

THE 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.

9th Sitting

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House met at 2.30 p.m.

Prayers

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION (No. 2, 1959) BILL

Division on Second Reading

Mr. Speaker: After the adjournment last night I was informed by the Clerk of the House that the figures of the division as announced in the House with respect to the Second Reading of the Supplementary Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1959 were incorrect, and that the actual figures were 17 in favour of the Motion and 16 against. It has been so recorded in the Minutes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. Hill (Surrey, Jamaica): **Mr. Speaker,** in the course of yesterday's proceedings the hon. Prime Minister called me a Communist, and I wish to take this opportunity of denying the allegation and of saying that I have never been and am not a Communist.

I will, in keeping with the rules of this House, say no more on this matter although, personally, I still reserve the right to raise it on other occasions.

All that remains for me to say is that if the hon. Prime Minister, for the short time he has been in this Federation —

Mr. Speaker: That is not a personal explanation. Stick to the personal explanation.

Mr. Hill: If the hon. Prime Minister wishes hon. Members and the public at large to accept what he says without corroboration, then I will invite him to repeat such statements outside of the precincts of this House, and in the hearing of witnesses.

IDENTIFICATION CERTIFICATES

Order read for the following Motion —

“Resolved that the Federal Government consider the advisability of enacting legislation to provide adult citizens of the Federation with Identification Certificates for the purpose of travel, voting and other purposes of identification within the Federation.”

—[MR. W. B. WILLIAMS]

Mr. W. B. Williams (St. Catherine, Jamaica): **Mr. Speaker,** I shall begin by

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. W. B. WILLIAMS]

inviting hon. Members on both sides of the House to listen attentively to this Motion as I go through it under three separate captions. I will first deal with it under travelling.

Now that Committees have been set up to go into certain matters relating to the revision of the Constitution, and while we anticipate freedom of movement within the Federation, I believe, Sir, that persons who have to travel to any of the ten federated Territories should be provided with some sort of identification. To ask everyone to obtain passports is a very costly thing. And I think, Sir, that some form of identification certificates should be issued to adults within the Federation. It would make things quite simple for them and they would be able to go about The West Indies without undue difficulty when freedom of movement becomes effective.

I come to voting, Sir. This is a rather touchy point. While we in this Federal Parliament must set standards for the Unit Governments of the Federation, I would insist that Members do not entertain the idea that this should be done for political reasons or for self-aggrandisement but rather to set a pattern befitting the highest Parliament of The West Indies so that other countries will appreciate the extent to which we carry out our voting as far as Federation is concerned.

When the discrepancies in Jamaica came about with regard to bogus voting, I sent a telegram to the Premier of Jamaica telling him that any investigation into the question of bogus voting should not be done by Jamaica alone but that he should invite the Federal Government to help iron out the difficulties since in any Unit of the

Federation we would like to have Federal elections conducted in the manner they were conducted in Jamaica.

I think that we should have to assist in any Territory. I am insisting that Members approach this matter — this is a thing that will have to be worked out in stages, and Committees, I presume, will have to be set up to work out a unified system of voting in order that our Federal Elections will be kept up-to-date. I appeal to Members to give this Motion their earnest consideration and so set an example for the Units of the Federation.

With regard to the other purposes of this Motion, I may say that there are times when, as we move about the Federation, it may be necessary for us to transact business in these Territories and to identify ourselves. It will be hard for a person from Jamaica who may be in Barbados for a few days, to be asked to find somebody to identify him. The same can be said for other Units of the Federation. I ask hon. Members to support this Motion for the reasons as I have afore-mentioned.

Mr. Lloyd (St. Kitts): I beg to second that.

Mr. Cato (St. Vincent): Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that the hon. Member for St. Catherine has not given the necessary time and energy to this Motion as he devoted to the Debate on the Budget which we endured a few days ago. That can be seen from his discourse on it. It would seem to me that the hon. Member is seeking to impose a good deal of regimentation on the people of The West Indies. I know of instances in which identification certificates have been used for very specific purposes. I know that such certificates

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

have been used in time of war in certain countries and abandoned immediately on the cessation of activities. I know that such certificates have been used in certain organisations such as the Police Force and other bodies, but I can hardly conceive of the purpose, or any useful purpose, which would be served by the introduction of identification certificates in the Federation at this time.

I have heard no suggestion from the Mover of this Motion as to how the cost of these identification certificates — for three and a half million people to begin with — is going to be borne; I do not know whether it is proposed that the Federation should bear the cost or that individual Territories or individual citizens should do so; but I can well imagine the reaction we would have in certain Territories. For instance, I could well imagine what the reaction in Jamaica would be, where the people would quite readily conceive of the Government of The West Indies endeavouring to place an indirect taxation upon them.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether it is proposed that a special department should be set up in the various Territories to administer the circulation of these identification certificates. I do not know whether it is proposed that one particular department would be charged with the responsibility of seeing that these certificates are carried at all times by the citizens, or whether any special check is going to be made of them. It has not been suggested whether we are going to be finger-printed for the purpose, or asked to take trips down to the photographers to have our photographs taken in order that they may be placed on these identification certificates. I see the hon. Member oppo-

site, who has recently embarked on the occupation of an amateur photographer, looking very interested; this might furnish occupation for him.

I hardly think that the majority of the people of the Federation would welcome this particular bit of regimentation. I consider that this Motion has been ill-conceived, that it is untimely and is a luxury which this Federation cannot afford to indulge in at the present time. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House cannot, and will not, support it.

Mr. Densham (St. Elizabeth, Jamaica): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the moment the most junior Member for St. Vincent gets up to speak his mind is immediately carried up to a bureaucracy. That is most significant to this side of the House. We feel that it has so permeated on the other side of the House that it has penetrated down to the most junior Member of the Opposition.—[*Laughter*].

I really have made a bloomer there, Mr. Speaker; I apologise. Perhaps I am only anticipating the future. That is all I have to say on the subject.

Mr. Hill: Mr. Speaker, the number of things that the junior Member for St. Vincent does not know would fill a catalogue in the Federal Registry or the Federal Information Office. I have yet to hear, Mr. Speaker, that when a Member of the House or any arm of the Legislature asks the Government or the Executive to consider the advisability of introducing any scheme or measure that it is incumbent on the Mover or on the House itself to say in what manner such a measure should be introduced, or such a scheme adopted. Because if the conditions implied in the

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. HILL]

speech of the junior Member for St. Vincent had to be applied, no Motion proposed in any Legislatnre could be accepted.

Mr. Speaker, what the Resolution asks the Federal Government to do is "to consider the advisability of enacting legislation to provide adult citizens of the Federation with identification certificates". Let us pause there.

The purposes of that are quite relevant at this stage. The Resolution does not say when, simply because it could not do so. And I am a little surprised and amazed that the junior Member for St. Vincent should have such little faith in the continuance of the Federation, because at this present period — well within the first five years of the transitional period—certain situations exist. Should it be thought that such situations would be permanent? So the question of time would be a matter for the Executive; the question as to the many details that my hon. Friend the Member for St. Vincent has raised would be a matter for the Executive; the question as to whether Jamaica would feel that the Federal Government would be indirectly taxing that Unit would be a matter for the Federal Government to consider when deciding—if it adopted the proposal at all. In other words, it would be a matter for the Federal Government to consider the pros and cons.

I cannot see how people are going to be regimented. If they want to travel they will ask for an identification certificate — and that is for travelling. Sir, I am certain that the first thing that an Executive, an intelligent Executive would ask itself, if it received a Motion in the form of a Resolution passed by the House would be: would

it be for all the adult citizens at large or would it be for those adult citizens who wished to travel? Those are the questions that the Executive would decide. But the fact that the Resolution doesn't pin-point and give details as to how the scheme would work is no reflection on the merit of the Resolution or on the idea behind the Resolution.

Insofar as voting is concerned, I know it would raise many questions, complex and otherwise in certain Territories; but then all these Resolutions are merely to be considered as expressions of opinion to the Federal Government, not merely for this year or next year or for the year after, but for the duration of the Federation and if we believe, if there are Members who believe, that the limitation which the Member for St. Vincent would impose upon such a Resolution were correct, then they would only be revealing their utter lack of confidence that this Federation would last for five more years.

I see no reason why this Resolution cannot be accepted, except perhaps because it comes from the Opposition. I ask this hon. House, Members on both sides, to read that Resolution calmly and objectively, to read it without considering the source from which it comes. I ask hon. Members through you, Sir, to consider it as an expression of opinion in regard to a general idea. I ask hon. Members to consider it on the basis that it could never be implemented, no scheme or proposal could be implemented, without the application of expert advice and opinion which would naturally be sought by the Executive of the Federal Government. And if Members do that, as I believe the majority of hon. Members on both sides will do, I can see

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1953

little or no difficulty in passing this Resolution and removing it out of the sphere of controversy, based upon prejudices which we would like to forget.

The Prime Minister : Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will pardon me if I am permitted merely to ask a question.

Mr. Sinanan (Victoria, Trinidad): If you behave.

The Prime Minister : I'll try. What is the difference between this and a passport? How can you have identification certificates? Authorities may give you a permit to travel based on your record. For the purpose of travelling all over the world a passport is sufficient. Why voting? You go to a voting booth and produce a passport? I understand that in some parts of the Federation, which shall be nameless, you have to push your finger in a bottle of ink to show that you voted once. If you know the secret, though, you go home and wash off the ink and come back again.

Dr. Duhaney (Clarendon, Jamaica): Bogus!

The Prime Minister : I am not going to say the name of any Territory. I am merely asking a question and I apologise because I was not in the House right at the beginning. What is the difference between an identification certificate and a passport?

Mr. Sinanan : Put the apology in writing.

The Prime Minister : I will. If you will read it out.

2.55 p.m.

Mr. Bousquet (St. Lucia): Mr. Speaker, I am up to now at a loss to under-

stand why such an identification card is required. I thought, in listening to the hon. Mover of the Resolution, that he would have told this hon. House why such an identification was required, what purpose it was intended to serve. But when he failed to tell us and the hon. Member for Surrey stood up, I very much looked forward to hearing such an explanation. But alas! I have not yet heard it. The hon. Member for Surrey at one time said: "Well it is for travelling primarily". But then there is, if I read rightly, "voting". Voting for what? Voting for Federal elections? What sort of elections? That is not stated here.

Mr. W. B. Williams : For Federal elections.

Mr. Bousquet : Voting for ordinary elections is a matter for the Unit Territories. Oh, for Federal elections! I don't know why identification cards are at all required. I understand that Members of the J.L.P. voted ten times but I don't know. I heard ten times, twenty times and so on.

Really, Sir, I must confess, as I have already done, that up to now it has not yet been explained why such a card is required and what purpose it would serve, and consequently I cannot see how I could possibly support such a Resolution.

If the Member wishes to move a Resolution for the love of doing so, all well and good, and perhaps he should try in five years' time to see if that will work; but as it is now, I know that if one wants to travel to the United Kingdom one travels with a passport. As the hon. Member for St. Vincent — I think he is the senior Member — so well said, these things

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. BOUSQUET]

are issued only at very special times — in times of hostility, times of war and so on, and especially to criminals. I think in the United States of America they are issued to criminals — to tag them as criminals, to make sure that people seeing them would know that they are criminals.

Mr. Speaker, to make a long story short, I must say that I am very much surprised at the Resolution as up to now I haven't heard a word about the purpose which it is intended to serve. So I cannot possibly see how such a Resolution could be supported by me.

Mr. Swabey (Westmoreland, Jamaica): Bogus voting.

Mr. Bousquet: I heard the hon. Member for Westmoreland is an adept at that sort of thing. I heard he was the expert in taking off the ink from people's hands in Jamaica.

Mr. Cargill (St. Mary, Jamaica): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that it is most improper for the hon. Member to make such a statement, and I hope he will withdraw it.

Mr. Bousquet: I must say, Sir, that I am only repeating what I heard. I am not making that accusation.

Mr. Speaker: I didn't hear what you said but once it has been drawn to my attention I think the proper thing to do would be to withdraw it. You can't bring "hear-say" in here and defend it.

Mr. Bousquet: But you didn't hear what I said.

Mr. Sinanan: If the hon. Member will not withdraw it, I will write a book

about him and mention all the things we have heard about him.

Mr. Bousquet: If it is untrue, Sir, I certainly withdraw it.

Mr. Sinanan: It just goes to show that you don't know what is right from what is wrong.

Mr. Bousquet: I said if it is untrue, I withdraw it!

The Prime Minister: Obviously, this is an international matter and certainly an identification certificate means nothing to a Frenchman or an individual in Venezuela. You talk about a girl or boy under twenty years not getting such identification certificates. What does the Motion ask for? I want to know. I know we are not going to vote for it and I know that hon. Members opposite will say we are dragoons and that sort of thing.

First of all, I knew nothing about this until a few moments ago when I came into this House. I must ask what is the purpose of this Motion—I see that it means nothing. You go with a certificate of identification

Mr. Sinanan: Mr. Speaker, I think the Prime Minister has spoken twice and I think that we will allow him to speak a third time. Now that he has spoken twice I would like to draw his attention to the Motion which says "Within the Federation".

The Prime Minister: The Leader of the Opposition is always very generous — in political as well as other activities. I ask for a clarification. What purpose can this Motion serve — an identification certificate, when a passport does the same? What

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

purpose does the identification certificate serve which a passport does not serve? Simple question.

Mr. Wakeland (Cornwall, Jamaica): Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed, that question is a useful one. I know that if you go to the Post Office, in any one of the Unit Territories for a registered letter and you have not got someone or something by which to identify yourself the letter is withheld; if you are not well known to a Justice of the Peace and you have no papers of identification and you want a document certified, he can never sign that document regardless of whether you are twenty-one or not. I understand that here individuals, so long as they are twenty-one, are called upon in all cases to identify themselves.

I think that this certificate would be a valuable asset to the individual. Whether hon. Members of the Government wish to take it mildly or not today, the day will come when this Motion will have to be introduced into this House if even in a different way. When we have freedom of movement and people from Grenada, St. Vincent, Barbados or any one of the Islands wish to come to Trinidad it would no longer be necessary to have a passport. A passport is a cumbersome and expensive thing and this suggested certificate could be made to do what the passport does. Take the tourist boats that come here — there are people on them who come from the U.S.A. not with a passport but a little identification card.

The Prime Minister: Before the Member sits down, I want to know this: is it not a fact

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is out of order. He has spoken three times on this Motion and cannot now make a speech.

Mr. Sinanan: We allow him five times.

