignity of Parliament. And I hope, sincerely, that we would continue that way, that the Opposition will continue to be as alert as it has been and that the Government, as a whole, will continue to do their job and to carry this Federation successfully forward. Because, Mr. Speaker, more than ever the Commonwealth needs this Federation.

I could not be more satisfied in my own mind that in spite of our financial differences we have a considerable amount of talent that can contribute towards world thought and world culture. We could bring to bear in the Commonwealth a considerable amount of good, and I believe that within a short time this West Indian nation will not only take its rightful place within the Commonwealth but we would be considered among the foremost of those nations of the world that are dedicated to democratic and parliamentary life.

Mr. Bradshaw : Mr. Speaker, I should like to say how deeply touched I have been by the expressions of approval that have come from all sides of the House for the speech on the Budget. I say that, as I always do, quite sincerely. I hope that as the finances of the Federation increase, and I believe they will increase, succeeding Ministers of Finance will be able to paint brighter pictures of the finances and economic condition of the Federation.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I will have to animadvert upon the attempts made to

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

[MR. BRADSHAW]

raise certain issues by some of the hon. Members on the other side of the House. May I be permitted, Sir, to deal firstly with what fell from the lips of the hon. Member for Surrey? He chose, Mr. Speaker, to accuse Government of having caused the Inter-Governmental Conference to fail.

I think, Sir, he said among other things that the Government did no homework, and that the Government held a counterfeit Conference.

Sir, if the Conference was a counterfeit Conference, then surely the hon. Member for Surrey is himself a political counterfeiter, because he took part in what he called a counterfeit Conference. He was a member of the Federal Government's delegation. Let me repeat: if in his opinion it was a counterfeit Conference and he has chosen to come before this hon. House and say that the Federal Government organised a counterfeit Conference in which he took part, then he himself is a political counterfeiter.

On the question of homework, Mr. Speaker, maybe the hon. Member was endeavouring to throw suspicion away from himself, because he had quite a lot of material on which he could do homework, and I believe he did none at all.

What was the Conference called for? We see in the Report on the Conference which was laid before this House, Mr. Speaker — page 1, I think, under the heading "Introduction" — a statement which reads as follows:

"The Conference was convened to review the working of the Federal Con-

stitution, to discuss various points of view and work out a pattern of proposals which could be put to Her Majesty's Government at the Conference to be convened under Article 118 of the Constitution".

That was the purpose of the Conference. In preparation for that Conference, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government did a considerable amount of work. The Conference was convened on the 28th of September, but on the 4th of September a Savingram was sent out by the Governor-General to all the Governors and Administrators in The West Indies Federation, advising them of the subjects that were to be considered when the Conference met.

In paragraph 2, Mr. Speaker, the Governor-General's Savingram had this to say:

"The Inter-Governmental Conference will convene at Federal House on the 28th September. Its purpose is to consider matters arising from the working of the Federal Constitution and to see how far agreement can be reached on a pattern of proposals."

On the 11th of September, Mr. Speaker, another Savingram was sent out from the same source and to the same people, and it set out a number of Papers that were being sent to the Governments and Administrators on matters that were to be discussed at the Conference. The subject matters of the Papers were as follows:

Paper 1 — G.C. 591 on Customs Union;
 Paper 2 — Issue of a West Indian Passport; Paper 3 — Representation in the

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

House of Representatives; Paper 4—Income Tax; Paper 5—Federal Finances.

Those were the Papers, Mr. Speaker, prepared for the Conference to discuss and which were sent to every Governor and Administrator within the Federation, and supplied in a folder to every member of the Federal delegation. So that, if the hon. Member for Surrey did not do his homework he must not come here and accuse the Federal Government of not doing its homework. The Federal Government supplied him with all the material with which he could have exercised his mind, and if he did not do that he must not accuse the Federal Government in the way he has.

Mr. Hill: The night before the Conference?

Mr. Bradshaw: But that is not all, Mr. Speaker. On the 19th of September, three other Papers were sent: (1)—Use of the West India Regiment for Internal Security Purposes; (2)—The Federal Information Division, Prime Minister's Department; and (3)—Constitutional Changes. So that, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member had before him, and the Conference had before it, eight Papers submitted by the Federal Government in addition to Papers submitted by various Governments on matters that were to be discussed.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, I have said enough to obliterate the false accusation that the Federal Government did no homework. The hon. Member for Surrey did none, because at the Conference he was more concerned about taking notes, apparently for transfer to newspapers and

for bringing into this House for the purpose of endeavouring to vilify the Government, than paying attention to what was happening at the Conference, or making any contribution to it whatever.

But, Sir, if additional evidence were needed to prove the amount of work the Federal Government did before the Conference and during the Conference, both on the scene and behind the scenes, I should refer you, Sir, to page 10 of the Report on the Proceedings of the Conference, to which I have referred before. At paragraph 46 you will find, Mr. Speaker, the following:

"The Prime Minister stated that he agreed entirely but as the Leader of the Federal delegation, he suggested reference of all the questions to Committees as the only possible way to avoid the collapse of the Conference. He was very concerned about maintaining the prestige of the Federation in the eyes of the world. He thought that further discussion in Plenary Session seemed unlikely to serve any useful purpose at this stage, and proposed an adjournment to Wednesday 7th October. In the interim, the Federal Government would work out terms of reference for a series of Working Committees which the Conference might appoint to consider the various problems."

And finally, Mr. Speaker, on page 13, paragraph 67, we see the terms of reference of the Committees to which the Prime Minister had referred, or had proposed, and also the terms of reference that were worked out by the Federal Govern-

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

[MR. BRADSHAW]

ment. Those terms of reference, Mr. Speaker, were adopted by the Conference, and used for the purpose not only of setting up the Committees, but used by the Committees to guide them along.

3.50 p.m.

I must say this, Mr. Speaker, as one who has had the honour of presiding over one of the Committees set up by the Conference—the one to deal with Constitutional matters and which met here in Federal House from the 16th to 18th of last month—that the representative from every Unit Territory who participated in the work of that Committee participated with a will, vigour and earnestness and with a degree of sincerity which was not evidenced at the start of the big Conference because everyone was charged up. But as a result of that Conference, where people had an opportunity to extend themselves to make known their views fully, they did so and having satisfied themselves that their views were known and appreciated, perhaps not agreed to by representatives from other parts of the Federation, they felt satisfied that we would approach the further work of the Conference in the Committees with an equanimity which was profound.

The hon. Member for Surrey, I think, suggested that the Premier of Jamaica took ten months before he came to the same conclusion Members on the opposite side had arrived at in respect to Federation. I think, Sir, that that is a piece of effrontery. I don't believe that I would live long enough to hear that the Premier of Jamaica looks to the Opposition for inspiration or for advice.

Dr. Duhaney: It is true!

The Prime Minister: Does he?

Mr. Lloyd: It couldn't happen.

Mr. Bradshaw: The Premier of Jamaica, his Ministers and his officials attended the Inter-Governmental Conference as the true and genuine representative of Jamaica, and not as bogus representatives. Be it remembered that the electorate of Jamaica gave the P.N.P. a resounding victory in July just about eighteen months, or something like that, after they had given a verdict with respect to Federal representation. So that we had here at that Conference the real and genuine representatives of the people of Jamaica. They put Jamaica's case. Jamaica's case was heard; Jamaica's case was appreciated and understood and agreed to. The *Daily Gleaner* itself has as its headline in its issue of Thursday, October 8th, "Seats Principle Is Won". The principle of representation by population in the Dominion of The West Indies was one accepted by the Conference, by Jamaica through the agency of the Premier, Mr. Manley and his Ministers—the genuine, real and true and not bogus representatives of Jamaica.

Mr. Hill: When was the question first raised?

Mr. Bradshaw: I am not concerned as to when the question was first raised; I am concerned about this fact: that when an opportunity presented itself for the Government of Jamaica to present its case, that case was presented with vigour and certainty. It was understood, appreciated and accepted in principle.

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Surrey did not stop there. He went on to say that the Federal Government knew that the Conference was destined to fail. If the Conference was destined to fail—and it did not fail, Mr. Speaker—then surely out of his own mouth the hon. Member convicts himself and should present himself for sentence because he took part in the failure—if there was failure. Ah! but there was not. But the hon. Member ducked back into history and he accused the Prime Minister, he accused the Government of having dithered about the Conference which he called a failure. But what happened here in the House, as you so kindly pointed out, Mr. Speaker? A Resolution was passed last year urging that a certain type of Conference should take place. A lot of water flowed under the bridge between the time when the Resolution was passed and when the time was nearing for the Resolution to be put into effect. The Federal Government had to consider the position of The West Indies Federation. It had to take into account the wishes of the Unit Governments and as a result the Prime Minister proposed another Motion. Mark you, Sir, his Government did not take it upon itself to do something different to what the Resolution called for, but the Prime Minister came back to this hon. House and invited it to adopt a slightly different course. He came back to the House. The Council-of-State did not act on this matter outside of the House. The matter was brought back to the House, explanations given, a Resolution proposed and carried by this hon. House—the same House which passed the Resolution

last year itself set that Resolution aside and adopted another one. How can the Prime Minister be blamed, how can the Government be blamed for changing its mind and coming back to the House and asking approval for that variation? The Prime Minister, when the Resolution was being debated, said among other things, and I quote:

"What happened? In the early days of the Federation when everybody was fresh and had to show that they had red blood in them, we talked and talked 'till finally on a Motion from a Government Minister—I think it was the Minister of Communications and Works—we agreed to have this Conference concerning the revision of the Constitution, and according to the Motion, not later than June this year. No Territory of itself took any steps for some time. I am checking on my dates, but I think I am right in saying that I sent a letter round to all the Unit Governments and to the Federal Government Ministers in November, asking for their comments and saying that we had had no comments so far, and that we would like to get some comments to have a preliminary conference before the June Conference. November, last year! If my date is wrong it would be corrected by my Permanent Secretary who is seeing about it."

—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 21st May, 1959; c. 1921.]

He went on to say, Sir: "How can you have two conferences in June, if the other Territories have not been ready?" And, after he explained that the Leeward and

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

[MR. BRADSHAW]

Windward Islands had asked for a Conference to be held in London on the question of Constitutional reform, he went on:

".... They are all ready with a lot of resolutions. What were we to do but tell the Leewards and Windwards O.K. we will see when it suits the Colonial Office. That is all that happened. It is perfectly true that I don't dodge anything that I have said. I don't say anything just for the fun of it. Everything I say I mean — except when I am praising the Opposition."

That is what the Prime Minister said, Mr. Speaker.

He went on further :

"The Leewards and Windwards are ready, the Colonial Office has accepted June as the date to meet them and there are several personal reasons affecting the Sitting of the House of Commons which made them fix a particular date."

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government, I feel, had a perfect right and freedom to change its Motion if, in the circumstances, it felt a change was necessary. If it is felt the Federal Government should not have exercised that freedom, I reject such a view as was suggested by the hon. Member for Surrey. For, Mr. Speaker, like Locke —

"our conception of freedom is the power of acting according to our will, or, in other words, the consciousness, when pursuing a certain course of action, that we might, if we had chosen, have pursued a different one."

We feel the change in the course of action was called for and that was decided. The House of Representatives was invited to accept that change and it did in fact accept it.

Mr. Hill : Second thought activated by second spring.

The Prime Minister : Sit next to the Archdeacon and you will get wise.

Mr. Bradshaw : We should pay some attention to what fell from the hon. Member for St. Mary. That hon. Member, Mr. Speaker, spoke as though he was sitting on nettle and acted in the nature of a fussy and frustrated hen sitting on eggs she had spoiled and could not hatch. —[Laughter] This is a funny, frustrated one.

He sought to criticise the Government. He tried to criticise what I said about Jamaican development. He said the Federal Government has nothing to do with Jamaican development. That is what the hon. Member for St. Mary said, Mr. Speaker. I think that the hon. Member for St. Mary should be reminded, if it is possible to remind him, that the Federal Government is concerned about development of every single Territory within the Federation and in the particular case of Jamaica, the Federal Government has been giving every assistance possible.

Last year, or early this year, I think, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Jamaica, under the able leadership of Mr. Manley and the late and very deeply mourned Minister of Finance, Mr. Nethersole, secured a loan of some \$12,000,000 from the U.S.A. The Government of Jamaica had

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

to have the support and the backing of the Federal Government to secure that loan and that support and backing were given wholeheartedly and readily. That loan is to be used for Jamaican development; so the Federal Government is helping Jamaican development.

Hon. Members (Opposition Benches): You are now telling us.

Mr. Bradshaw: Further than that, Mr. Speaker, in the creation of their Central Bank, the Federal Government has again given every possible assistance and we have given that assistance for various reasons. Because, if the Federal Government wanted to provide obstacles, we have got the constitutional right so to do.

Mr. Hill: Like the oil refinery.

Mr. Bradshaw: Article 98(3) of the Constitution says:

"Nothing in this Article shall prejudice the power of the Federal Legislature or of the Legislature of any Territory to make laws with respect to currency:

Provided that no law of the Legislature of a Territory with respect to currency that is enacted after the date on which this Constitution comes into force shall have effect unless the Governor-General has declared by notice in the *Gazette* that he consents to its having effect."

Hon. Members have made the statement that we have done nothing. That is a scurrilous statement, and any such Member making it is obviously speaking out of sheer ignorance and perversity. So, any Member who makes the statement that the Federal Government has not

helped and is not helping in the development of Jamaica is talking utter nonsense — sheer rubbish.

The hon. Member for St. Mary went further. He gave this House the indication of his thinking in respect of Federation — if he thinks at all. He said, Mr. Speaker, that having a Budget of \$16,000,000 before us now made him think that the \$16,000,000 could provide a refinery for Jamaica. The inference to be drawn from such a statement is that, in his thinking, the refinery is of more importance than the Federation itself.

A refinery was more important than Federation itself because the \$16,000,000.00 could build an oil refinery! He would prefer an Oil Refinery to the whole Federation itself. That gives some idea of his attitude to Federation, his attitude to the hon. House in which he sits.

The hon. Member for St. Mary referred to the Federal establishment. He tried to make out that the Federal Government was employing civil servants at a very rapid rate, and also went so far as to suggest that the Federal Government had more employees than the Colonial Office had at the peak of British Colonial power. He completely forgot one thing: that the Colonial Office does not count as active members of its staff the British Army Unit that it has in Jamaica, the British Army Units in British Guiana or the Units that are to be found in nearly every Colonial Territory of the United Kingdom.