The Prime Minister: I am not making a speech, I am merely asking, before the hon. Member sits down, if he will tell the House whether today it is not possible to go to the Police and get an identification card?

Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Sinanan: Mr. Speaker, frankly I am astonished at the attitude of the Government. The past few days were not very happy, yet this I cannot understand.

The Motion merely states:

Resolved that the Federal Government consider the advisability of enacting legislation to provide adult citizens of the Federation with identification certificates for the purpose of travel, voting and other purposes of identification within the Federation.

It would even be good for the Members of this hon. House because only the other day a certain well-dressed person was mistaken for the Minister of Finance. This would be a means of identifying Ministers of Government.

The Prime Minister: Somebody was convicted for impersonating you!

Mr. Sinanan: I am not aware that anyone was convicted. But it is difficult to impersonate me. I do not know that he has been convicted. I am now trying to find out.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

I am glad that the Prime Minister has raised that matter for if he supports this Motion, Members of Parliament also could be identified and no one could be able to impersonate them.

I am very glad that the Member for Cornwall brought this up. We have here in this Territory, and I believe in Barbados and other parts of the West Indies, a Labour Welfare Fund. From it some benefits go out to peasants and there are thousands of farmers who from time to time come into town to cash their cheques and who have to beseech the men in the Public Service to assist them, and we have to take the risk most times without even knowing the men and identify them in order that they can get their money from the bank. This is a very unsafe practice.

If these identification cards could be adopted it would be a great help to these people, it would help Commerce

The Prime Minister : You could use the passport.

Mr. Sinanan : My hon. Friend the Prime Minister seems not to realise that it is not everybody who has a passport in The West Indies and that there are more people among us without than with passports. If he intends to continue with his stubborn attitude — if he is really stubborn in opposing this Motion —

The Prime Minister : Who is opposing it? We are only saying we will throw it out.

Mr. Sinanan : All this Motion asks is that the Government should —

“Consider the advisability of enacting legislation to provide adult citizens of

the Federation with identification certificates for the purpose of travel, voting and other purposes of identification”

There is absolutely no obligation on the Federal Government, absolutely no onus on the Government to carry out anything. If the Federal Government wants to say that there is such machinery in existence at present in The West Indies well, what's wrong with the Federal Government saying that they will make efforts to establish a unification of the system?

Mr. Bousquet : Not simply.

Mr. Sinanan : Don't tell me the Member for St. Lucia does not want to be identified in Trinidad. We would like to know that he could be identified so that he could be saved from his P.N.M. friends in Port-of-Spain while he is walking about the Federal Capital. We want to know that we will be able to identify him when we pick him up on the streets of Port-of-Spain. How else could we? We want to be able to identify him before he falls a prey.

Mr. Bousquet : Mr. Speaker, on a point of information—

Mr. Speaker : There is no such point.

Mr. Bousquet : On a Point of Order. I just wanted to know whether I was marked down as a prospective victim of the D.L.P.?

Mr. Sinanan : The answer to that would be “Yes”. He would be a victim in so far as we can cause him to cross the floor of this House. We have nothing against the hon. Gentleman: he may not always be safe in Port-of-Spain; there may

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

be a time when we will want him to be identified.

Hon. Member : When ?

Mr. Sinanan : I cannot give the details.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my hon. Friends to consider this Motion again and the advisability of enacting legislation; the advisability of having any West Indian identified.

The Prime Minister says that if a West Indian goes to Curacao and produces such a certificate it would be meaningless. But the Resolution does not mention Curacao; they have not come into the Federation as yet.

The Prime Minister : More documents? We want to stop writing all these documents.

Mr. Sinanan : We want to get away from passports; they will have to go; but citizens of every other country have identification cards. What is the reason for opposing the Motion? Is it a reluctance to have clean voting? Is that the real reason? Is this going to make for cleaner, healthier elections? Why is it being opposed? Is it to prevent cleaner voting? I agree with my Friend the Prime Minister: even here in Trinidad finger-staining has not been very effective as we can judge from the Municipal elections.

Hon. Member : What !

Mr. Sinanan : Finger-staining has failed. Am I to stand here in this House and close my eyes to the fact that elections in Jamaica were not very clean ?

Hon. Members (Government Benches): Shame, shame ! Who says so ?

Mr. Sinanan : Will this be a means of identifying civil servants when driving in their big cars, financed by the Government, with petrol financed by the Government, when house-to-house campaigning is being done? Is this to identify civil servants ?

The Prime Minister : Is the hon. Member in order to indict a Territorial Government ?

Mr. Sinanan : Indict ? You mean when I stand up in this Federal Parliament I am not to take notice of a number of things which are bound to receive the attention of the Federal Parliament in the future when they are stronger, even if they are weak-kneed today?

What am I to understand? The hon. Member comes to this House and suggests identification certificates are going to assist not only with regard to travelling facilities but with respect to cleaner elections; and the Government is refusing even to consider the matter. I cannot understand this attitude. The elections in Jamaica were not clean, and you know it!

Mr. Ricketts : On a Point of Order. I am suggesting that the matter in Jamaica to which my Friend is referring is being probed and I do not think

Hon. Members : Hear, hear !

Mr. Sinanan : Thank you very much. The hon. Member tells me I must not indict Jamaica. The Prime Minister says I am indicting Jamaica, but the hon. Member admits

Mr. Ricketts : I did not admit it. I said nothing can be considered until it is proven. You cannot stand a licking.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

Mr. Speaker : I understand that the hon. Member was referring to allegations which have been made and which now form the subject of an investigation. The judicial investigation was refused by the House of Representatives, the Parliament of Jamaica.

Mr. Sinanan : The fear of my hon. Friend in allowing me to refer to the Jamaican elections is

Hon. Member : You were afraid in Jamaica.

Mr. Sinanan : I was never afraid in Jamaica. I will say this for the benefit of my hon. Friend: except for one place, even the P.N.P. people who came to scoff remained to cheer. I had nothing to fear.

How are we going to fight an oiled machinery — if my hon. Friend provokes me I may have to spend a long time in justifying this attempt to have identification in The West Indies. A machinery that is oiled and geared to fill a ballot-box could never overturn or devastate political principles or political philosophies, and that is a fact.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most desirable Motion. The hon. Member, if he comes from Jamaica or any other West Indian Territory where they suffer as a result of poor identification, is entitled to come to this Federal Parliament and suggest something that would affect the West Indian nation as a whole, in order to make for cleaner elections. If this could be passed, we might make healthier and cleaner elections. It might help, and if it helped one tittle, we would be justifying our position here.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this Government again: "Why are they refusing to consider

the advisability of doing it?" We are not asking them to take a firm decision saying, "Let it be done or it must be done". We are just asking them to consider the Motion, and if they feel as a Government that it would assist travelling, if they feel it would assist West Indians, if they feel it would help in elections, then do something about it. If after consideration they feel it would not help, don't do anything about it.

The Prime Minister : We have considered it.

Mr. Sinanan : When? Which one of these Committees considered it?

The Prime Minister : Years ago the Americans asked us to wipe out passports. Each Unit considered it. Go and ask your Premier.

Mr. Sinanan : I shall ask you to go outside with me in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, how can the Prime Minister say that this Government has considered it already, when the Americans asked us to do away with passports?

Mr. Joseph : Not Trinidad.

Mr. Sinanan : My hon. Friend was in the Government of Trinidad for a number of years. He says it is not correct.

I am very happy that my Friends have ceased to provoke me on the other side. I was happy for the Minister of Agriculture to continue to tell me this will not help in the elections. The battle is won to the extent that your Premier appointed a joint Committee of the House following a judicial inquiry; and the results, even the findings of one of the two Resident Magistrates, showed that more people voted than were on the voting list. How can you

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

stand up in this House and attack a judicial finding or stand up in this House and say that the Resident Magistrate was wrong?

Mr. Rose : For whom did they vote ?

Mr. Sinanan : It doesn't matter for whom they voted. That is where my hon. Friends have absolutely no sense of values. It doesn't matter for whom, once more people voted than are registered on the list. It is improper, it is bad, it is immoral, it is wrong. Now I will answer and say that those votes in the particular area where there were more votes than voters on the ballot paper were apparently all P.N.P. By now even my Friend the Prime Minister must realise that if he feels this Motion is innocuous there is absolutely no harm in this Government saying they would consider it.

Mr. W. B. Williams : Mr. Speaker, I must first thank Members on both sides of the House for their contributions to the Motion, some against and some for. But there is the old saying: "Where there is no vision the people suffer".

Hon. Member : Perish !

Mr. W. B. Williams : I say suffer. It is unfortunate that those who got up on the Government benches to oppose this Motion are living in a region where the means of travel is on a basis of relative to relative, and where there is no need for identification. But when we come to the big Territories where there is need for some type of identification and where we would suffer, then the need is clear. The prestige of voting and otherwise has been altered as a result of not being able to

identify the culprits. I say this Motion, in every phase, is worth supporting.

The Member for St. Vincent raised the question of cost. I would like to deal with that. It is important because, where a passport will cost more than a guinea, identification certificates will be in the vicinity of two to three shillings.

Mr. Pierre : How do you arrive at that ?

Mr. W. B. Williams : You have just started in this business. I have been in places where it has been brought forward and used.

I would like to say this Federal Government must begin to think on its own initiative because this Federation is peculiar in its structure as there is more water than land, and as divided as they are, the people must find a way of getting around.

How can you expect to have Federation and have people marooned in any section? If we are anticipating a prosperous Federation, if we are anticipating freedom of movement, how are we going to identify people of Jamaica from those of the other islands when the time for free movement comes about ?

We are to try this Federation, as far as The West Indies are concerned, on our own initiative. You can move from one part of Canada to another. You may travel through the United States. But even there you have identification cards. The people of those countries are clean in their purpose. But we here have a way of hoping to get to power by fair or foul means. I am insisting that my hon. Friends on the Government benches reconsider the

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[Mr. W. B. WILLIAMS]

purposes for which I have brought this Motion, and support it.

Question put.

House divided: Ayes 18, Noes 23, as follows:

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

18

23

Motion negatived.

FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

(Inter-Governmental Conference)

Order read for the following Motion:

RESOLVED that the House deplores the failure of the Inter-Governmental Conference held in Port-of-Spain during September-October of this year and requests the Federal Government, in any revision of the Federal Constitution, to implement the following principles:

1. That Unit Territory representation in the Federal House of Representatives should be based on population;
2. That the Federal Government should have no power to impose income tax, customs or excise duties, or imposts of any kind on any Unit Territory without the consent of that Territory;
3. That the Federal Government shall not acquire land under the Federal Land Acquisition

Act in any Territory until after consultation and agreement with the Government of the Unit Territory concerned;

4. That no Federal policy of industrial incentives or protection shall be enacted into law so as to affect any Unit Territory without its consent.—[Mr. Cargill]

Mr. Speaker: Before I call upon the hon. Member, I must inform the House that he has presented an amended Resolution which has been handed to me. I would ask hon. Members to correct their copies.

The amendment is contained in the first part of the Resolution which now reads as follows:—

“RESOLVED that the House deplores the *inconclusiveness* of the Inter-Governmental conference held in Port-of-Spain during September—October of this year and *agrees upon the following principles* . . . in any revision of the Federal Constitution:”

Mr. Cargill (St. Mary, Jamaica): Mr. Speaker, the enthusiasm with which these amendments were met by hon. Members on the other side gives me courage to hope that for once in their lives they might possibly listen with some enthusiasm, if not exactly with intelligence, to what the Opposition is saying.

Mr. Speaker, I felt it necessary to put forward this Motion before this hon. House for the purpose of trying to get this House to clarify its thinking and its views on certain fundamentals which are very important to the people of The West Indies and particularly to the people of Jamaica.

As we all know, a Conference on the Constitution is envisaged in which representatives from the Federal Government and the Unit Territories and the United Kingdom Government will eventually meet and revise the Constitution of The West Indies. But at no time has this House ever

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

given to The West Indies any firm idea of what in fact this House feels about any possible revision of the Federal Constitution. It is as if everybody is giving parties without the guests of honour.

Sometime ago a Motion was brought before this House and that Motion was defeated. It will be remembered that that Motion was brought by the now resigned Member for St. Thomas (Mr. Lightbourne) and after a very considerable Debate in which the Government did everything possible to belabour and to defeat the Motion the matter came to an end without there being any understanding as to exactly where this House stood.

I do not want to indulge in any recriminations about the past, but it will be remembered on that occasion that among the views put up by this side of the House was the proposal that we should have proportionate representation. That view was contradicted and opposed by all the Members on the Government Benches. It must subsequently have been a matter of considerable embarrassment to the Members of the Government benches who are from Jamaica, for within a matter of about four or five months after those Members had voted against the views put forward by the Opposition, those very same views were in fact adopted as the official policy of the party to which they belong in Jamaica, and the Premier of Jamaica got up in the House of Representatives in Jamaica and fought for those very same views.

Naturally a situation of that kind, Mr. Speaker, has caused a great deal of confusion in the minds of people not only in Jamaica but through the whole of The West Indies.

Here are five Members of the Government who appear to have voted contrary not only to their own Party, not only to their own Government in Jamaica but contrary to the policy which has now become the official united policy of Jamaica — a policy in which both sides of the House and both Parties in Jamaica, and everybody in Jamaica are solidly joined, and I think that for this reason alone, if there were no other reasons, it is necessary to get those five Members here in this House to declare themselves in order to let Jamaica, to let this House and the people of The West Indies know where they stand. There are certainly many other reasons. I do not know what my Friend opposite finds so outrageously funny. Naturally we have heard so many different points of view from that side; we have heard so many contradictions — one man saying this and his Party saying the other. I think it is high time to clear the air and get Members to settle down.

Hon. Member (Government Benches): And what is the Opposition saying?

Mr. Cargill: If what I am saying amuses certain hon. but simple-minded Members of the other side, I am glad. I am glad that at any rate it entertains them even if they do not understand what I am getting at.

Hon. Member (Government Benches): And what is Bustamante saying?

Mr. Cargill: My Friend asks: what is Sir Alexander saying? He is saying exactly what I am saying and exactly what your leader, Mr. Manley, is saying, only that we said it in advance and you are now following our example.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

Mr. Pierre : Your example !

Mr. Cargill : Apart from those arguments and those minor considerations, I think it is wrong that of all the people who have given vent to their feelings and their ideas the only body who has not is the body most deeply concerned, namely the Federal Government itself. As a matter of fact I should have thought that before all these various Committees and Working Parties were put underway that the Government would have taken the elementary precaution of coming to this House and finding out how this House as a whole feels about the Constitution issue. But not a bit of it! The Government in its usual way — for they seem these days to be hiding behind somebody's apron-strings; either the Governor-General's or somebody's else — has remained silent on this matter. So that, Mr. Speaker, we on this side felt that for this reason we would like to provoke some thought from the Government on the subject and so arrange matters that this House would at least have the opportunity of giving its views not on every point of the Constitution, because that would not be practical at this stage, but on the major points which have caused the greatest concern, not only to everybody in The West Indies but particularly to Jamaica. Because I think, Mr. Speaker, that everybody here will realize that our way in the Federation would not be clear, our path would not be smooth, until the large Territory of Jamaica is set at ease. And every time we on this side of the House have come here and tried to set Jamaica's mind at ease we have met all kinds of opposition from the Government, even opposition which has contradicted the leaders in the Territory concerned.

I feel, Sir, that the time has come when we must stand up and give our views, and we must let The West Indies know what we all feel about the matter.

I do not intend to speak much longer, but this particular Motion speaks for itself. There are four major points in this Motion, Sir. I would like to say that I know perfectly well that this House cannot pass any Resolution here today that is going to bind any future Conference, because in the last resort the Conference to take place is the Conference between the Unit Territories, the Federal Government and the United Kingdom Government. Therefore nothing we pass here today could bind any future conference, nor can it even, if the Motion were to be passed here and now, cause anything to be written into the Constitution. I am perfectly well aware of that. All I am trying to say is that we have got to find out what this House feels about it, because some time or another this Parliament has got to be a party to the Constitutional Conference convened under Article 118 and cannot go into that Conference not knowing what its point of view is going to be. And certainly it would be absurd for it to do so.

The Motion, Sir, expresses four main principles about which we are concerned:

Number 1 —

“That Unit Territory representation in the Federal House of Representatives should be based on population;

Number 2 —

“That the Federal Government should have no power to impose income tax, customs or excise duties, or imposts of any kind on any Unit Territory without the consent of that Territory”;

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

In the latter case, after a certain lamentable outburst on behalf of the hon. the Prime Minister, that matter was threshed out quite fully in this House and I think that all of us here fairly well understand the position. Even if perhaps the hon. the Prime Minister does not.

Number 3 :

“That the Federal Government shall not acquire land under the Land Acquisition Act in any Territory until after consultation and agreement with the Government of the Unit Territory concerned;”

Here again, Sir, that matter was fairly well threshed out during a debate here on the Land Acquisition Act. Everybody knows that a Government must have power compulsorily to acquire land against an individual, but all it says is that if the Federal Government wishes to acquire land compulsorily against an individual in a Unit Territory — it doesn't have to ask the individual, — nobody would suggest that — but it has to ask the Unit Territory whether that Government of the Unit Territory consents to its walking in and taking land from one of its individuals.

Number 4 :

“That no Federal policy of industrial incentives or protection shall be enacted into law so as to affect any Unit Territory without its consent.”

Here again, Mr. Speaker, hardly any argument is needed at this stage. Jamaica, and indeed other Territories, have made it quite clear that they would in no circumstances consent to any action by this Parliament which would hamstring or handicap industrial development which, in

a country like Jamaica, is already under way. Indeed, I think it quite fair to say that if the Federal Government were ever to take any action, any action at all, that would jeopardise the nascent industrialisation of Jamaica, that would be the end of Federation so far as Jamaica is concerned. Mr. Wills Isaacs made that crystal clear in stronger terms than I have just made. And I agree with him and I would like to go on record as having agreed with him. There are people, various people all over The West Indies, various Governments who made their views fairly clear in this matter. But I think it high time, that is why I got up to move this Motion, that we should let The West Indies know just precisely where we stand in this House on these points that I have put forward.

Mr. Mathura (Caroni, Trinidad) : Mr. Speaker, I crave your indulgence to second the Motion so ably moved and presented for the consideration of hon. Members of this distinguished House by the Member for St. Mary's, Jamaica. It is not to be supposed for one moment that I have any intention to reiterate what I believe the Mover of the Motion has dealt with so masterfully. In my opinion he has been factual, precise and since also, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion — judging from the rather amicable expressions on the faces of hon. Members of this distinguished House, more so of our Friends across the Table — I have no doubt that when the vote is taken of this Motion it will be recorded as having been unanimously accepted.

Mr. Speaker, through the ages we have been taught in life generally, and history has proven to us that nothing that is worthwhile having, to cherish or to own, is ever accomplished easily. The Federation of

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. MATHURA]

Malaya, the Federations of the United States of America, Canada, Australia and for that matter Switzerland, have all had their trying days, their strains and their stresses, their trials and tribulations. Today, Sir, we the very humble Members of the Opposition are undertaking to assist the Government in solving some of the most pressing and complex issues, some of the most major problems, problems which can have far-reaching consequences in the future development of this beloved Federation of ours.

This is a Motion with which each and every one of us in this House is very familiar. What this Motion seeks to do is indeed familiar to West Indians who are politically alert to the critical situation confronting this West Indies Federation. This Motion originated from the failure, or should I say with due respect to you, Sir, from the "inconclusiveness" of the Inter-Governmental Conference, so recently held in this building. In my opinion, and I am sure that I express the opinion of hon. Members of this side of the House, the inter-Governmental Conference was a miserable failure. It could be likened to Inter-Governmental limbo dance in which some of the entertainers were too small to pass under the bar, others were too short to hold the bar high enough, and since the fat ones were left out to provide a side show, the show was eventually called off and fixed for another day. The big grand show.

Mr. Speaker, going down the lines of this Resolution I see that it says that the Federal Government should have no power to impose income tax, etc. I prefer to deal with this vexed question of taxation and I claim your privilege, Sir, to remind hon. Mem-

bers of this distinguished House that in the year 1958, and you will no doubt recall this, when the Democratic Labour Party went to the polls in the Federal elections, we of the Unit Territories of Trinidad and Tobago, made a most sincere promise to the electorate. We knew that the population of this Unit Territory was heavily and unjustifiably taxed already, and so, we promised that when we should have taken our rightful places within the four walls of this House, we would oppose vehemently any move, any measure of additional and further taxation.

Let me remind and refresh the minds of hon. Members of this House that the people of Trinidad and Tobago are likely to be taxed further next year, according to the Premier of that country when he sought approval by that country's Legislature of his Motion for improving the status of Civil Servants.

Mr. Sinanan : Rose is behind that.

Mr. Mathura : May I enquire, Sir, with due respect, why is this obsession for more revenue? Why is this obsession for more revenue, without the corresponding effort for better facilities and more amenities?

Don't make your remarks near the Table where only Hansard will record them. Get up and talk and we will have the opportunity to reply to you.

Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty of saying that we, the Members of the Opposition representing the two largest Territories of the Federation, are unquestionably opposed to any measure of taxation whatever, moreso taxation on people who are in no position to pay.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

Some of our Friends opposite seem amused and obsessed with this subject of taxation, moreso my Friend from Trinidad. Taxation is their cry now; once it was emancipation, the other year it was taxation, the next year it was discrimination, and the next year radiation. I foresee that the next year will be mass rejection.

—[*Laughter*]

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to prolong this Debate but I would like to refer to another important part of the Resolution. It seeks—

“that the Federal Government shall not acquire land under the Federal Land Acquisition Act in any Territory until after consultation and agreement with the Government of the Unit Territory concerned;”

Land Acquisition — two words in the English vocabulary, which provide an extremely bitter taste to the mouth of people who are accustomed to living in comfort, acting in comfort and living in freedom.

May I remind the hon. Members, Mr. Speaker, that land in any part of the world is of no value unless human labour has explored it, unless human labour has built on it, unless human labour has burnt and ploughed it into cultivation or unless human hands have exploited it. Land is no more essential, in my opinion than capital or food is essential to this Federation. What I believe the Federal Government should undertake to do is to take the necessary steps to initiate or encourage legislation throughout the Federation to safeguard against exploitation of land owners — enabling them, encouraging them to play the

part they have always played of providing the bulk of the capital in agriculture.

I am sure that I give the opinion of all Members on this side of the House when I say that we are representing public opinion on this side of the House as regards to land acquisition by the Federal Government without due consultation with the Unit Government concerned. That this should be the policy of the Federal Government without due consultation with the view of the Unit concerned — is a gross interference of the natural rights and privileges of personal property.

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

Mr. Pierre: Not personal, real property.

Mr. Mathura: Let us not misinterpret this Resolution. What this Government seems not to realise is that public opinion is a dynamic force, it is a most important instrument behind any Government undertaking to govern peoples in any part of the world. What the Government should keep in mind is that a Government's responsibility is to secure acceptance by way of public opinion, not to block the expression of public opinion as to its proposals. That does not mean that the Government has to recite in detail to the public what is its every proposal but it is the duty of Government to consider and make allowances for public opinion and to state to the public what is Government's general policy, its policy which undoubtedly will affect the particular masses of the country that Government has undertaken to govern. Public opinion judges the taste of the cake by the cooking not the ingredients.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. MATHURA]

So much has been said in this House, Mr. Speaker, during the last 72 hours about the future development of the smaller Territories of the Federation and still we hear about land acquisition in the Federation. What concrete proposals has the Federal Government submitted for the development of the smaller Units?

I have had the opportunity of going, since I am a Member of this House, to all the smaller Units of the Federation and, my Friend from St. Lucia knows that I have danced with the people, dined with them, talked with them on matters affecting their everyday life. I have participated in their joys and sorrow and I can tell you that the peoples of the smaller Units of the Federation are totally fed-up, completely fed-up. They need jobs and have not got them; they need food

Mr. Bousquet: What?

Mr. Mathura: That is not true about St. Lucia. St. Lucia does not need food. They need better living conditions. When we present these problems of the peoples to the Government all that we could hear is that Government 'is concerned,' 'we are aware', 'we are quite up-to-date on the facts' and yet nothing is being done. It is true that hon. Members opposite have the majority in this House. We know how they came by that majority.—[**Hon. Members:** Tell us how].—It is very embarrassing at times to see how they use that majority.

The Prime Minister: We earned it. That's how we got it.

Mr. Mathura: Mr. Speaker, it would be worth the while for hon. Members in this House to know that in my opinion

there are certain Members of the Government who are capable of making a success of this West Indies Federation without taxation and acquisition. There are men on the opposite side, who are efficient and understanding but who, I am afraid have got their hands tied — not tied with chains or rope — but they are held and controlled so as to dance to the tune of the tall man with the guitar in Jamaica and the little man with the steel-pan in Trinidad. I feel that the sooner hon. Members of the Government decide to take on their responsibilities and do not allow themselves to be dictated to by the leaders of the largest Territories the better it would be for the future well-being of this Federation. I am not aware, Sir, what would be the general effect of this but I have one message for my hon. Friends in this House and that is — no Member of this House should cease undue suffering to any of his fellow West Indians, either directly through the infliction of personal violence or indirectly through economic and moral coercion.

It is of utmost importance that, whatever be the result of this debate, we the hon. Members of this House be afforded the continued privilege of walking the streets of the various Units as West Indians, sailing the seas of the Caribbean as West Indians, carrying our message of dwelling together in unity, seeking a rightful place under God's clear blue sky, amongst the Nations of the world.

The Minister of Communications and Works (Mr. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the hon. the Mover of the Motion and the Seconder putting forward what they hope this House would accept as the reasons for supporting this

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

Motion. We, on this side of the House, have been listening quite attentively in order to see whether they could justify what appears to us to be very peculiar concepts.

The Resolution, which has just been moved and seconded, asks this House to accept certain principles. The principles to be accepted are: that Unit Territory representation in the Federal House of Representatives should be based on population; that the Federal Government should have no power to impose income tax, customs or excise duties, or imposts of any kind on any Unit Territory without the consent of that Territory. Listen to this again, Mr. Speaker: that the Federal Government should have no power to impose income tax, customs or excise duties, or imposts of any kind on any Unit Territory without the consent of that Territory; thirdly, the Federal Government shall not acquire land under the Federal Land Acquisition Act in any Territory until after consultation and agreement with the Government of the Unit Territory concerned; and finally, that no Federal policy of industrial incentives or protection shall be enacted into law so as to affect any Territory without its consent.

In putting forward this Motion the first mistake which I think the hon. Member for St. Mary made is that he comes here and talks about the President of the W.I.F.L.P. having a particular policy in Jamaica which he says has been accepted, which is now the Government policy and which is the united policy of both Parties in Jamaica; and he proceeds

to infer that because of this the W.I.F.L.P. must accept and endorse that policy. On behalf of Members of this House . . .

Hon. Member (Opposition Benches):
Not the House, the Government.

Mr. Rose: . . . on this side of the House, I say that the time has come when hon. Members must appreciate the distinction between the Federal Party and Unit Parties. Each Unit Party has its own policy: it must: it is entitled to have its own policy.

Hon. Member (Opposition Benches):
I thought so long ago.

Mr. Rose: We have a Federal Party consisting of a number of Unit Parties. Each of these Unit Parties has an individual policy. The Federal Labour Party develops its own policy and the Federal Party cannot hope to bind or to restrict any Unit Party, particularly when that Unit Party is the Government in that particular Territory.

I think the time has come when Members of this House should realise that there is a distinct difference between the policy of the Federal Government, the Federal Party, and the Parties of individual Governments. There must be a great distinction between them because they have entirely different approaches. A Unit Territory is studying a particular policy in relation to the Territory. The Federal Government must think of the whole Federation and consequently it is necessary to modify the Unit Territory's policy in the context of the Federal Party.

Mr. Sinanan: You didn't tell the people of Trinidad that!

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

Mr. Rose : We did tell them that.

The West Indies Federal Labour Party's manifesto says this: that nothing in the Federal Labour Party's manifesto can be rejected by any Unit Territory which forms that Party

Hon. Member : Rejected only by P.N.M.

Mr. Rose : It has not been; nothing has been rejected.

Mr. Sinanan : Is Mr. Manley supporting it ?

Mr. Rose : Mr. Manley is supporting it. The West Indian Federal Labour Party which put out an election manifesto, has come into power and the Government is trying to put into actual practice the policies in that manifesto and no Unit Territory — no constituent unit party — would attempt to prevent the W.I.F.L.P. Government from implementing that policy.

I think Members should be aware of this and should not try to speak about the P.N.P. in Jamaica or the W.I.F.L.P. in The West Indies as if they are one and the same thing.—[*Interruption*]—Quite naturally. You have the same Leader over there too.

Mr. Sinanan : We say the best.