These are as much a part of the force of the Colonial Office as any civil servant, because they are the instruments of the Colonial and Metropolitan power,

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

Mr. Cargill: I have not counted the West India Regiment either.

Mr. Bradshaw: The hon. Member says he has not counted the West India Regiment, but in the Estimates is to be found a new item in the Secretariat for a Pay and Records Office. These are records for the battalion of the West India Regiment, and they are as much a part of the Regiment as the soldiers are.

Hon. Member: He has not done his homework.

Mr. Bradshaw: Obviously he has not done his homework.

In speaking of the staff employed by the Federal Government, the hon. Member seems not to take account of the fact that the total number provided for in the Estimates before us—462—includes members of the staff of our Commission in the United Kingdom, including the Migrant Service. He has not taken into account the Staff of our Commission in Canada, nor the fact that the 462 persons budgeted for, are in fact not all with us, because we have got increases in the establishment in various Departments, but up to now, at this stage of the year, posts for which provision has been made in the 1959 Estimates have not yet been filled. It has not yet been possible to secure the services of an expert on Standards for instance. He has not taken up his post yet. Various other posts have not been filled.

But, Mr. Speaker, I don't expect the hon. Member to remember these things, because his one idea apparently is to endeavour to make the Federal Government look small. So I invite him most earnestly

to go over the Estimates once again, and to do a bit of homework, to apply himself intelligently to what he is about, rather than just endeavour to make scurrilous and perverse attacks on the Federal Government.

I was a bit surprised—although I should not have been—at the remark of the hon. Member for St. Mary about my reference to the production of eggs—not spoilt eggs—within the Federation last year.. He caught himself in time from making a very rude remark, but the inference was very clear. But I say I am not surprised at the hon. Member because his Leader had to make a public apology for him in Jamaica last year, when he insulted ladies in upper St. Andrew—in the Jamaican Press—by comparing them with animals. So I am not surprised at his behaviour here. He is living down to his reputation.

The hon. Member for St. Mary set out to ask a question about the Federal Government's economic plan. We were told last year, when this House sat between November and December, by the hon. Member who was Deputy Leader of the Opposition and by other Members—I think the hon. Member for St. Mary himself said that the Federal Government should have nothing to do with the industrial development of Jamaica. We should have nothing to do with it.

I think the hon. Member for St. Mary, just a few days ago, referred to the Federal Government Ministers as being apprentices—I think he used the word 'prentice-hand'. He said we should have nothing to do with Jamaica's development. How then does he ask what the Federal Government is doing about development in Jamaica ? How does he ask about that ?

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

It has not been possible to organise an Economic Planning Unit as Jamaica has been able to do. Indeed it is only now that the Federal Government has been able to organise the accommodation, or organise space here in Federal House, for the necessary machines that are used for statistical tabulations. Within the limits of the Federal Government's resources, both financial and otherwise, we have given advice and assistance to various Units.

Last year, for instance, when the Federal Government received a delegation from the State Department in Washington to discuss the economic development within the Federation, as a means of giving the Americans an indication as to the quarters in which they might give assistance to the Federation, the Federal Government invited every Unit Territory to supply it with its development plans. And with, I think, one exception, every Unit Territory sent in its development plans.

The Federal Government went beyond that. It invited representatives from all the Units to be present when we would meet the Americans so that they could discuss their matters separately with them.

But Unit Governments, Mr. Speaker, are sovereign in themselves and there are certain things they will not permit the Federal Government to interfere in. Development is one of these things. They asked for advice and we gave it freely. They asked for financial assistance and to the extent that we had the necessary funds available, we gave it to them. Further than that, in preparing their various schemes and programmes experts are called upon from time to time by the Unit Territories, for assistance. We have ad-

visers to give the assistance that is necessary.

During the course of this year the Marketing Officer of the Federal Government was seldom at home. He spent more time in Barbados and Jamaica than anywhere else, working on behalf of Jamaica, Barbados and Trinidad than for the Federal Government. And so, Mr. Speaker, I say these Unit Governments will not permit the Federal Government to take part in their development directly, but they call upon us for aid and assistance which is given whenever and wherever the Federal Government can possibly give that aid and assistance.

The hon. Member for Surrey asked some question about outside assistance from international agencies. If I remember correctly I think he asked whether the Federal Government was geared to making use of assistance from international organisations that might be available to the Federal Government. Let me give him one example. Within the last month an announcement was made to the effect that the United Nations Special Fund had made a grant of, I think, \$880,000 to the University College of the West Indies. The application for that grant, Mr. Speaker, was channelled through the Federal Government; indeed it had to have the support of the Federal Government before it could be presented to the United Nations through her Majesty's Government at Westminster.

Mr. Hill: Did the Federal Government meet these claims and applications?

Mr. Bradshaw: The Federal Government had to support the claims and applications specifically. It had to give all the

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

[MR. BRADSHAW]

reasons possible. That was done. The Federal Government has the capability. It has the resources at its disposal to make a case to any international agency for any assistance that might be required. Indeed, now that the gift of the Canadian ships which are to be given to the Federation by the Government of Canada has been secured, the Federal Government is now proceeding to put proposals to the Canadian Government for the use of the remainder of the money. And we have to make a case for every single project.

I say we are capable and able of surmounting the necessary expertise and knowledge to present an overwhelmingly convincing case to any overseas agency for assistance which they might be able to give to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for St. Mary apparently got confused in reading my speech because he said he did not know whether the Federation was on a plane of life or facing a peak. I think I was very specific, Mr. Speaker, in what I said.

I refer to Hansard of November 19th, 1959, at column 40 in which I said, among other things :

"Sir, West Indians should by now be fully aware that our gravitation to nationhood does not proceed along a well surfaced road—or indeed a road that is clear at all. It has led us far into the primeval forest of doubt; on to the bleak and bare and dizzy abysses of uncertainty and despair and plunged us deep into the roaring whirlpools of almost unending controversy. But it now seems to be bringing us out into the lofty plains of light where translucent streams of

understanding move gently among the green recesses of unity."

I closed by saying :

"Mr. Speaker, the year 1960 confronts the Federation like a formidable peak which must be scaled; but upon whose forbidding face footholds to support us can quite clearly be seen. Let us then to the grand assault for we cannot evade the challenge of our national destiny."

I have heard the Member for St. Mary speak of people being illiterate. I don't know, in his illiteracy and frustration, whether he was unable to read the Queen's English which was presented with such clarity.

Mr. Hill : You are illiterate.

Mr. Bradshaw : Mr. Speaker, may I conclude my reference ?

Mr. Hill : I said, you are illiterate.

Mr. Bradshaw : Say it again, if it pleases you !

Mr. Joseph : Even you might believe it.

Mr. Bradshaw : Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Surrey suggested that the Federal Government was throwing up its hands in despair. Every few sentences he uttered he quoted what I said about "demoralising immobilism." — [Interruption]. Keep quiet, will you ? Your interference is garrulous. You are just garrulous.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Surrey carefully avoided what I said about the work of the Federal Government. Just a few sentences below it says this :

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

"This is a time for understanding; for greatness; for magnanimity and for a tangible display of the resourceful leadership which this Government possesses: the Government is doing and giving all of these.

"It will secure the foundations and reinforce the superstructure of the Federation so as to ensure that the edifice can never be destroyed."

I leave that impression to the hon. Member who has endeavoured, so futilely to discredit the Federation.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill Read a Second time.