Mr. Rose : The best? I will not be drawn into any sort of bantering about individual people who are not Members of this House, but I would like to say that we on this side of the House

Hon. Member (Opposition Benches) : Are you speaking on behalf of the Government ?

Mr. Rose : cannot accept the Resolution in its present form. First of all, there is a particular concept which runs throughout this Resolution. This peculiar concept is that nothing which the Federal Government can do or must do, must be done without the consent of the Unit Governments.

Hon. Member (Opposition Benches) : That's right.

Mr. Rose : That is a peculiar concept. I challenge the Members opposite to show any precedent in any Federation, in the Federations to which some Members have referred — the Federation of Malaya or the Federation of Nigeria — for this type of Federal concept.

Mr. Sinanan : Produce a similar Constitution first.

Mr. Rose : We have.

Mr. Sinanan : Show a similar Constitution.

Mr. Rose : That is not the answer. We accepted — the people who were the architects accepted as a basic pattern the Australian Constitution. Isn't that so? That is what they have done. The Constitution which we are trying to work, has been based on the Australian pattern.

Mr. Sinanan : Not entirely.

Mr. Rose : It has been modified here and there, naturally, but that is the basic concept.

Mr. Sinanan : I wish my hon. Friend would give way to a question.

Mr. Rose declined.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

Mr. Sinanan : I can't help it if he is not a good parliamentarian.

Mr. Rose : I am that and hence the reason why I don't give way

Mr. Sinanan : I always resume my seat when a Member rises.

Mr. Rose : I am not afraid of anything.

Mr. Sinanan : Why don't you give the answer? At least it would be better for you to answer it now.

Mr. Rose : Mr. Speaker, may I continue?

We cannot accept this peculiar concept that any Federal Government action must be subject to the previous consent of the Unit Territories. That in itself is a negation of something which is a basic factor of all Federal concepts — the principle that Territorial Governments within the sphere of their own constitutional responsibilities, are sovereign: that is to say, the Unit Territories working within their own particular fields.

Mr. Sinanan : I must rise on a Point of Order. I am sure the hon. Prime Minister does not share this particular theory that is being enunciated. Is the hon. Minister saying that a particular Unit Territory is not a part of this Government or part of this Federation?

Mr. Rose : I see, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Member has had to resort to a subterfuge.

Mr. Sinanan : I still have not heard the answer.

Mr. Joseph : Ask somebody else.

Mr. Sinanan : But he is the only learned man in the whole Government.

Mr. Rose : May I repeat what I was saying — that the particular concept enunciated in this Resolution is contrary to what is a basic Federal concept, and for that reason we cannot accept it.

The hon. Member for St. Mary, when he was moving this Resolution, referred to the Inter-Governmental Conference, and said, Sir, that the Federal Government had not made known its attitude to Federation and to the Federal Constitution. I would have thought that what the hon. Minister of Finance said yesterday was sufficient to refute any attempts by anyone to say that this Government had not done any work, and had not had any concise views on what the Federal Constitution should be.

The Minister of Finance pointed out that a number of papers had been prepared by the Federal Government and I was therefore surprised to see the hon. Mover of the Resolution getting up here and trying to perpetuate this myth.

Another peculiar thing which has emerged from this debate is that the hon. Mover of the Motion said he brought this particular Motion to the House for the purpose of embarrassing the Jamaican Members of the Government.

Hon. Members (Opposition Benches) : Not at all.

Mr. Cargill : I am glad to see the hon. Minister has at last given way. He must not say what is not true. I did not

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. CARGILL]

say we had brought this Motion to embarrass the Government. I said I had brought it for the purpose of finding out the views not only of the whole House but of all sections of the House.

Mr. Speaker : I would like to point out that the proper expression to use in rising on a Point of Order is that "the hon. Members must not misquote me. He must not say what is not true".

Mr. Rose : Mr. Speaker, may I put it this way. We on this side got the impression, from what the hon. Member said, that the purpose of bringing this Motion was to embarrass the Jamaican Members on this side of the House. May I say this, Sir, that we on this side of the House are tired of these specious threats from the Jamaican Members of the Opposition.

Mr. Joseph : Thanks! You are obliged to Sir Grantley.

Mr. Sinanan : Williams wrote it and Sir Grantley is instructing you.

Mr. Rose : They come here, Mr. Speaker, and try to test the loyalty of Members who have shown and demonstrated in this House time and again that they have one paramount loyalty—loyalty to the Federation, and that their one purpose in this hon. House is to see that Federation succeeds.

I think the time has come when we should make them realise that those Members from Jamaica who are on this side of the House, no matter how many attempts at embarrassment are made by

the Opposition, will stick to the concept of Federation and see that it works.

Mr. Speaker, let us examine this Resolution. Let us see what it attempts to say. Look at Number 2. There is absolutely no need for me, at this stage, to say anything about Number 1, by virtue of the decisions which are now being taken in Another Place. But what is this new concept of the Federal Government imposing taxation on the Unit Territories? Are we going to have a continuation of the mandatory levy? Is this what the hon. Mover of the Resolution intends? That we should have a perpetuation of the mandatory levy so that thereafter Government would not be in a position to impose taxation on the Unit Territories?

I would have thought that one of the things which Government was to impose

Mr. Sinanan : Tax them for the City of Port-of-Spain.

Mr. Rose : The hon. Member can make these statements because he is privileged.

Mr. Sinanan : I have said it outside of the House. And I will say it again. Tax them for the City of Port-of-Spain.

Mr. Rose : Go on. You are privileged. Mr. Speaker, what is this nonsense we have here? I know hon. Members opposite will certainly not say things they don't mean.

Mr. Sinanan : We have said it already.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

Mr. Rose : Are you on a Point of Order? Mr. Speaker, we have heard that there must be no form of taxation. I would have thought that by now we would have reached the stage in our political development when no representative of the people would come into an hon. House like this and propound such a peculiar theory — that Government must continue to work without having the power to tax.

Mr. Sinanan : You want to go to Jamaica and tax them?

Mr. Rose : I would have thought that we had long passed this particular stage.

Mr. Sinanan : Why didn't you tell your leader that in the Conference? Why didn't you tell Manley?

Look at No. 3, Mr. Speaker. Here we are told that the Federal Government should not acquire land without consultation and agreement with the Government of the Unit Territory concerned. May I say quite categorically on behalf of my Government that we would never attempt to acquire any land in any Unit Territory without consulting them in the first instance and without attempting to get an agreement.

Mr. Hill : We cannot accept that!

Mr. Rose : But, Mr. Speaker, let us assume that there has been consultation and that it was not possible to come to an agreement, certainly there must be some authority which must be able to say, in the interest of the Federation as a whole, that this particular land must be acquired by the Federation for this particular type of use. And certainly, Sir, I

do not understand what this Motion really purports!

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

Mr. Rose : Really, I do not understand it. We are told that we must not enact any law of industrial incentives without getting the consent of the Unit Territory concerned. We have given that assurance —

Mr. Hill : We want more assurance from this Government.

Mr. Rose : — and we would give it again. Sometime ago a statement had been given in this House by the Deputy Prime Minister —

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

Mr. Speaker : May I remind hon. Members that there are rules against interrupting a Member while he is speaking, however exasperating his speech may be.

Mr. Sinanan : Mr. Speaker, I wish to apologise on behalf of the Opposition, but I would like to remind you that even in the House of Commons whenever a Government that is famous for not living up to its word makes any promise, there is usually an uproar.

Mr. Speaker : It is the duty of the Speaker to correct.

Mr. Rose : Mr. Speaker, these cheap jibes from the hon. Members opposite will not deter me from saying what I have to say. As a Government we have our responsibilities to the people of The West Indies, which responsibilities we are prepared to continue to discharge, and it is

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. ROSE]

quite all right for Members of the Opposition to come here and talk nonsense — sorry, Sir — and to charge the Government with being dishonourable.

I think that I would rather not pursue that particular point. I might be tempted, Mr. Speaker, to transcend the ordinary limits of parliamentary decorum.

Mr. Speaker, may I say finally that there are certain basic principles which we on this side of the House have accepted and which we have enunciated as being desirable for a Federal Government. This particular Resolution attempts to cut across those principles, and for the reasons which I have already given we are not prepared to support this Motion.

4.35 p.m. : *Sitting suspended.*

5.00 p.m. : *Sitting resumed.*

Mr. LeBlanc (Dominica): Mr. Speaker, I have taken opportunity on a previous occasion to speak on an almost similar Motion. And I am here today to reiterate the arguments I advanced on that particular occasion.

The question of representation is a knotty problem. That was proved at the Inter-Governmental Conference held in Trinidad recently and I must admit that those people who took part in those deliberations did, to a certain extent, approach the matter in a very statesman-like way. I would like to see this attitude adopted by the Opposition in this hon. House.

Some Members glibly talk about other Federations and use them as a means of justifying their case when they ask for

representation according to population. But The West Indies Federation is not a monolithic land-mass. We are divided by water, and although we may say our histories are similar, there are still little differences, in expression, in customs, in methods of approach to particular problems.

It is for this reason I am asking the Opposition to withdraw this Motion. I do not entirely endorse their attitude on very many things. It is not my duty in this hon. House to attribute motives, and I will not do it here. But somehow, it creates a question-mark in my mind. Why is the Opposition, which consists mainly of Jamaicans insisting that the House should be comprised mainly of Jamaicans? Whether you are Jamaican, Antiguan, Dominican, the main reason why we in The West Indies have come together to form a Federation and try to become a Nation is that we wanted to be free from the compromising yoke of Imperialism.

If it is the intention of Jamaica to become the Government of The West Indies, then no people of the smaller Territories will agree to reject British Imperialism and accept Jamaican Imperialism in its place.

It may be unfortunate for Members of the Opposition here, but I maintain that Members of an Opposition, which constitutes the majority of Members from Jamaica, are in support of representation based on population. No Unit Territory will remain in this Federation as a Colony of another Unit.

We hear from the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, according to the second require-

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

ment of the Motion, that the Federal Government should have no power to impose income tax, customs or excise duty or taxes of any kind on any Unit Territory, without the consent of that Territory.

This matter has been reviewed in this House already, Mr. Speaker. But while the Opposition demands that this, as a Federal Government, should have no power to do this, no power to do that, and must always come back to the Unit Territories to see whether they agree with them in their plan to carry out certain things, these very Members come here with Motions asking for money to spend on various projects. At every Sitting of the House you will find Jamaican Members asking for amenities for the smaller Territories and asking that more be done for these Territories.

We realise that, at this stage, the only monies the Federal Government can spend are monies received from the Colonial Office and elsewhere. We are aware of the fact that the Mandatory levy restricts expenditure of the Federal Government to around \$9,000,000. Therefore, I do not see why this Motion should be brought up, except to magnify the inconsistencies of the Opposition.

This harping about the smaller islands abroad: it is high time it is stopped in this hon. House, because it only provokes remarks that are not really decorous or statesmanlike. I would like the Member for Caroni to realise that in spite of the fact we in the smaller Territories are poor—we do not deny it—it must be

realised there is also poverty in the larger islands.

Look at Shanty Town or the Ras Tafarian Settlement in Jamaica. In every Territory you will find poor and rich. In Jamaica, opulence and riches thrive side by side with poverty and squalor.

The West Indies as a whole is a very poor region, and I think it is the duty of this hon. House to let our first responsibility be to the people of The West Indies, in our efforts to become a nation. I am advising that we should approach our problems in a more realistic and statesmanlike manner.

Mr. Vaughan (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest and a certain amount of trepidation—may I put it that way—to the hon. Member from St. Mary, and I must begin by saying, at once, I cannot agree and I cannot even respect the sentiments couched here in his Motion:

First, “that Unit Territory representation in the Federal House of Representatives should be based on population”. But that was something discussed at the late Conference. And may I pat myself on the back, for I was the first Member—the hon. Member (Mr. Sinanan) can bear me out—to stand up and say that the Conference should agree to the contention and insistence of Jamaica, that we should not discuss anything else before the question of “representation”. It was some time after my appeal that the big shots got up and consented to that same request.

Mr. Speaker, this question of consent—before the Federal Government does

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. VAUGHAN]

this and before the Federal Government does that, and before the Federal Government does the other, it must seek the consent of Unit Territories — displays a total ignorance of the concept of Federation; an infantile view, and unworthy of a Member elected to this Parliament.

We have got consent: The consent of Jamaica, Trinidad, Barbados, the Windward Islands and the Leeward Islands brought the Federal Government into existence. When they discussed the idea of Federation in London and ratified that idea by accepting the Constitution legalised by Her Majesty's Government, was the consent absolutely essential to bring this Federal Government into being? We have not got to seek further consent to carry out the powers which the Constitution granted us. We can seek consultation by right, but if the idea is that before we can advance any of our own concepts for the good and progress of The West Indies we must seek consent of every Unit, then this Federation cannot ever exist; and I would not be proud to be a Minister in such a Federation, because it would be a Federation lacking the fundamentals of a Federation.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is further consent. Everybody seems to forget that further consent. We have been elected by the people of The West Indies. This is a more fundamental consent — even if I may say so. And if the Federal Government is asking for power to do this, that and the other, it justifiably wants that power, because it only wants power to advance the interest and progress of the people of The West Indies. There

could not be any other reason for wanting greater power. We want power for our purposes here as a Federal Government which would only be obstructed by the selfishness and by the reactions of certain powerful little elements in the various Unit Territories.

We must have certain powers. No Federal Government in its political senses wants power to detract from the progress of any Unit; no Federal Government in its political senses wants power to retard the progress of a place like Jamaica in its present forward strides; no Federal Government wants power for such purposes, because the advancement of Jamaica means advancement for its people and the advancement of the Federation.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Vaughan: May I say here and now, Mr. Speaker, despite what others may think, I was very impressed by the Jamaica leadership, and I think such leadership essential to the faster progress of this Federation. But let nobody think that we are going to get that progress from the sort of obstructive tactics advanced by the Opposition.

The very Conference which some called a "failure", and some, "inconclusive", is evidence that this Government does not mean to tread rough-shod over any Territory. This Government, after all, brought that Conference into being. Never forget that. This Government brought that Conference into being, premature or otherwise. When these ten Territories came together, they realised that there was a positive purpose for coming together in Federation. They realised that none of

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

them alone could exert the influence over world opinion; none of them could advance the ultimate interests of their peoples, if they remained as individual Unit Territories. And when the smaller islands joined this Federation and consented to bring this Federal Government into being, the only purpose for their consent was to get away from the consequences of their smallness. And every West Indian, if he is worthy of becoming a "national" and belonging to a nation, must welcome the smaller Territories into this Federation and do everything in his power to see that the Federation brings them out of the consequences of their smallness, which is the only purpose for their being in this Federation. They are not in this Federation only to take from it all they can grab. They have something to contribute to this Federation. We must remember that the smaller Territories have produced citizens who rank among the greatest of these West Indies.