Mr. Speaker : Before I suspend the Sitting, I would like to suggest that after we return to deal with the Items which are down for consideration, we should go straight on and complete them without further adjournment this afternoon. I do not think it should take us beyond half-past seven o'clock.

4.35 p.m.: Sitting suspended.

5.10 p.m.: Sitting resumed.

Mr. Bradshaw : Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House go into Committee of Supply to consider the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year 1960.

Mr. Speaker : I would like to point out that the only Estimates that can be considered are the two first Estimates to which no amendments have been proposed. Under the Rule dealing with Amendments, all amendments must be placed on the Order Paper on the particular day on which they are going to be considered and no amendments which have not been

tabled as amendments under this Order can be discussed. The amendment must be placed on the Order Paper. No notice has been given in respect to Heads I and II. Therefore, we can go to Committee of Supply under Heads I and II.

House went into Committee of Supply.

Heads I and II agreed to and stood part of the Bill.

Mr. Bradshaw : I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the House do resume to report progress and that leave be given for the Committee to sit again.

Agreed to.

House resumed.

Mr. Bradshaw : Mr. Speaker, I beg to report that in Committee of Supply, Heads I and II of the Estimates of Expenditure were passed without amendment, and I beg leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. Speaker : Will you name a day, Mr. Minister of Finance, to continue Committee of Supply?

Mr. Bradshaw : I name tomorrow, Sir, after Private Members' Motions.

INTERPRETATION REGULATIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Order for Second Reading read.

The Prime Minister : I beg to move the Second Reading of this Bill. The object of this Bill—I say it for the benefit of the hon. Leader of the Opposition who unfortunately could not be here earlier—is to amend the Interpretation Regulations, 1958 (Cap. 291) by inserting a provision defining the expression "Governor", in relation to any of the Territories of the

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

Leeward and Windward Islands, to mean the Administrator of that Territory.

It is very simple, even if it does not go as far as hon. Members would like it to go. But it is making it clear that the expression "Governor" covers anybody in the position of Governor, even though they may be called "Administrators". It means the Governor of a Territory, not the Governor of a fatuous Opposition. It is very simple, so simple, that even the Member for St. Mary understands it. I beg to move.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read a Second time.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now go into Committee to consider this Bill Clause by Clause.

Agreed to.

House in Committee.

Clauses approved.

House resumed.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I beg to report that this Bill has been passed in Committee, and to move that it be read a Third time.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read a Third time and passed.

CENSUS AND STATISTICS BILL

Order for Second Reading read.

The Prime Minister: If hon. Members will read and re-read the objects and reasons, I don't think this Bill will take any length of time to go through.

The objects and reasons, as set out in the first page of this Bill, are very clear

on what it seeks to achieve. It is intended to facilitate the competence of the Federal Statistical Office in co-operation with all the Statistical Departments of the Unit Territories. I do not think it is necessary for me to say much about the importance of statistics to any Government today.

Over and over again, from 1937, when there was a series of disturbances in the area, it has been clearly seen that you could not set about to clear up slums and build houses and so on without knowing how many houses you would have to build and so on. When you turn to the slums, you may be wasting money and time if you have not got a proper survey to let you know how many houses there are unfit for human habitation, and so on.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, for one reason or another, during the period I am referring to, you very seldom found Government Departments trying to get all the information that was necessary. I hope there are no Civil Servants in the room—proliferous people who sit down and do nothing except inquire whether the Prime Minister has telephone in his bathroom! These Government Departments in the past did not do all that was necessary, because they might have been asked why they wanted to waste the tax-payers' money, especially taking into consideration the fact that appointing a Statistical Department entails the necessary staff which includes stenographers and so on. But today, Mr. Speaker, we realize that there should be one, and that the Federation would be standing badly if we hadn't such a Department.

Another thing is that we were told as far back as twenty years or more by international organisations, Colonial Organisa-

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

tions, and by people like the United Nations and other Labour Organisations, that they did not know how to help us when they don't know the trouble, or the extent of the trouble. That has happened over and over again.

Those of us who were, I should say, mid-wives of the Federation and who were members of the Standing Federation Committee, who even went back to Montego Bay in the old SCAC days, were very aware of the necessity of knowing what we had to face before we attempted to face it. So that, Mr. Speaker, today we can pat ourselves on the backs as West Indians for a job well done.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government recognises the need for a comprehensive supply of the information that can be given by such a department, and I would like to say that the Minister of Labour and Social Affairs, who has been sometimes derided, was mainly responsible for the Federal Government giving absolute priority to the matter. I should also say that an expert was assigned to the Government by the Canadian Government. I refer to Mr. Herbert Marshall who was formerly Head Statistician in Ottawa. With his expert assistance our Statistical Department was thus established. It has now been brought up to full strength, and the Government now wishes to define the frame-work within which its officers must work; and also to give the necessary authority to collect information.

Barbados has enacted legislation for census. As a matter of fact, it is only in Barbados, Trinidad and Jamaica that legislation has been passed to enable the collection of statistics.

The enactment of a Federal Census Bill will therefore immediately provide for certain benefits—[Interruptions]

I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether the first two Members on the other side speak for all the Members of the Opposition.

Hon. Members (Opposition Benches): All, all, all!

The Prime Minister: In that case it is not necessary for me to say anything more. I am glad to see that hon. Members have paid so much attention to this Debate and that the usefulness of the legislation is so apparent to them that it is unnecessary to waste any more time with it. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a Second time.

Question put and agreed to.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now go into Committee to consider the Bill.

House in Committee.

House resumed.

Bill reported, without amendment; read a Third time and passed.

SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION (No. 2) BILL, 1959

Order read for Second Reading.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Bradshaw): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill entitled the "Supplementary Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1959" be now read a Second time.

Question proposed.

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

Mr. Cargill (St. Mary, Jamaica): Mr. Speaker, I again hope not to be very long, but I feel that I must return to a matter that was brought up in this House before. Before I do that, I would like to say that I am very glad about one thing. I do sincerely congratulate the Prime Minister on his excellent sense of humour. I find it very refreshing and not only refreshing but disarming. He comes to this House and asks us to excuse him for all manner of sins and shortcomings. He does it with such charm and such humour and such good grace that by the time he is finished with us we are almost disposed to forgive him everything.

The Prime Minister: Forgive?

Mr. Cargill: Yes, forgive. It is a great tribute to his charm. But there are certain things that we cannot, even with the Prime Minister's charm, let him get away with.

When I last spoke on the emoluments of the Speaker of this House set out under Head III, I do not quote everything that the hon. Prime Minister had said for the very good reason that the hon. Prime Minister was not in the House at the time. He has already complained here this afternoon that he has no use for people who make free with his reputation when he is abroad or out of the House. He says that under a British system we should tell him what he has done wrong. I am therefore very glad to see the Prime Minister in the House today and if he would be a little patient with me I will, I hope, tell him without any shadow of a doubt exactly what he has done wrong. For it is a matter which strikes to the core of democracy; it is a matter which

has brought this House and will bring this House into contempt.

I need not waste the time of the House by pointing out that a Select Committee, as I have already pointed out, was appointed to look into the whole question of the remunerations and salaries of the Servants of this House. That Select Committee had on it two Ministers of the Government who signed the Report. That Report was put before this House and was unanimously adopted. Before that happened there was a debate in this hon. House about the question of the Speaker's salary and other matters, and at that time when the debate took place—Tuesday, 9th December, 1958—the Prime Minister said certain things. I read from the *Hansard* Report of that Debate. I want to read very carefully, Mr. Speaker, and with your permission I am going to read it twice for I feel that everybody in this House, not only the Ministers, not only the Members of the Opposition, not only the Members on the Government Bench, but Press and public alike should know exactly what happened in this matter. The Prime Minister said :

"I understand that somebody is drafting notice of a Motion that this House should fix the salary of the Speaker. I don't disagree with that. If the House feels the Speaker should get \$12,000 a year and the House tells the Government so, it must be done and no one can stop it. The Financial Secretary will have to find the money. I do not remember whether we have adopted the Report of the House Committee, and therefore, when the Opposition accuses the Government of causing this Debate, I think it is

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

quite regrettable".—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 9th December, 1959, c. 1386.]

With your permission, Sir, I am going to read the first part of that a second time, for I want it carefully noted.

"I understand that somebody is drafting notice of a Motion that this House should fix the salary of the Speaker. I don't disagree with that. If the House feels the Speaker should get \$12,000 a year and the House tells the Government so, it must be done and on one can stop it. The Financial Secretary will have to find the money".

Now, a little while later on in the debate, Mr. Speaker, I think it was the Member for St. Thomas at that time who got up and no doubt having had past experience of the Prime Minister's capacity to, shall we say, forget what he undertakes to do, suggested that the Prime Minister's undertaking was not worth very much; and the hon. Prime Minister leapt to his feet with great indignation that such a disgraceful suggestion should have been made. He said :

"I do not have to go into details, but I have already given the House my solemn assurance on the matter. However, the hon. Member for Jamaica has not accepted it. I was crudely insulted. Here am I, as Prime Minister of The West Indies, giving a solemn assurance to make it as clear as possible that the independence of the Speaker is to be maintained and the Member being crude enough to say he does not believe. Never fear, for I will never think anything of you for the rest of my life."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 9th December, 1959, c. 1394.]

And with that display of righteous indignation the hon. the Prime Minister took his seat again.

I quite see now, Mr. Speaker, why the past Member was so anxious, and I am afraid that by the time I am finished with him the hon. Prime Minister will feel himself again "crudely insulted"; but this time he will have to bear it. He will have to bear it because a little while later he got up and said :

"I am sorry if my English was not clear enough . . ."

I understand that at the time a number of people had not yet become used to the Barbadian accent and were finding it difficult to understand the Prime Minister. He went on :

" . . . I never said that. I said that if we come here and say he should get \$10,000 the Executive cannot touch it. If the House once sends up a Resolution to the Executive, the Executive cannot alter it. You have got to find the money . . ."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 9th December, 1959, c. 1395.]

That was during the Debate on the 9th December.

As I have said, Sir, as a result of that Debate a Select Committee of the House sat on this matter and reported, as was visualised by the Prime Minister, Government Members and everyone else in this House. Ministers of Government were on that Committee; they signed the Report, there were no dissenting voices. The Report was brought before this House and another Debate took place. One or two Members thought that the Report should be considered but not adopted entirely. There was some discussion on the matter. There were a number of Members on the

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

[MR. CARGILL]

other side who suggested that the House Committee's Report should not be immediately adopted.

During that Debate the hon. Member for Manchester, Jamaica, who took such pains to give us the reason why the matter could not be carried in that last Debate, got up and said :

"I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, I am in disagreement with my Colleagues on this side of the House. Here is a matter properly referred to a Select Committee of the House to deal with—a matter which has been said by the Leader of the Opposition to transcend Party politics. Here is a decision which has been brought to this House and which, in my opinion, is one this Government should accept gracefully.

Let us not enter into any harangue or temper about this matter at all. We should not bring into this Debate the emoluments of the Speaker who occupies a very exalted position. Let us make a common effort gracefully. I would like the Government to agree with the decision of the Committee in this matter".—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 2nd June, 1959, c. 2269.]

I think the Member spoke well. He was a Member of the Committee, of course.

Mr. Delapenha : Oh, no.

Mr. Cargill : I am so sorry. I withdraw that, I thought you were. I thought that the hon. Member spoke very well and showed considerable courage in that he was going against the decisions of his Colleagues.

The Debate continued and ended up with all sides agreeing that the Report should be adopted, and it was so adopted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go on too long in connection with a matter about which we know all the facts already. It is all very well for the hon. the Prime Minister to get up and use a lot of grandiose words about democracy and to say that we should tell the world how well we are operating our Federal democracy; but how can we when he seems to regard democracy as one-way traffic ? It is all right for him when the Members of the Government Benches agree with every word he says. If we disagree, it is 'not democratic'. We have seen over and over again, in this House, performances by the hon. The Prime Minister which lead us to believe that he feels he can run this Federation, run this Government, run the Opposition too, and if you will forgive me, Mr. Speaker—treat the Speaker as he likes, without any form of contradiction or interference whatever.

Last night in this very House we saw a performance, a very regrettable performance, from the Prime Minister that I would not like to see again, in which the dignity of this House and the parliamentary procedure as regards debates in this House were flouted by the hon. the Prime Minister as if he did not know any better. He told us that he has been in politics for the past 30 years. If that is all he has learnt in that length of time, then I am sorry for him.

Constantly you see the hon. the Prime Minister telling Ministers and Members of the Government side that they must not talk, and to sit down.

The Prime Minister : Not at all.

Mr. Cargill : I saw him last night. He even held down one of his Ministers by his trousers. I saw that. It is no good

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

the Prime Minister denying it. I spoke previously about this matter. I am not discussing now the rights or wrongs or whether or not the Speaker or the Clerk of the House should get a raise in pay, or even whether the Deputy Speaker should get one, though I understand that some time ago he was given certain undertakings. What I am concerned with at this stage, Mr. Speaker, is that this House cannot be flouted by anybody, least of all the hon. the Prime Minister. If he comes and says we should set a good example to the world, I think the good example should start with him.

Hon. Members : Hear, hear!

Mr. Cargill : He should not give definite and solemn undertakings and then refuse to carry them out because of some whim or fancy of his, and when we call for the undertaking to be fulfilled, to have him say we insult him. He should not do these things and come back here thinking that because he amuses us we will forgive him everything. We will not, Mr. Speaker.

I say this: we have got to decide in this House—Members on the Government Benches and the Opposition alike—whether we are going to run a democracy or not or whether we are going to allow the hon. the Prime Minister to run a one-man band—

Hon. Members (Opposition Benches):
No.

Mr. Hill : A rag-time band, yes.

Mr. Cargill : It is not good for the Government, it is not good for this House, it is not good for the Federation and it is not good for The West Indies.

Any Prime Minister who gives an undertaking and refuses to execute it is acting not only in a manner hostile to democracy but in a manner which smacks of personal and political dishonesty.

We have had too much of this. This is an undertaking to this House given by the hon. Prime Minister. He leaves here and feels that we have forgotten all about it and then comes round and enters by another door. He blows hot and cold. He says one thing today and another thing tomorrow, and the sum total of this is, that his poor Ministers are bewildered.

I do not wish to be unduly hard in this matter because we feel that this is a matter which transcends—as the hon. Member for Manchester has said—Party politics. I hope no single person in this House today will think I am getting up and speaking about this matter in order to take an unfair Party advantage over this matter. I agree that sometimes I have spoken in this House for the purpose of having a little attack or fun at someone in terms of Party. But this is not one of them, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the House to accept that from me.