There should be no question of disrespecting the smaller Territories because of their smallness. If this Federation seeks power for the acquisition of land it must have that power if the acquisition of land means the advancement of the peoples of the Territories. And that is the only reason why it would want that power. If the Federation wants power or must have power to tax, it must get that power to tax in the interest of the advancement and the progress of the peoples of the Federation; not to tax to embarrass the progress of any Unit. No Federation in its political senses would seek to do that. No Federal Government would seek to do that. You must give

the Federal Government credit for some political sense and vision

Mr. Sinanan : That's just what we did !

Mr. Vaughan : and failing to do that you only become obstructionists, not an Opposition. There is a difference between the two, a fundamental difference. Her Majesty's Opposition! You have that title. Her Majesty's Opposition! Not Her Majesty's Obstructionists. When the Opposition degrades into obstruction, it is time for the electorate to pelt them out

Mr. Sinanan : Let's go to the polls.

Mr. Vaughan : We want no obstructionists in this Government and we must regard any Member that brings Motions like this as an unadulterated obstructionist. He really doesn't believe in Federation, and he is only here for the purpose of seeing that he can obstruct the progress of the Federation. He has no faith in the Federation. He has the old-time cliquish pettiness that West Indians are not ready for nationhood and have no right with it. The man who can bring this Motion, yes, the politician who can bring this Motion, fundamentally deep in his own consciousness he doesn't accept the Federation, nor does his Party. In his political consciousness he has never accepted Federation and that is the reason for bringing that Motion. But however much he may wish to impress his Colleagues that the Federal Government wants to make them poorer, we hope that this Party and its affiliated sections in the other Territories will convince the majority of the people in the

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. VAUGHAN]

Territories that Federation is for their good. And let me tell you something that everybody may forget — Federation is popular with the common man. It is popular here, in Jamaica, all about. Federation is popular with the common man.

Mr. Sinanan : You let him insult you, he's calling you-all common.

Mr. Vaughan : It only needs the propagandist agencies of the various Federal Parties to put it across for good, and then everybody — Opposition Parties, Opposition Leaders

Dr. Duhaney : On a Point of Order. Are we to understand that the hon. Minister is telling us about the policies of Parties or is he talking about the Federal Government ?

Mr. Speaker : That is not a Point of Order.

Mr. Bradshaw : That is a point of disorder.—[*Laughter*].

Mr. Vaughan : One must apologise to the hon. Member if my English is incomprehensible to him, but that is not my fault. The day will come, and come soon, I am convinced, when no Party, Jamaican, Trinidadian, D.L.P., Cargill-faction . . .

Mr. Speaker : That is a proper Point of Order. You must not refer to another Member by name.

Mr. Vaughan : I apologise for calling the name of an hon. Member but in this particular case it was used as an adjective, you know.—[*Laughter*]. I am convinced that when that day comes the Opposition Party will only campaign on this concept

—“we can make a better Federal Government than the other Party”.

Mr. Carrott (Antigua) : Mr. Speaker, the mere fact that I have no notes will force me to be brief. Personally, I feel that the Inter-Governmental Conference is serving a purpose. It is serving a purpose because it is bringing out the qualities of our leaders in The West Indies. Some of us believe that the Inter-Governmental Conference of recent weeks could have solved the whole question of a Federal system. That is completely out of the question. We would have to have many more Conferences of that type and the breaking down into various Committees. I feel that weeks and months, maybe years, will prove whether or not — I am not going to say the people now — the leaders of The West Indies want Federation.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Federal concept developed since around 1876 when the British Colonial Office put forward the first proposals. It is about 83 years now. Ten Islands of the Caribbean have come together for a purpose. We have been federated. We have a Parliament. The second stage has now come. It is that stage of bargaining and we have to bargain realistically. Certainly, if we are going to have representation on a population basis — that is what the people of The West Indies may want. If Jamaica says she must have 100 seats because it is on a population basis, it is their right. In every Federation there are laws. It is not a unitary form of Government. There must be State rights and every Unit of the Federation is entitled to make its

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

views known if we are going to be a federated people at all.

I am in agreement with other speakers that the Motion is bad. We should do nothing at all at this stage to prejudice the workings of the Committees now sitting.

The Mover of the Motion said that he had motives for bringing the Motion here — because of his Jamaican M.P.'s. If this is a fact, I am sorry; when we come to this House we must come here for a purpose, not to make joke.

Mr. Sinanan : A little humour is not bad.

Mr. Carrott : A little humour yes, but not to be mischievous. We must be serious, we must be realistic.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to some of the debates during various Sittings of this House. I think it would do some of the parliamentarians in this House good if they would visit the Legislatures of some of the smaller Units and sit down and see how they go about the business of their Territory. If this House can develop certain standards, the people of the world will respect us.

Mr. Joseph : Why are you looking at the Prime Minister ?

Mr. Carrott : It is standards that will build The West Indies. It is very, very lacking in this House. The standard of debate in this House is very, very poor. I am appealing to all Members of this House, on both sides — I think I have the courage of my convictions — if we

are going to weld the people of The West Indies into Federation which the other developed countries of the world would respect, then we had better from this very moment begin to refashion our minds. If we can do that, Mr. Speaker, I think posterity will have something pleasant to say of us.

The Prime Minister : I want to congratulate my hon. Friend the Mover of this Resolution on the fact that more than five minutes have been wasted on it. It is remarkable to get people, who should not be outside of a mental home, to spend five minutes here !

I will say this, Sir. There is just one thing that is amiss. Number 5 of this Motion should be — no Federal law should be enacted unless approved by each Unit Territory.

Mr. Sinanan : Or no private Members' Motion should be accepted without prior approval by the Government.

The Prime Minister : I agree. According to this, nothing should be done without prior approval.

In the year 1950, I don't know what it is

Mr. Joseph : You forget that already !

The Prime Minister : Mr. Speaker, long ago I used to be a teacher in an elementary school — in second form; what you call "second standard" today — and I had to deal with certain types of boys. That was so long ago that I have no time now to deal with these two Members on the other side.

Today, the what is it ?

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

Mr. Joseph : You don't know the date ?

The Prime Minister : Well, what of it ? I thought we were in November and someone had to correct me just now and tell me we are in December. I was born in April, so was Shakespeare. The only date a man should remember is the date on which he gets married

Mr. Sinanan : That is the one you should forget.

The Prime Minister : The date you should remember is the date you get married to your wife and yet that is the date you forget ?

You started with Federation. This Motion starts with Confederation, but I want everybody to realise the Americans started with Confederation in 1787 and they eventually had to change. What do you mean ? That we all have to go back home and get our Legislatures to agree to something ? The Americans had to get away from that. They had to give power to somebody to establish the law and bind the nation. Now, after 200 years you get an hon. Member coming here to ask us to tear up Federation and start Confederation ! And, he manages to get us to sit down and listen to a debate on this thing !

The only reason why I got up is that if I sat down and said nothing, one of these days some village idiot will say or write in the Press that the Prime Minister himself sat down and said nothing.

I am only going to be two minutes. Clause I of the Resolution does not merit any comment. Clause II — “that the

Federal Government should have no power to impose income tax, customs or excise duties or imposts of any kind on any Unit Territory without the consent of that Territory” My Friend here, the Minister from St. Lucia, has something to say to that. If such a matter was posed in Britain I would love to hear what the British taxpayers would have to say as to where we are going to find the money for this Federation. You have to ask each Territory before you could bring in a Bill ? I am going to say something now and I don't care. I always say when you're in hot waters you could always get in hotter waters. I hope some Territory will say, as regards one or two things in the Constitution, “I don't agree with these and therefore I want the present Constitution removed”. I suggest to some hon. Members not to be present in the House when the Emergency Bill comes. We shall surely have to have a couple of policemen ! Anyhow, that is a matter for the Speaker because, make no mistake, we will certainly have to have some order in the House.

I am going to say something serious now. Quite often I have said in this House, and I say it again, that in Barbados we have a species of fish which, before they reach the water, jump. In the same way as soon as I said I was going to say something serious all the fish on the Opposition front bench jumped.

5.40 p.m.

There is one serious thing I am going to say. It is suggested here that no Federal policy of industrial incentives or protection shall be enacted into law so as to affect any Unit Territory without its con-

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

sent. I am going to repeat what I have said on the floor of this House. I told the Premier of Jamaica that, far from the Federal Government hurting anybody, we are willing to accept—I said it on the floor of this House but memories are short when it comes to politics—the Jamaican standard of incentives, and pass it into Federal legislation. Yet we are accused of hurting Jamaica's economy.

One of these days when I am really in a bad mood—I was in a good mood the other night—I am going to collect all the things said on the floor of this House about Federal policy and publish them so that we will see how the Federal Government is hurting anybody. We went farther than anybody thinks. I read a statement here on Federal Government policy, long before the British made it a reality, in which the Federal Government gave an assurance that hard currency earned in The West Indies could be taken out of the area. We did it long before the British Government made a general statement.

Far from hurting anybody, the Federal Government said it would entice manufacturers to come into our area to put up factories and new industries. We felt that they would do so if they could carry away any profits made, or plough them back in the area. The Federal Government made the statement—it was not generally known that that was the policy and it is only now the British Government are saying, "Relax restrictions", and so on.

Those things should be known to hon. Members on both sides of the House. I

make no reflection on Members on Government benches. People are not being kept in the dark when statements are made publicly. It is easy to forget and so I repeat that the Federal Government, as far as I know—I put it that way, because frankly I don't say that Australia or some other Government might not have done it—was the first part of the British Commonwealth to say publicly that we will relax restrictions in regard to taking out profits to hard currency areas. Yet we are told we are hurting the economy of Jamaica, of St. Lucia and other countries.

My apologies for flouting the hon. Member and talking so long. All I got up to say is, that I am not going to sit and let judgment be passed against me personally or as Prime Minister or as one of the Ministers of the Federal Government by keeping quiet and allowing this preposterous suggestion to be made to us that we must make Federation go back to a system of Confederation where the Federal Government must go to every Unit Legislature and ask them to agree, or to wait for their Governments to say whether they agree before we call upon the Attorney-General to draft a Bill. This is what it amounts to. The Unit Government must say we can go ahead before the Attorney-General is asked to draft a Bill. Why have a Federation?

I congratulate the hon. Member on getting us to take him seriously and to reply to him. I sometimes wish I could bestir myself with sufficient energy to take seriously, to answer seriously, some of the preposterous nonsense said over on that side of the House.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

Before I sit down let me say this with the greatest possible respect. I don't agree with what the hon. Member said on this question of good speeches. I have sat in the House of Commons and gone to sleep, and even in Christ Church in Barbados, where our Speaker was born

Mr. Speaker: My birth certificate states that I was born in the Parish of St. Michael.

The Prime Minister: I am glad to hear that. I also was born in the Parish of St. Michael. The hon. the Speaker lived so many years in Christ Church that I thought he was born there.

The standard of debate in the House of Commons is no higher than it is here. They have one or two exceptional people, like Sir Winston Churchill, to whom you listen when they get up to speak — [*Interruption*] — and one or two back-benchers who use the same accent as the hon. Member for St. Catherine (Mr. W. B. Williams) who just interrupted me.

I hope that hon. Members will feel that they have nothing to be ashamed of as regards the way we conduct our debates. We sometimes hear the same nonsense from the Opposition that is heard in the House of Commons, and we will continue to hear it, because they are there for life.

Mr. Hill: Mr. Speaker, the expressions of opinion in this Debate on the questions raised by this Motion by the hon. Member for St. Mary, grow more and more confused and astounding on every occasion that a Member on the Government benches of

this House has an opportunity to speak on them.

I am going to ask hon. Members to be a little patient with me this evening, because what has been happening is that through the hydra-headed character of at least one of the two Parties in this Federation, it is impossible to pin down any one of the Members who sit on the opposite side to a consistent statement on the policy which their Party affects to represent.

Let us look back during the last 18 months and see the outstanding acrobatic tendencies on the part of Members on the opposite Benches when in different capacities, either as Dr. Jekyll or Mr. Hyde, they appear either as Members on the floor of this House to defend the policy of their respective Units, or when they appear on the floor in the Inter-Governmental Conference to represent their personal opinions.

Now what has happened? In October last year a certain incident occurred involving the Prime Minister of the Federation. I forgave the Prime Minister long ago, but have the people of Jamaica forgotten? Has the Government of Jamaica, which after all is a partner in the Federal Party which controls this Federal Government, forgotten?

After the Prime Minister got involved in October last year — for the first time it is true — the Party represented by five Members on the Government Benches enunciated a policy and presented it first to the Jamaican people after they had discovered that the reaction of the Ja-

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

Jamaican people was in keeping with the policies enunciated by the Opposition Party in Jamaica and the Federal Opposition Party in this House.

I know it was for the first time. Let us forget that. The fact is that when you listen to the Members of the Federal Government, who after all belong to the same Federal entity as the Leader of the Jamaican Government, the Jamaican Party that is affiliated to the Party controlling the Government, we find a diversity of opinions. We find they make different and conflicting expressions which vary as to whether they are speaking in this House or at the Inter-Governmental Conference.

Let me quote what the Leader of the Jamaican Government said. The Leader of the Jamaican Government belongs to the same Party as the Government Ministers — the West Indian Federal Labour Party. He is an influential partner in the Government of this West Indian Federal Labour Party.

On the question of representation — and I desire to say, if he had had the opportunity it would have been on a number of other allied matters — what did the Premier say? Has this House been told officially by those who had the opportunity to be present there? Here's what he said: He said the point had been raised that Jamaica came into the Federation and agreed under two different Governments to get a certain proportion of the seats.

Why then, asked the Prime Minister, had Jamaica not raised the point in 1953

and in 1956? The Jamaican Premier's answer was simple. He said:

"We were foolish not to have foreseen it. But having foreseen it we do not propose to go on in this Federation unless Jamaica's representation is settled properly, and to the satisfaction of the Government and people of Jamaica."

On every occasion it becomes the painful duty of the Opposition to bring out these naked facts and unmask them and reveal them, and not only to Members on the Government benches who are not privileged to attend conferences. It is left to us to have the painful necessity to bring this into the open so that the people of the respective Territories can always know the acute problems they have to face.