This is a matter in which the very honour of this Parliament, and more important than that, the very honour of the Prime Minister, if he cares about it, are at stake. I ask him to think again; I ask him with great sincerity to change his mind. If he will forgive my saying so, he is sometimes a very stubborn man and sometimes in order to make a point which he knows in his heart is wrong — because the hon. Prime Minister is an intelligent man whatever his other multitudinous faults may be—he stubbornly clings to his error simply because he does not want it to be seen

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

[MR. CARGILL]

and thought that anybody in this wide world is capable of correcting him — his Ministers or anybody else in this wide world. I think that, carried to that point, it is destructive not only to the atmosphere in which people work, but also destructive to the individual concerned.

I would ask him to think again, to live up to his undertaking made to this House, and whatever has happened to put the honour of himself and the Government first. I ask this with the greatest sincerity. By his actions in this matter the Prime Minister — because actions speak louder than words — will show whether he means what he says about democracy, decency and building up the traditions of this House or not. I say that if the Prime Minister does not do something to reverse the position he has now created — or his Government has created — he need never come to me, or at any rate, to any Member on this side of the House and speak about democracy again. Because we shall know by this test what he believes, and no amount of sweet words, no amount of charm, will ever restore my confidence in the Prime Minister again.

The Prime Minister : Mr. Speaker, if it means that never again in my life will I have a word in anger or pleasure with the hon. Member who has just sat down, you may rest assured it will not happen.

A mistake can be made, we are all human, but to accuse the Prime Minister or any other person of deliberate dishonesty, is coming down to the gutter. No man says that to another.

Mr. Hill : You called me a Communist.

The Prime Minister : I never did.

Mr. Hill : You are a liar.

Hon. Members : Withdraw it !

The Prime Minister : Here am I accused of personal dishonesty. If the hon. Member wants to be nasty I will tell him why he is attacking me. He had the gross impertinence to suggest that I should use my influence to stop action of the House in connection with his seat.

Hon. Member : Shame !

Mr. Hill : I don't believe you.

Mr. Cargill : On a Point of Order. If the best that the Prime Minister can do to defend himself on a charge of dishonest behaviour is to tell a lot of falsehoods in this House, I am very sorry.

Mr. Speaker : You wanted to rise on a point of order. On a point of explanation, you may do so but you cannot say the Prime Minister is telling falsehoods. You can say he stated a fact and it didn't happen that way. Two or three times today a Member of this House rose and said that a fact stated about him personally was not true. The proper Parliamentary procedure is to accept the denial and not to repeat the allegation again unless it is intended to bring a vote of censure before the House, or take some other means to censure the Member. This is the procedure of Parliament, as I understand it. Each side accepts the honourable intentions of the other side. If facts are stated and the other side denies them, it is the proper parliamentary procedure for an hon. Member who made the allegation to accept that he may be mistaken and accept the words of the Member who has denied the allegation. A Member

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

cannot get up and accuse another across the floor of this House of being a liar, or telling falsehood and such things. It is most improper.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Member facing me thinks that the way we are behaving is normal.

I say again: in ordinary civilised society how can a man be accused of wilful dishonesty? I am accused of personal and political dishonesty. A man who can descend to that depth — perhaps I should not use the word descend, because that is his level — can do anything.

I know what the hon. Member thought about me when the election petition was going on. It made no difference to me. I met him and spoke to him; I called him by his first name as usual, as though nothing had happened. I knew what he was building up for me and he is employing it here tonight.

I never thought that any of us on this side of the House or on that side could reach the stage of telling someone to his face that he is personally dishonest. That is the sort of remark that is not made in civilised life; it is left for lesser breeds, people who have never learnt better. It is immaterial to me how much money a man has, how many fatted earls may be in his ancestry, but he should not descend to the depths to which the hon. Member has gone tonight. I should not speak to him for the rest of my life.

He quoted me. Let me say frankly that I do not know if those quotations can apply, because when this matter was first brought to my attention I drew a point

of distinction between Barbados and ourselves.

I will say this: With the very best possible intention I felt that if the House should submit to the Executive that they should give a certain salary to the Speaker, money must be found for it. I am willing to go further and say this: If, however, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Agriculture, of Communications and Works or any other Minister, gives an assurance here, unless the Council of State has approved of it, he is only stating that he will try his best to have that particular point passed. But unless one of us can say: "I have the assurance of the Council of State", where money is involved, unless one of us can say: "This matter has been decided by the Council of State and I am authorised to bring it to this House", it is only a personal assurance. The Minister may fail to win his point. That is what I feel; and if I am reported as saying that I said what has been quoted, it only shows that I thought we should be generous to the Speaker. Even if I went so far as to use the word "assurance", blame me for going too far in giving the impression that that could be decided here. But to accuse me of dishonesty!

Let me tell the hon. Member that when he talks about Select Committee — I think this point must have been made already — a Select Committee was set up in England in 1947 and it submitted a Report with recommendations with respect to Members of the House of Commons, and the servants of the House, and they took five years before the Government decided to bring it down to the House.

You do not, by bringing a Resolution, put an end to the matter. Even if the

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

House approves, it only means that they say if you come to us with a Resolution we would vote for it. I say again, the same thing happened in 1947 in England, and it was five years before the British Government sent it down to the House of Commons.

You do not bind a House or a Government. You tell Government what you want. That can always be done. If the House decides to send a football team somewhere or a weightlifting team to Helsinki or anything like that, you can only tell the Government that we would like to send such a team. But Government can say, we cannot waste money on Helsinki or anything like that, even though the House agreed to it.

I want to make it clear to Members of this House that you vote money but it is left for the Council of State to say whether a Resolution for any sum shall be sent to the House. You do not bind us. I could say, or any Minister could say something. Call it wisdom, or ignorance, if you like, if we turn around and say we are not voting for this. How can you blame us?

I wish to give the hon. Member credit for one thing, and that is, making after dinner speeches on serious occasions. Now he has changed. If he had stuck to after-dinner speeches he would not now be so cruel as to accuse somebody else of dishonesty. I hope this is the last time we find anybody in the House making remarks like that.

If you want, curse me outside, but not on the floor of this House. I repeat, if I said so, it must have been with the best good-will in the world. If we turn down

anything it is because we think that some of these salaries can come about when we have more money. That is the only reason. But let us get out of our heads any idea that we are flouting democracy merely because the House passed a Resolution suggesting to pass so and so, and then the Executive which has to consider all its commitments, asked itself, "can we really afford this now".

Standing Order No. 45, paragraph 3, states:

"Except upon the recommendation of the Council of State, to be signified by a Minister and recorded in the Minutes of Proceedings, the House shall not receive any Government Bill and shall not proceed upon any Motion"

I can understand the stand of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition but not the Leader of the Opposition, who is a Solicitor.

Mr. Pierre: Take No. 21. That is correct.

The Prime Minister :

" . . . the House shall not proceed upon any Motion or amendment to a Motion the effect of which, in the opinion of the Speaker, is that provision should be made for imposing or increasing any tax, for imposing or increasing any charge on the revenues or other funds of the Federation or for altering any such charge otherwise than by reducing it, or for compounding or remitting any debt due to the Federation."

You cannot introduce, not even Government Members or Ministers can introduce anything which means taking money out

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

of the Treasury, except on the recommendation of the Council of State and the Minister must go to the Despatch Box and say that he has been authorised on behalf of the Council of State to introduce a Bill which creates a charge on the revenues of the Federation. Therefore, he is the only person who can say so, but not until the Council of State has sat down and made a decision.

Accuse me, if you like, of being cautious. But to say I am dishonest because the Council of State does not see fit to approve of certain recommendations is something else. Only certain hon. Members will do that.

As long as I have a seat in this House, even as a back bencher, let alone as Prime Minister, I will take that as an indication of what they have proven themselves to be tonight. I will never say anything improper about anybody.

Mr. Hill: You said it today.

The Prime Minister: I said the hon. Member was a Communist. Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the hon. Member and myself fought for many years together on the side of the working man of The West Indies. It had been decided by the P.N.P. that though he would make an excellent Mayor, if certain charges were proved against him he would have to go. And he went.

Dr. Duhaney: You cannot prove that.

The Prime Minister: Don't attack me. I never attack anybody first. When anybody attacks me I will never raise my hands and cry "Kamerad".

Mr. Hill: You are a stooge of the Colonial Office,

The Prime Minister: You have heard about little children sitting by the gutter and taking up mud and filth. That is what the hon. Member is doing now.

Mr. Hill: You started it.

The Prime Minister: That will never hurt my career. Keep it up if you like. I will get my votes in Barbados when I return. I wasn't aware there were voters in Jamaica or Trinidad who are voting for me.

I have to give the House an explanation, and I am perfectly sure every Member facing me, barring those two hon. Gentlemen, accept my explanation. I get on extremely well with the Opposition, inside and outside the House, but if these two hon. Members facing me think that they are going to provoke me into doing the same things they do—descend to the gutter, they have another thought coming.

Mr. Hill: We must have met you in the gutter.

The Prime Minister: Before I sit down, I will repeat. I have been in politics for a long time and I have never seen more real friendship between Members of a Government and Members of an Opposition than I have seen since Federation started here.

We get along well together. That is why I am appealing—he sneers at it—that is why I am appealing to let the rest of the world know we are working together for the good of the Federation. When you come inside here, forget the word gentleman. It is a word I hate to use, but no gentleman uses the words which the hon. Member used tonight.

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

Mr. Hill: You said I was a Communist.

The Prime Minister: What is wrong with that? Khruschev is a Communist.

Mr. Sinanan: I thought the Prime Minister was finished.

The Prime Minister: I am not. But I could always take the advice of the Leader of the Opposition. I will sit down.

Mr. Sinanan: Mr. Speaker, there are several aspects in this incident which I find extremely unfortunate, but I am going to ask the Prime Minister to consider this matter shorn of heat and to give it very impartial scrutiny. The reference to 1947 and the British House of Commons does not apply. What happened here was this: a Committee of both sides of the House was appointed by this House to make recommendations. The Council of State has absolutely no jurisdiction over this House. If anything, it is the House that has jurisdiction, and the power to review the policy of the Council of State. The custodian of our rights and privileges is the Speaker of this hon. House. And if both sides of this House, Mr. Speaker, got together and approved recommendations on this question, any Civil Servant or Minister who seeks to change this Report, is guilty of contempt of this House. And if my hon. Friend the Prime Minister wishes to set aside a date to debate this I would be only too happy, because we would come here armed with authorities to prove who is right and who is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. As a matter of fact, I regard it as one of the most serious matters that has ever occupied the attention of this House. Because

the one thing we are bound to do in this House is to lay down the firm pillars of Parliamentary democracy lest we be reproached by the people who will occupy these seats in the future.

If this is a mistake on the part of the Government, then let us accept it as a mistake; if it is a mistake by some other person, let us accept it. If this Report was adopted unanimously by this House and there is any desire to change it, the matter must be referred back to the Committee which considered it in the original instance.

If a Civil Servant sat down and did anything inconsistent then he has taken very serious liberties; or if the Minister of Finance has done this he has taken very serious liberties as regards the functions of this House.

I am not going to make any quarrel about this. I am not going to generate any heat about this, but I give you the assurance that we are going to fight this issue to the last. If necessary we will introduce Motions affecting the privileges of this House and will invoke every Parliamentary opportunity, because we feel that you should not come here and disrespect the Members of this House. And when I say so, I do not refer to all the Members opposite as being Members of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, we all stood here, as Members of this House, and voted on this matter. I remember the Debate very well, because even when the Minister of Finance was reluctant, we on this side of the House told him that if he found himself in difficulties then he should refer the matter back to the Committee and come before

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

the Committee himself and explain his problems as Minister of Finance, and let the Committee decide what they would ultimately recommend to this House. But you cannot come here and refer to that section of the Standing Orders which talks about public revenue. Obviously the reason for that is that in any form of government that is a democracy you cannot have Members of the House getting up one after the other introducing Motions or Private Bills that would result in the imposition of a charge on the public revenue. That cannot be done. Because what would happen is that you would find a number of Members bringing Motions every day Parliament sits causing public expenditure and the consequential depletion of the Treasury. So that what has been done is this — it is in every Constitution. You make provision that no Member can introduce a Motion or a Bill that would be a charge on the public revenue, unless it is sanctioned by the existing Government; that is the Executive of Parliament and that is all that really means. But in this case that does not apply, Mr. Speaker. Because this Parliament sat down and referred a matter to a particular Committee and said: "Now you report back to us and if we accept your recommendations we will forward them; if we do not accept them we will reject them or amend them." The Report was adopted. I say that to my hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister — a person I have referred to as an eminent jurist in his own right — and I am astonished that is his stand now.

Mr. Speaker, what my hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister said on this question at the time is, in my respectful opinion, the correct parliamentary usage

and correct parliamentary form. That is to say, the Prime Minister is correct in saying that if this House unanimously says that any officer in this Parliament should receive any amount of money, then it becomes the will of this Parliament. And I am going to appeal to the Prime Minister to reconsider this matter. If he is against us in the presentation of our arguments then the least he could do is to reconsider this matter and not rush and bull-doze it through the House tonight.

I agree entirely with my hon. Friend the Deputy Leader and I congratulate him on the language he has employed in putting forward his arguments. I did not understand at any time that he accused the Prime Minister of being a liar. He was merely pointing out the inconsistencies of the Prime Minister's utterances and the present action of hon. Members opposite, which any Opposition is entitled to do. Mr. Speaker, these inconsistencies are becoming too many, and I am becoming alarmed. I hope that I am wrong, but there seems to me to be an attitude on the Government front benches to display a complete disregard for the Members of this House. If this is so, Sir, I am afraid they will find that we are going to be very, very firm in our battle to maintain the privileges of our Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no merit in this argument; and it is unfortunate that the question of "Mr. Speaker" has arisen in this matter, because if it were not so I would have asked, and I would have used my right in this House to appeal to him to rule that this is contempt of this House. I cannot very well do so in the circumstances.

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

The Prime Minister: How can the Executive be guilty of contempt?