That is one of the duties of an Opposition, that whatever is important, is vital to any section of the population, be it a unitary State or a Federation in one monolithic land-mass or as separated as The West Indies is by hundreds of thousands of square miles, it is a duty and responsibility which the Opposition must undertake, to bring out the realities of the situation and not leave issues clouded and masked with equivocation and evasion, hidden behind the veil of ideological slogans or propagandistic activity.

It is in this light that I regard this Motion. For example, we would be pleasantly surprised, but we would be nevertheless surprised, if we were to seem to get spineless unanimity on Jamaica's proposals. We respect the views of each Territory, no matter how small, to propound its

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. HILL]

views. We would be pleasantly surprised, but surprised nevertheless, if when these proposals from Jamaica were propounded, everybody supinely accepted them.

The point I want to emphasise is : Do not charge the Opposition with ulterior or any other motives but that of carrying out its duty to unmask these issues and bring them before the people and show that acute problems do exist. Do not hide them or clothe them with idealistic sentiments.

Let me be fair to West Indian Federal Labour Party Members in this House, outside of Members from Jamaica. Let me be fair to the representatives of every other Unit Territory and others on those Government benches. If I were in their positions, I would feel myself — and I have felt myself — grievously let down that the arm of my Party representing the largest Unit involved — as Jamaica is involved in these proposals — did not disclose from the outset the proposals which have caused so much alarm, concern and misgivings.

We on the Opposition benches are very sympathetic — and I have said so publicly and written that publicly on behalf of the Opposition : that we sympathise with the position of all the Members belonging to the Unit Parties affiliated to the West Indian Federal Labour Party.

From the outset it was the duty of the governing Party of Jamaica; it was the duty of the Jamaican arm of the Government Party in this Federation to have disclosed the true feelings of the Jamaican people and not to have gone as far as to

stick to controversy and contradict these views when we of the Opposition expressed them before this hon. House one year ago.

That is why I say the problem of Jamaica is, in my view, more psychological than real. If the Premier would cogitate, meditate and contemplate on that, he would discover there are many more ways of getting around some of these points than by trying to answer with the precedents of other Federations.

I am grateful to the Prime Minister for reminding me, a few minutes ago when he rose to speak, that it is either Federation or Confederation. It is not the Opposition which has conjured up such a proposition. It is also the Jamaican Government's submissions that are even now, today, being currently considered by Working Committees — the Jamaican Government's proposals, based upon our revelations, made by the Opposition in Jamaica and in this Federal House, as to how the Jamaican people felt. When we said Jamaica would not be satisfied with the present representation; when we said the Jamaicans were wary of surrendering and handing over, to an Extra-territorial Government, powers that the Jamaican people had newly won, we were condemned by the leader of the Jamaican Government, the present Premier of Jamaica, then Chief Minister.

He said we were prophets of woe; Jeremiahs ! frightening the people of Jamaica with the bogey of taxation. Yet, one year after that he, out of the necessity of respecting the processes of democracy, came to the same conclusion that we had reached. When he came to that con-

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

clusion, our view was, and still is, that he should have made the Federal Government know in an official note; that he should have made that new policy of his Party and his Government known through the Members of his Party in this House.

Mr. Robinson (Tobago): On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Standing Order 35 (9) states:

“The conduct of Officers administering the Government in Territories comprising part of the Federation, of Presiding Officers of Territorial Legislatures and of all Judges in those Territories shall not be raised in debate.”

The reason for that, Sir, I submit, is obvious. These Officers are not present to answer when these matters are being debated.

Mr. Sinanan: Nonsense!

The Prime Minister: What is nonsense? All commonsense seems to be nonsense to Members of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker: The Standing Order referred to says:

“... of Presiding Officers of Territorial Legislatures and of all Judges in those Territories...”

Nobody has mentioned any of those persons here.

Mr. Hill: Mr. Speaker, I am trying in all sincerity to give the reason and the background as to what has caused confusion and division in the ranks of the Party which controls the Federal Government.

When the Peoples' National Party, which is affiliated to the W.I. Federal Labour Party, was forced by the processes of democracy in Jamaica, to agree with the policies enunciated by the Opposition in Jamaica, in my view it became their bounden duty, out of fairness to their colleagues and to the West Indian Federal Labour Party and out of an abundance of interest for the people of The West Indies, to have disclosed those policies at the earliest possible moment. Yet when we came forward in this House with these same policies embodied in a Motion last year, in November and December, the very proposals that were subsequently sanctioned by the House of Representatives in Jamaica, under the leadership of the Peoples' National Party, which had been converted to our way of thinking, converted to accept the policies of the Jamaican people, as expressed by the Jamaica Labour Party, what did we find here? That the Members of the Jamaican arm of the Federal Government's Party, voted down those proposals and did an injustice to their colleagues, an injustice to the Federal Government, an injustice to the people of The West Indies, by saying that our proposals were propagandistic.

But, Mr. Speaker, we found that the Chief Minister of Jamaica had promised the people of Jamaica that he would withdraw Jamaica from the Federation. His exact words were: “Peacefully we came into this Federation; peacefully we would withdraw if certain conditions are not met”. These conditions turned out to be the proposals that had been put forward by the Opposition in Jamaica, the pro-

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. HILL]

posals set out in a Motion moved by the then hon. Member for St. Thomas (Jamaica), a Motion moved in this House and debated in November and December, but defeated by the Government benches. Why? Because the majority of the Members on the Government side of this House were kept in ignorance by their Colleagues from Jamaica, and the P.N.P. members among them voted against that Motion because of some breakdown in their Party machinery.

I am being very generous, Mr. Speaker, because I am more concerned with getting the majority of the Members of this House, particularly the Government Members, to understand the serious problems that they face over Jamaica.

When the hon. Prime Minister, in criticising some of the points in this Motion, says that it would not be a Federation, but that we are proposing a Confederation, he is merely agreeing with the proposals and agreeing with the criticisms made by the Premier of Trinidad and Tobago in regard to the Jamaican proposals — not the proposals of the Opposition alone, but the proposals agreed to by the Democratic Labour Party in the Federal Parliament; agreed to by the Jamaica Labour Party Opposition in the Jamaican Parliament; agreed to by the Jamaican Government and the Peoples' National Party of Jamaica. And what are those proposals? Those proposals are the proposals put before the Inter-Governmental Conference, the proposals now before the Committees and the Working Parties currently engaged in seeking to change the nature and form of the

existing Federation, which would and could justifiably be described as wanting a Confederation in so far as Jamaica is concerned.

The Prime Minister: What follows from that?

Mr. Hill: What follows from that is that the imputation by Members on the Government Benches that our Motion before this House today has been brought for any other reason than that we believe it is proper, is not justified by the facts. I am pointing out that this is not the first time that Members of this House have seen this Motion, or most of it.

This House is being asked by the hon. Minister without Portfolio from Barbados to say that these are obstructionist tactics. But then if it is obstructionist tactics being used by the Federal Opposition, certainly they are tactics agreed to by the Government of Jamaica and their Peoples' National Party, and the Jamaican Government's Party forms an integral part of the Government benches over there!

Mr. Rose: So what?

Mr. Hill: So that you are Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde! Any one Party which can be separately identified among the affiliated Parties of the ten Unit Territories in your Federal Government Party —

Mr. Rose: You have it over there too!

Mr. Hill: Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde over on these benches? That is not true!

Mr. Vaughan: Joshua fought against the proposals!

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

Mr. Hill : If the hon. Members on the Government benches cannot see the confusion that is being caused in the peoples' minds, especially in the minds of people in that segment of the population which is about 52 per cent of the population, then they are living in a fool's paradise, and because they will not understand that, the situation grows more and more confusing to the people of Jamaica.

For, let us take the question of representation. I think that in principle the hurdle has been leaped, but in practice nobody knows what the accepted formula will be.

When we come to the questions raised under paragraphs 2 and 4, you will find that they are similar to the proposals agreed to by the Jamaican Government. The only point that I wish to press home is that in so far as the Jamaican people are concerned there is no division of opinion between the Party in Opposition and the Party in power

The Prime Minister : You mean they are all in a lunatic asylum ?

Mr. Hill : I reject the proposition *sotto voce* of the Prime Minister that the Premier of Jamaica and the Leader of the Jamaican Opposition should be in St. Ann's or any other mental home.

. . . . because the proposal of the Jamaican Government amounts to a Confederation, amounts to a close association by Jamaica with the rest of the existing Federation. And for Members who hold such responsible positions as Ministers to get up and so glibly mislead the other

hon. Members on the Government benches into believing that this is just a propagandistic point, or a futile point, or a pnerile point that you can just dismiss without consideration is, in my view, doing a disservice to this hon. House and to the Federation. It is better, no matter how harsh the proposals may be, no matter how unpleasant the situation may be, that the people of The West Indies should be made aware of them. For in the final analysis we say this : that the opinion of the people of The West Indies is sovereign. They may take a long time to know when they are being duped or whether they are being properly led—and that applies equally to the larger Territories to the north of the Federation

Mr. Bradshaw : It is not north of the Federation it is in the Federation.

Mr. Hill : and as I said a few days ago, nobody should ever dare to coerce the people of Jamaica, and I hope too that no one will ever be able, successfully, to coerce any other island or the people of any other island in The West Indies.

How the Minister of Finance upon whose face I saw fleeting moments of anxiety during the Inter-Governmental Conference can, with such levity, get up in the middle of this debate and make casual remarks, is beyond me. I suppose that is why to the people of Jamaica the Party which controls the Federal Government is made up of Drs. Jekyll and Messrs. Hyde. A split personality. And the purpose of this Motion, the cogent reason for this Motion is to end the split personality of the Government Party in

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. HILL]

this Federation. For that split personality is creating confusion in the minds of the people of Jamaica, and also confusing the minds of people in the other Territories. I am sure the people of Jamaica, whatever they may feel about the Federation, do not wish to deny success in the Federation to any of the other Unit Territories who have come to the conclusion that Federation is the peak of their ambitions. Whatever the people of Jamaica may feel about their own position they will respect the views of the people of any other Territory in their own devotion to the concept and idea of Federation. In other words the people of Jamaica would not ask for themselves that they be allowed exercise of what they describe and regard as their democratic right and at the same time deny free exercise of similar rights to any other part of The West Indies.

The Prime Minister: That's why you say that Jamaica should lead the Federation?

Mr. Hill: My own view is that Jamaica should lead the Federation, without domination. We have never wanted to dominate you. That is another untrue allegation. We have said that we should lead the Federation, in the interest of the seven smaller islands who cannot hope for the best practical political leadership or experience of political advancement, who cannot hope for the exercise of any real experience of economic or industrial development, outside of Jamaica in this Federation. Jamaica has never offered to lead because we are conceited; we have offered to lead because we believe we have

the best contribution to make, in point of time. Progress is not a constant factor throughout the world. Some countries make progress faster than others but the making of progress is a matter of time. The progressive country of today may become a backward country, industrially, tomorrow. We say at this stage of Federation we on the Opposition — and I believe we have convinced the Party in power in Jamaica — that Jamaica should offer leadership to this Federation but offer it on the basis that in any union with the other islands, nothing should be allowed to jeopardise the interests of Jamaica.

We have never challenged the sincerity of purpose of the representatives of any other island in so far as the Federal principle or concept is concerned. We have never challenged it. We believe that they earnestly want Federation. We want a Federation that will succeed but we have had grave doubts about it and those doubts have been, shall I say, enhanced, those doubts have been aggravated by the rather pallid performance of the Federal Government, constituted as it is.

As the hon. Premier of Jamaica said in the Jamaican House: the nature of the Federation is one thing, but personnel is not significant, because you can change people and move them around. You can change personnel and Jamaica recognises that. But Jamaica also recognises, both Jamaican Parties recognise, that the nature of the Federation and the power of the Federal Government must be of equal, if not more, important significance in view of the economic and political develop-

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

ments that Jamaica has experienced. If theirs was a country whose development had started fifty years ago, I have no doubt that Jamaicans would find it quite easy, comparatively easy, to come into this Federation. If Jamaica's internal self-government had been achieved fifteen or twenty years ago, I think it would have been easier to have induced the Jamaican people to shed some of the power that they had tasted and enjoyed, to share it more easily. So the problem is also psychological. You can't expect people getting internal self-government after twenty-one years just to transfer it. It is a psychological problem. You can't have a country just getting on its feet industrially but not quite sure that its pattern is perfect or that it has matured, happily allowing outside intervention by an unseen force with less experience. We are still in the trial and error stage. Isn't it a psychological problem to you, Mr. Speaker? I ask hon. Members opposite, isn't it a psychological problem if you are at that stage of economic development and you are asked to hand over or to allow the intervention of some extra-territorial body?

In federating, don't try to make one big leap through the corridors of history, where other nations and peoples have crept, and walked, changing and adjusting until they achieved what they have today. We can't do all that they have done in one big leap.

The Prime Minister : Therefore travel by donkey cart, don't travel by airplane.

Mr. Hill : I say to the Prime Minister, we are dealing with people — and in an

economically backward region, the economically backward region of the British Caribbean.

Mr. Vaughan : All the more reason for Federation.

Mr. Hill : Nobody is saying the concept is not good. We are saying you have got to take that concept and adjust it to The West Indies without apeing the Australians, the Canadians or the Americans.

Hon. Member : You may want to bring another Constitution?

Mr. Hill : It was Colonel Stanley, who was the Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1945, who proposed one or two federations of The West Indies. He said that The West Indies could possibly have not one Federation but two Federations. That was the proposal made to the Jamaican Government. In opening the first Jamaican House of Representatives under adult suffrage, he said it was not the policy of His Majesty's Government and it should not be the policy of West Indians that we should develop as imitation or 2nd class Englishmen in The West Indies or that we should ape the customs and traditions of Britain or of the rest of the Commonwealth.

I believe that this veil of suspicion that has been created need not have existed, and I charge the Jamaican Party affiliated to the W.I.F.L.P. for keeping the rest of their colleagues in ignorance all along. If this veil could be lifted, if this veil could be removed (and to remove it is what we of the Opposition regard as our duty), we would end the suspicion that Jamaica wants to dominate the Federation. But, I say to those who

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. HILL]

believe this, if Jamaica even gets every seat claimed for her by the Premier, with the support of the Opposition in Jamaica, we cannot dominate the Federation if the two-Party system continues to operate in The West Indies as it now does. It requires no mathematical formula to realise this. You do not have to be a great mathematician to realise that. One Party would have to win all the seats and in addition it would have to have two Colonies or servile States to follow it, before it could dominate the Federation, which as far as I see, is not possible.