Mr. Sinanan: The Executive Comprises Members of this Parliament, and every individual Member of the Council of State is guilty of contempt of this House if a Committee's Report is accepted unanimously here and is then rejected by the Council of State. What does this mean? I am really astonished to hear the Prime Minister ask whether the Executive could be guilty of contempt, when Members of that Executive stood here in their respective capacities, on the front benches and the back benches, and voted for this Report, and then the Ministers went to the Council of State and took a contrary point of view. They did not come back to this House and give us the opportunity to refer the Report back to Committee, but they come here and say this is laying down the law. If anything is *ultra vires*, this is.

The Prime Minister: It is not!

Mr. Sinanan: Mr. Speaker, it is no use my Friend the Prime Minister saying it is not. We are saying it is. We challenge the Government to set aside a date for this Debate. We have the time. If it is necessary, let us adjourn now and resume in two hours, because in that time we would be able to put our hands on the authority.

Mr. Bramble: What authority?

Mr. Sinanan: I hope when the hon. Member becomes Chief Minister of that great sub-Continent of Montserrat he would not follow these practices, or his democracy will be imperilled before he assumes office. I really hope he does not carry these precepts to Montserrat.

Mr. Speaker, this is wrong; it is improper. And even in Parliament I hesitate to use the word "improper", but it is improper. How can you disregard the feelings of the Members of this House? How can you accept the recommendations of a Committee and then do something else without consulting them — without coming back to them in any way; without reporting back to the House and to the Committee? How can it be done? It just cannot be done.

And am I now to understand that my hon. and learned Friend, the "Minister" from Manchester, after making that very long speech, which I remember so well, and pointing the right road to his Colleagues on the Government Benches, is now trying to justify this, together with one or two of the other lawyers below the gangway? Solicitors in Trinidad are known to be extremely eminent. I doubt very much if the Member for Port-of-Spain East would support this. He cannot. Look through May's, you can borrow Campion's, you can do what you want, you will never find one authority to justify this. And I am going to appeal to my hon. Friend the Prime Minister again. Let us not today write into the Reports of this House such a bad precedent for the future. If we feel so strongly about it, in accordance with the established practice of a parliament, by paying due regard to the views of a minority — because that is one thing a Government is bound to do, whether the wishes of this minority are wrong or right — this minority feels so strongly about it that we ask you to invoke that other parliamentary practice by giving us the opportunity of proving ourselves right, and by giving the matter further consideration

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

as all parliamentary democracies allow. We ask this Government not to rush this through tonight. It is not going to end very well. It will not do for this House and this Government to be fought every inch of the way; because we will fight you and we will embarrass you. You know very well that if there was ever a Government that could not stand up to a big battle in Parliament it is the present Government. If there was ever a Government that ought to conduct itself in such a way that would enable it to have the goodwill of the Opposition it is this Government. And make no mistake about this, the West Indian public knows and the outside world is fast coming to know that it is on the responsibility of this Opposition that will rest the future and ultimate success of this Federal institution.

Hon. Members (Opposition Benches) : Hear, hear !

Mr. Sinanan : You might laugh but it is true. If this Opposition were not a responsible Opposition this Government might have found itself in some very, very difficult situations. And we are asking you not to force us to bring Motions here that will amount to Motions of Censure. We are asking you not to force us to fight this every inch of the way in this Parliament, and to have it published throughout the West Indies that this Government is prepared to mutilate established democratic and parliamentary procedure, merely because they have failed to recognise the fact that when a House accepts the recommendations of a Committee of its own that not even the Speaker could interfere with it.

The Prime Minister : He is only here to keep order.

Mr. Sinanan : He is the only authority in this House. I think my hon. Friend is tired tonight. I am suggesting that he come back refreshed tomorrow and reconsider this matter.

Mr. Bradshaw : Mr. Speaker, I don't think I should say anything more on this matter. It was debated quite fully when the Supplementary Estimates were being discussed and I won't exercise my right of reply tonight.

Mr. Sinanan : Mr. Speaker, I beg to move an adjournment of this House for half-an-hour as a mark of disapproval. Members can look in May's Parliamentary Practice, look at dilatory Motions and you will see. Sir, I submit with the greatest respect that I am entitled to move the adjournment of this House as a mark of disapproval of this Government's action and I will give my reasons for moving that Motion.

I ask this House to adjourn for half-an-hour because this is one of the worst days this Parliament has seen since Federation began. I ask this House to adjourn for half-an-hour to mark its disapproval of the manner in which this Government is conducting its affairs, in so far as this matter is concerned. I offer that to this House as my reason for moving the adjournment of this House for half-an-hour, in order that every Member of this House should show his disapproval for the fact that the arguments presented by my hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister are no longer valid arguments.

Mr. Speaker : I will consider the Motion for an adjournment. The Sitting will now be suspended until 8.00 o'clock.

Tuesday, 1st December, 1959

6.30 p.m.: Sitting suspended.

8.00 p.m.: Sitting resumed.

Mr. Speaker: At the moment when the Sitting was suspended, I indicated that I would consider the Motion for adjournment made by the hon. Member for Victoria. As I understand the procedure as explained in May's Parliamentary Practice, 16th Edition at page 408, this Motion can only be made by a "Member who, on being called by the Speaker in the course of the debate, is in possession of the House". I did not and could not call upon the hon. Member for Victoria as he had already spoken in the debate. The Motion therefore would be out of order. I would like to add that the position is somewhat embarrassing to me and I have no wish to interfere with the rights of hon. Members to move a dilatory or any other form of Motion. And of course it is open to any other Member who has not spoken on the Motion proposed to the House, if called upon, to propose a similar Motion. But I would point out that this Supplementary Appropriation Bill is a special kind of Bill embodying proposals already approved by this House in Committee of Supply. I would further point out that hon. Members will have the opportunity, on both sides of the House of course, to debate this question under Head III of the Estimates of Expenditure for 1960 which are already before the Committee of Supply.

Question put.

House divided: Ayes 17; Noes 16, as follows:

AYES	NOES
Dr. C. G. LaCorbiniere	A. S. Sinanan
R. L. Bradshaw	M. Cargill
Mrs. P. B. Allfrey	K. G. Hill
N. H. Richards	L. J. Adams
V. B. Vaughan	Archdeacon Lennon
D. P. Pierre	C. W. Swabey
D. S. Lloyd	W. B. Williams
H. F. Cooke	Dr. F. R. Duhaney
R. J. Williams	S. Mathura
R. M. Cato	E. W. Wakeland
W. H. Bramble	C. T. Afflick
B. T. Carrott	M. H. Shah
E. O. LeBlanc	S. B. Stone
J. M. D. Bousquet	L. U. Densham
R. E. Brown	M. A. Hector
L. P. Delapenha	Mrs. F. E. Daysh
A. U. Belinfanti	

17

16

Mr. D. H. L. Ward abstained.

*Motion carried.**Bill accordingly read a Second time.*

Mr. Bradshaw: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill be now read a Third time.

*Question put and agreed to.**Bill read a Third time and passed.***PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL***Order for Second Reading read.*

Mr. Bradshaw: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the Second Reading of the Pensions (Amendment) Bill.

Mr. Sinanan: Mr. Speaker, I beg to interrupt the hon. Minister. My Colleagues and I feel very strongly about the methods that were adopted by the Government in this matter, and, as a result, the only way we can show our strong disapproval of their conduct is by taking no further part in these proceedings.

Opposition Members and Mrs. Daysh withdrew from the Chamber.

ADJOURNMENT

Resolved; That this House do now adjourn—[*Mr. Bradshaw*].

Adjourned accordingly at 8.10 p.m.