The moment that point was brought to the attention of the Inter-Governmental Conference, the cold war atmosphere which had prevailed began to dissipate. Members of the Conference began to think, and said to themselves: "Here we are, suspecting Jamaica of wanting to dominate the Federation and it just occurs to us that no one island could dominate it". The result was that they said: "We accept the principle". It was as easy as that.

The Minister without Portfolio from Barbados, in a rather impassioned but very instructive speech, took his stand from the point of view of the other islands, and we respect that stand. But when he seeks to charge that there is any particular segment, any particular section in Jamaica represented on the Opposition benches in this House that has any improper motives

Mr. Vaughan: I rise on a Point of Order, Sir. I do not think that to say the Opposition represented certain sections is imputing improper motives.

Mr. Hill: I did not imply that and I was not going to say that. Only a person coming from Mars, or Jupiter, or off the Soviet side of the Moon

Mr. Rocheford: One like you.

Mr. Hill: . . . could agree with the hon. Member. But the hon. Member and his Colleagues in this Governmnet find themselves embarrassed by the claims of their own Party in Jamaica — the Government of Jamaica as well as the Leader of the Opposition in Jamaica, by their own Party Leader in his position as Premier of Jamaica. This Government seeks to make people believe, in their speeches, that what we are saying is something quite different from what their own Party Leader in Jamaica is saying on this very issue today — belatedly.

It may be politically expedient and clever to do that but if you sow the wind of confusion you will reap the whirlwind of dissolution. We prefer to prove our case out of the mouths of the representatives on the Government benches and the Leader of the House, the Minister of Finance, predicted that a state of demoralising immobilism was overtaking this Federation.

It seems to me that if this hon. House whose majority are representative of the West Indian Federal Labour Party rejects this Motion

The Prime Minister: You will secede.

Mr. Hill: I am addressing myself to the Chair and I hope the Prime Minister will conduct himself with the decorum which is due to his public office.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

If this Federal Labour Party, the majority in this Federal House of Representatives, rejects this Motion, if the Government, either through the speeches of responsible Ministers or through speeches made by Members in the Government majority, continues to be unsympathetic to these proposals—I put it that way; I put it as low as that—even if they are only unsympathetic, much more if they reject them, then let them understand—so that the Prime Minister may not think it is a threat, let me say it very calmly—that, in these circumstances, the people of Jamaica and the rank and file of both political Parties in Jamaica will come to the conclusion that, despite the joint representation of Jamaica by both their Jamaican Parties, they will have to choose between continuing in this Federation as second-class citizens (which the Premier of Jamaica said was intolerable and could not continue and which he was not going to allow to continue), or have second thoughts about this Federation.

The Prime Minister : Just give us the date when you are going to secede.

Mr. Speaker : I hope the hon. Member, who is a Ciceronian scholar, will not interrupt again when he is building up a census of conditional clauses.

6.32 p.m. : *Sitting suspended.*

8.00 p.m. : *Sitting resumed.*

Mr. Sinanan : Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that hon. Members opposite are reluctant to engage any further in this debate. But there are one or two points

made by the hon. Minister of Communications and Works which have caused me to get to my feet tonight. I am glad to see that on this subject he has been vocal. He was silent at the Inter-Governmental Conference, but not in this House.

I would like to know what has become of the three large books which he had at the Conference. When he came into the Conference day after day with those three books under his arm, I thought that at some stage of the Conference he would have made use of them; but he never even opened them. I assumed they all dealt with Federation. One of them, I think, was entitled 'Parliamentary Emergence' or something like that. It was the largest of the books; but he never got down to opening one page of those books.

There were large files in the possession of the Leader of his Party but those files were never opened. When I say the Leader of his Party, I refer to the Leader of the P.N.M. who I believe is his leader. It seems to me that these files were never opened because from the very word 'Go', out-manceuvring started and they never caught up with Mr. Norman Manley, the Premier of Jamaica, after that. The books and the files remained closed.

I had expected that the Minister of Communications and Works would have got up at the Inter-Governmental Conference and said that the Federal Government was pursuing one policy and the Territorial Governments pursuing another. That is the place where he should have said it—[*Interruptions*].

My hon. Friend asked me during the Debate, and I am replying to the points raised—because it is a startling statement

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

for him to make in this House, namely, that the Federal Government is pursuing a policy different from that of the Territorial Governments. I am sure when he reflects further he will realise that is a mistake. He proceeds now to accuse Gentlemen on this side, and to say they are not really federalists.

The Prime Minister: Not Gentlemen; hon. Members.

Mr. Sinanan: Hon. Gentlemen. He went on to say that those five gallant Gentlemen over there were indeed federalists; but nobody on this side or the two representatives at that Conference told Mr. Manley he could walk out of the Conference; he could walk out of the Federation. We did not say that; that came from the Leader of the hon. Gentlemen opposite. So who is a federalist and who is not?

The Prime Minister: Who is the Leader?

Mr. Sinanan: My Friend the Prime Minister asks me who is the Leader? Well, if he desires to get me confused, I am confused. It seems to me that my hon. Friend from Surrey is wrong. There is no longer a Jekyll and Hyde; two other characters seem to be added. There is confusion and doubt about the personality of the Leader.

The Premier of Trinidad goes to my home-town and tells the people there that the best speeches made for Jamaica were by your Representative, Ashford Sinanan. If we belong to this Parliament, we are to approach the problems of Federation with the attitude of good federalists.

Jamaica is as dear and near to my heart as any part of Trinidad, as any other part

of The West Indies; and if I feel that the Federation will be best served by acceding to the arguments of the Leader of the Jamaica Government that representation should be based on population alone as a yard-stick, then I believe that the attitude of a federalist should be to say that the case for Jamaica is unassailable and that it is sound.

At the beginning of the Conference the Leader of the Trinidad Government said: "No, the basis of representation is not only on population, it is upon the ability to pay." What could be a greater attack? —[*Interruption*]. Let me accept what the hon. Gentleman who is quite rightly outside the House has offered to me.

It is a wrong proposition, and my hon. Friend the Prime Minister knows that. The basis of representation, especially in a Federal Government

The Prime Minister: It is one of the factors.

Mr. Sinanan: Ability to pay is not a factor that should be taken into consideration. What we want from the smaller Territories is their talent and goodwill, and their ability and spirit for Federation.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sinanan: If ability to pay were the yardstick, my hon. and learned Friend would not be Prime Minister of the Federation. I am not referring to his personal pocket but to the ability of Barbados to pay. We would be prejudicing the case of Barbados, Montserrat and even of Dominica—we would be prejudicing the chances of these people of lending their talent and ability to the federal impulse by saying that ability to pay is the factor.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

It is not ability to pay but population that counts; and if Jamaica has one half of the population of The West Indies, no man who has a rudimentary knowledge of Constitutional Law can deny that she is entitled to greater representation. That was borne out by the Premier of Trinidad, because he went back on his original statement on ability to pay and produced a formula which I think would allow 46 per cent representation to Jamaica.

Mr. Rose : On a Point of Order. Is the hon. Member —

Mr. Sinanan : My hon. Friend would realise that I am yielding the floor.

Mr. Rose : To a Point of Order. Is the hon. Member speaking on the Motion?

Mr. Speaker : Is that a Point of Order?

Mr. Sinanan : Mr. Speaker, every time that the hon. Gentleman and any other person who belongs to his Territorial Party, seeks, on a point of Order, to prevent me from bringing facts to this House, I know that the facts are embarrassing.

This is very recent history. It took place in the presence of the hon. Member, and he must not get up here and speak in such a strain and feel that we would fall into the same error as his colleagues, by believing that the oracle has spoken and therefore everything that he says is correct and acceptable. Not at all. No Member, particularly the Minister of Communications and Works, can stand in this House and say that the hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House are not good federalists. That is what the hon. Gentleman said.

Hon. Member : What about Ben Lomond?

Mr. Sinanan : Some of the best speeches are made in Ben Lomond, and people there always respond to an intelligent approach. If I am to be taken to task, because of the contributions I made at the Inter-Governmental Conference, by people who would go about now and say, "Well here you have a Trinidadian who is speaking on behalf of Jamaica", may I ask what is the purpose of that? What is the purpose of trying to inject into the minds of the Trinidad public that one of their own men spoke out on behalf of Jamaica? Is that not an anti-federalist attitude?

Mr. Rose : Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Member relevant in what he is saying? He is not speaking on the Motion.

Mr. Speaker : He is speaking on the population issue as far as I understand.

Mr. Sinanan : I have always understood, Mr. Speaker, that when a Member of Parliament advances certain arguments one is entitled to get up and reply to those statements. I am trying to do so; my hon. Friend knows it, and that is the reason why he is trying to prevent me from saying that when he comes here and accuses people of being anti-federalists, we are entitled to point out to him and his Colleagues that they are the ones who are anti-federalists. That is what I am doing. If he stands here and says that a Trinidadian spoke out on behalf of Jamaica, what he is trying to do is to arouse an anti-Jamaican feeling in this country. What my hon. Friend does not realise is that that is what I said at the Inter-Governmental Conference, and on

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

the floor of this House, and in places in Trinidad where the people are intelligent enough to assess the position. And I will say it again. Federation is a farce without Jamaica. And I will be no party to any sort of action that would attempt to force Jamaica out of this Federation. It is as simple as that.

As a Trinidadian, and as a West Indian and as a pro-federalist, I am not going to allow anybody, or any group of people to attempt to make Trinidad the focal point around which the smaller Territories must revolve; and I am not going to be a party to allowing anybody to come to the conclusion that they cannot attain their ultimate goal unless Jamaica is forced out of the Federal pattern. I want to make that abundantly clear, not only because of the resultant influence that would be forced upon Trinidad but also because of the fact that we need Jamaica. We need everything Jamaica has in order that this partnership should go forward.

What I cannot understand is why, when the hon. Member stands up here and brings a Motion, all these ulterior motives must be attributed to him. The history of this incident must not be lost sight of. What is all this attitude, to protect Jamaica, about? What is it all about? In the normal course of events this Conference would have taken place within five years, but suddenly we had all these protests from Jamaica and the Jamaica point of view coming across to us.

I remember standing here and addressing the Prime Minister and saying to him, "I have gone to Jamaica and I am saying to you and this Government that you have a situation in Jamaica that demands early attention. It is recorded in Hansard.

But nobody took me seriously; least of all, the Prime Minister. I think he laughed and said he had heard that before.

The amount of things my hon. and learned Friend has heard before, he should be a walking encyclopedia! I am saying you ought not to laugh at these gentlemen when they come here in all good faith and honesty and say that, as a result of what has been said, people have got certain impressions and these impressions ought to be erased. Nobody took them seriously. The whole position was allowed to develop and to be crystallised. And this is the result.

But it is not only one Party that has been allowed to come to this Island and put forward the claim of Jamaica. It is both sides. And let us admit that honestly and frankly. There was complete unanimity among the Jamaica delegates when they came down here. And I maintain, and I will go on maintaining, that where you have a Federal form of Government and any problem is brought to the attention of the Central Government or the central body, that body is bound to give that problem attention and consideration.

It is the same thing we were doing in the case of St. Vincent. Hon. Gentlemen over there supported the senior Member for St. Vincent. Both Members were not critical of this Government. They said nothing harsh. They merely rose and exercised their rights, on the Motion for Adjournment, to bring to the attention of this Federal Government a problem that exists in St. Vincent. They were not only ignored, but the whole thing was treated as if they had committed treason.

Members of the Government front bench refused to give it any attention and

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

said that the matter was going to receive their immediate consideration. How long is this going to continue? The more Government behaves like that the more it plays into the hands of the Opposition. The more you go on like that, the more you play into the hands of those who would like to torpedo the boat.

It is the same thing we were saying then: a problem had arisen in Jamaica. Give it your immediate attention. That was not done. Today, when you have an incident like this, when people are sensible enough to bring this Motion and to see into the future, they are told they are anti-federalists.

What would be the position of these Gentlemen in Jamaica if they allow these things to continue and they do not protest? Hon. Members opposite would say, "you are raising your voices too late." You should have acted before. Well that is what they are doing now. They are warning and advising by coming to this House with this Motion. If you want this Federation to succeed you should not make it difficult for it to succeed by making threats to this Opposition.

This Government is endowed with a lot of talent, the most outstanding being their complete inability to destroy this "immobilism" spoken about by the Minister of Finance—their complete inability to understand the meaning of Federation; complete inability to move with West Indian feelings. They refuse to go forward and to introduce some sort of dynamic approach into this Federation. They will not realise they have a job of work to do in this Commonwealth. They will not realise it is the duty of the Government to carry this Federation and the message of

Federation outside. Instead of that, this "immobilism" seems to be creeping into this Government.

How on earth can twelve men from Jamaica forever be coming to this Parliament and pointing out the problems of Jamaica if they did not have the unqualified support of the broad masses of their country?

How is it that even Mr. Manley has come down here in complete unanimity with the Jamaica Labour Party? We have not had one public meeting of protest in Kingston or any part of Jamaica? If they were not reflecting the legitimate views of the population of Jamaica how is it that not one letter, not one view, not one article of protest has been published? Yet, we ignore this situation in the Inter-Governmental Conference where they were receiving cables telling them to get out of the Federation.

It is a fact that you cannot get out of the team. Let this Federal Government realise they have got to take the initiative. Let this Government realise that we are satisfied in our own minds that Jamaica is absolutely necessary to the Federation. Let them consider the points which my Friend has put forward. Send your Members on the back benches to Jamaica. That is how Federation must work. Wherever a problem arises, send your Members as a fact-finding team to come back and report to this House and then take measures that would alleviate the position.

That is the only way. The solution of the problems of Federation is in this House. No other institution could take this Federation and make it viable and powerful, for this impetus comes, Sir, right

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

here in this Parliament. Territorial Governments are bound to have their own local problems. Problems are bound to arise between Territorial Governments and the Federal Government, and that much I concede the Minister of Communications and Works; that alone.

Mr. Rose : Thank you !

Mr. Sinanan : They are bound to arise, yes; but what machinery has this Federal Government to smooth those problems out and to attend to them ?

The Prime Minister : The Regional Council of Ministers !

Mr. Sinanan : Is that the answer ? Mr. Speaker, let us listen to the inept answer that has been offered to me from across the floor of the House—"Regional Council of Ministers." This Federal Government should try and utilise some of the talent that it has on its back-benches; because I heard a speech today from a certain Gentleman opposite (sitting on the back-bench) and if I had my way I would put him where the Minister of Communications and Works is now.

Mr. Pierre : To suit your purposes !

Mr. Sinanan : At least we would not have repeated what occurred at the Inter-Governmental Conference.

Hon. Member (Government Benches): Come over on this side.

Mr. Sinanan : I cannot do that. I will remain right here on these benches, because here is where I can serve the Federation best. The pressure that has been brought upon me to return to the Terri-

torial Parliament of Trinidad and Tobago has been extremely great. No man has undergone greater pressure within the last three months than I have with regard to my going back to that Parliament. But I have made up my mind; and believe me I do not see anything in the future to cause me to alter my decision. So that, in answer to the invitation from my Friend across the floor, I must say that I believe I can serve this House, this Federal Parliament and the peoples of The West Indies better by sitting on this side of the House; by attempting to make this Government a little more responsible, a little more alive.

Nobody could silence us as long as we remain here. For the next few years we intend to be talking and talking—

Mr. Pierre : From there ?

Mr. Sinanan : From here ! I don't mind remaining right here on this side for the next ten or fifteen years. Believe me it does not matter to me. In fact, it affords me the great opportunity of practising at the Bar and still remaining an hon. Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, what astonishes me is one statement made by my Friend the Minister without Portfolio from Barbados who is a Federalist at heart. And even though I did not agree with all he has said, I think he has made a worthy contribution to this Debate. The sooner we have a clearing up of the air, as he has done, the better for this Federal Parliament; the better for this Government. But he made one statement which astonishes me—that is, that we cannot go consulting Territorial Governments at every turn.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

Mr. Vaughan : Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I am very sure that the hon. Member completely misunderstood me. What I did say, Sir, is: Consultation yes, but not asking for consent every time we have a problem.

Mr. Sinanan : What did you say ?

Mr. Vaughan : I said "Consultation, yes; but not asking for consent every time we have a problem".

Mr. Bradshaw : Do you accept that ?

Mr. Sinanan : I am bound to accept what the hon. Member says. But even then I am astonished, because I understood the Prime Minister to say, when he presented certain Bills here in this House, that he had to get the consent of the Territorial Governments. Let us remember well.

The Prime Minister : Nonsense.

Mr. Sinanan : If the Prime Minister describes what he said as nonsense, what can I say ? I quote my Friend, the Prime Minister, who says : "Nonsense". I don't agree with him that he talked nonsense at that time. But I am not going to do what was done last night and refresh my Friend's memory by quoting him from the pages of Hansard, because he might be tempted to make the same kind of weak excuses that were made here last night.

The Prime Minister : Find it and quote it.

Mr. Sinanan : I will produce it for you tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, those are the words I understood my Friend had used, especially when he brought one Bill before the House and said in that particular Debate that he was not going to disclose the objections that were forwarded by Territorial Governments, but he would inform us that they did object. If that is so, Mr. Speaker, how can a Territorial Government object to a Bill that is being discussed in this House if it was not sent to that Territorial Government ? How can a Territorial Government dare to send in their arguments against a particular measure, if the Federal Government did not send it to them, either for consultation, their advice, or their consent ?

The Prime Minister : Will the hon. Member give way ?

Mr. Sinanan : Certainly.

The Prime Minister : The Federal Government is an entity; Unit Governments are all entities. Politeness very often is the only reason for consulting a Unit Government. Tomorrow I will hand to the hon. Member a book on Constitution Amendment in Canada. Because in this book there is a statement which I consider the best statement I have ever read on this subject. It says that you can ignore everything a Unit Government says unless the Constitution says you must not. Therefore, if I am reported to have said, "consent" I would certainly get up in this House and ask that that be changed, and I would say that the Reporter did not hear me properly. Let me say further, that if ever I got under the influence of alcohol to the extent that I did not know what I was saying, I couldn't say that.

Mr. Sinanan : I believe that the problem with my Friend is that when he

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

makes these statements he is not under the influence of alcohol.

I agree entirely with my learned Friend The Prime Minister. It is the very point I was about to make; that within the context, the frame-work of the Constitutional Instrument, the founding fathers thought it necessary to give that pivotal position to the Territorial Governments which cannot be denied them. You cannot deny them the right to be consulted or summoned on questions like that, because it is within the Constitution that they shall remain important factors for the first five years. So when the Prime Minister refers to a precedent in Canada he refers to a Constitutional set-up, a frame-work which is not on all fours with our West Indian Constitution.

The Prime Minister : Show me.

Mr. Vaughan : Territorial Governments are an integral part of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. Sinanan : I am glad to hear my Friend, the Minister without Portfolio, saying that the Territorial Governments are an integral part of the Federal Constitution.

The Prime Minister : What's that ?

Mr. Sinanan : If my hon Friend the Prime Minister does not agree with that, I suggest that they have a Party caucus tomorrow. But I agree with that point of view. I may be wrong, but I would like the Prime Minister to convince me that I am wrong. It is my opinion that this Federal Constitution takes into consideration the importance of the Territorial Governments, and it is enshrined

in Article 118. If they were not an integral part of this Constitutional frame-work, why do they have to be included in any review of the Federal Constitution ?

The Prime Minister : We put it in the Constitution.

Mr. Sinanan : I don't understand what is going on. From what malady are my Friends opposite suffering ?

Mr. Bradshaw : None.

Mr. Sinanan : Well, that's the worst of all. The mere fact that they have to be brought into the Conference to revise the whole Federal Instrument shows that for the first five years the difficulties confronting these people together with the anxieties that existed—in the pre-Federal days you brought them in, you made them an integral part and at the end of five years they are the ones to also join in a review of this Constitution. And until this Federal Constitution is changed, amended or completely revised, it is the duty of the Federal Government, as much as possible, and as far as possible, to seek to obtain the unanimous opinion of all the other Territorial Governments.

The Prime Minister : Sheer undiluted nonsense.

Mr. Sinanan : If my hon. Friend says so, I hope he is right; but I am convinced in my own mind that again he is wrong. Whether you want the word "consent" or not—if you object to the word "consent" then get a suitable formula for it. Put it into the Motion if you want, but don't refuse sanction of this Motion by saying that, "you are insulting us when

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

you talk of consent". The only time consent is important is in another place on a very serious charge. [*Laughter*]. I haven't said anything, but my Friend is behaving as if it is something criminal; that is why I was provoked to make that remark.

Hon. Members opposite sneered when the Amendment by my hon. Friend was announced to read, instead of "failure" "inconclusiveness". They should have welcomed that, because they know within their hearts that they should welcome it. The Conference did not break up, the Conference broke down—[*Laughter*] . . . into Committees. [*Laughter*]. Now, I will use the language of my hon. Friend the Prime Minister: "The type of fish that always jump when they think they see a bait". Hon. Members will not wait for me to finish my sentences. I said the Conference broke down into Committees. And it did. So why are my hon. Friends laughing like that? As soon as I said the Conference broke down they started laughing, not waiting to hear me say "into Committees".

The formula was presented here. The same first recital of this Motion—representation on population. Are my hon. Friends going to vote against that? If they are reluctant about the other recitals, we can put them to the vote one after the other instead of taking the Motion as a whole. [*Laughter*] We will agree to that. It can be done. I believe there is provision for that.

Mr. Ricketts: Try your best.

The Prime Minister: I would hate to see you ever lose. You are perfect.

Mr. Sinanan: I'm not perfect, Mr. Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister: Perfect in that job.

Mr. Sinanan: Why are they reluctant to accept the Motion even if we propose the recitals one by one. I am going to suggest that to his Hon. the Speaker. Don't forget that withdrawal or not it is there on record—a formula that would give Jamaica 46 per cent. But if I am wrong, my hon. Friend (Mr. Rose) would have jumped to his feet, but my recollection is 46 per cent; and then it was withdrawn. The reasons that were advanced for that withdrawal were very puerile. They were very childish. Because the *Gleaner* said something, because the *Gleaner* published something, because the *Gleaner* had made somebody out to be a monster. At the crucial stage of the Conference when the whole Conference could have been made a success it was withdrawn. When we had almost reached agreement, Mr. Minister, it was withdrawn. Yet the people of San Fernando are being told that a Trinidadian spoke out for Jamaica. A most undesirable statement to make particularly when one occupies a position that calls for some sort of kaleidoscopic view of the entire West Indies, and when the situation calls for one looking at every entity of the Federation as one would look at one's own home island.

The Prime Minister: That's a big word.

Mr. Sinanan: No, no. Kaleidoscopic is not a big word, it might be a strange word for my hon. Friend but it is not a big word.

The best thing that we can do at the moment—and I offer this quite seriously

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

to my hon. Friend, in order to allow a little lull and in order to allow us to come back to normal here and in other parts of The West Indies—is to set at rest for a little while any talk of increased taxation. What is the use talking about it? What is the use people from time to time saying “we can tax,” or “we cannot tax”? Leave it alone. Let there be a lull because it cannot be done until very important conferences take place and it would help us to maintain some sort of tranquillity. We cannot blame the people of Jamaica if they are told, “let us have this grand scheme of the *Economics of Nationhood*”, because we have been hearing of the excesses of certain Territorial Governments, have been hearing of all these things that bring in the Venezuelan Companies to have all sorts of schemes. How can we submit to further taxation when we are going to have a sewer scheme where there is no water in the island, or we find that we are confronted with the problems of the City of Port-of-Spain? Why all of a sudden are we having all this talk about taxation, removing the mandatory levy and increasing the budget? And to do what? To inspire greater fear in the minds of the average people? Make no mistake about it, there are very few wealthy people in The West Indies today, so that it would be a large number of that unfortunate class of sitting ducks that would have to pay up in order to see the same experiment that is going on, on a Territorial level, developing into a greater danger at national level and have you play ducks and drakes with our money.

Well, I believe that I am a taxpayer and that hon. Gentleman over there knows that I am a taxpayer

Mr. Rose: I belong to this Government.

Mr. Sinanan: Mr. Speaker, I am so reassured to hear the hon. Minister of Communications at last announcing publicly that it is this Government that claims his loyalty. I am so refreshed, I am so happy. If that is the case I look forward to a lot of harmony, and to all his energies and all his talents being spent in favour of the Federal Government. I sincerely hope so.—[*Interruption*] The hon. and charming Minister of Labour and Social Affairs—I didn’t hear the remark from her—but she always has me frustrated. The hon. Gentlemen are not very gallant on the opposite side. She always has me frustrated in that when I stand here to speak she mutters and says certain things that I could never understand even though I know those remarks are directed at me. My one regret is that it is only remarks that are directed at me.

Mr. Speaker, I still wait to hear the suggestion which she was putting forward, because we are entitled not only as taxpayers of Trinidad & Tobago but as taxpayers on the West Indian level to get up and say what we feel on the subject. We are taxpayers on the West Indian level—I will not disclose to the Federal Parliament how a number of us are subsidising the Federation at the moment; they ought to know.

The Prime Minister: Tell us, how?

Mr. Sinanan: My hon. Friend the Prime Minister asks me, “How”? Probably his salary is free from taxation.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

The Prime Minister : No professional man in Trinidad is well off.

Mr. Sinanan : You must mean "well off" from the tax collector.

Mr. Speaker, let us not delude ourselves. The tempo of the Federation depends on a large measure upon the conduct of certain Territorial Governments. We cannot divorce the two. I am glad to hear the Prime Minister agrees. They all constitute the entire effort of Federation and where you find a Territorial Government placing fear and alarm in the minds of the sitting ducks of that particular Territory, whenever you as a Federal Government raise the issue of Federal taxation, desirable as it may be, you are always going to run up against a stone wall.

Take 'Economics of Nationhood'. The people of the Unit Territories say, "if we are going into this grand scheme propounded in *Economics of Nationhood*, what guarantee have we that our money will not be squandered by the Federal Government in the way it is now being squandered in Trinidad?" What assurance have they that their money will not be squandered in the Federation of The West Indies if certain people are successful in their efforts to unseat my learned friend the hon. the Prime Minister?

Mr. Speaker, in spite of all the sarcasm and the vitriol heaped on the Opposition by the other side it must be remembered that Governments have a way of taking their fingers off the pulses of the people; the Opposition, has a way of keeping its fingers there and this Opposition is keeping its fingers there—keeping them there in the interest of the people

who have chosen us as their representatives. And, why should we not. We are people of the West Indies and we are not going to allow ourselves to be deprived of the opportunity to have our voices heard. Why should not the people from every other island get up here and warn the Federal Government. The same alertness and eagerness we display here today on this issue which is claimed to affect only the interests of Jamaica, the same spontaneity we will display in the case of any other Territory, even if for instance my hon. Friend the Member for Montserrat becomes the Chief Minister of Montserrat tomorrow we will remember him as being once among us in this House, we will remember his sallies and we will run to his assistance and claim the same privileges for Montserrat. That is how I understand the principles of federalism.

I wish now to agree with the point made by the hon. Gentleman, Mr. Spinach—*[Laughter]* . . . Mr. Carrot, the hon. Member for Antigua. Sorry, Sir, I am getting confused with my vegetables. It is a sound proposition that States have their exclusive rights and that a Federation ought not to do what a State can do properly, effectively, and efficiently. It is one of the things the Federal Government must always be careful about. I agree with the Prime Minister that from time to time there is always the tendency in Federations to take on more and more and to encroach more and more . . .

The Prime Minister : With the permission of the Territories.

Mr. Sinanan : I am not speaking about single activity. —*[Interruption]*.

Mr. Speaker, one thing I am anxious to put forward for the consideration of

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

Members of this House: don't always rise in this House and seek an ulterior motive in every Motion. Ulterior motives were thrown across this Floor against the Mover of this Motion and against many other Members on this side of this House. What does the Government want us to do; come in here and rubber-stamp everything? If you want that, we can try the experiment, but I feel certain that even this Government might get tired of that. If only to stimulate this Government in its thinking, and to action, and that is the job of an Opposition, and that is what the hon. Member said—to stimulate the Government in its thinking, that was the reason behind the Motion . . . I never heard him say anything else. He used the word 'provoke'—it is a perfectly good English word. He said he was going to provoke a debate in this House in order to assess the feelings of the Members of this House, in order to assess the attitude and feeling of the Federal Government on this vital issue because the Federal Government, up to this date, has not taken a stand on this matter. Probably the Federal Government likes, and in this case would prefer, to wait and assess the feelings of the Federation and, having assessed everything, then take a decision. Nothing is wrong with that. If that is their case, it is a good argument. But that is not their argument; so it seems that our duty is to come here and 'provoke' debates in order to learn what is their policy. I think that should be embarrassing to any Government, but it does seem to me they are utterly incapable of being embarrassed.

The Member for Westmoreland has also made a statement. I think I could always accept one hon. Gentleman opposite in so far as his assurances are concerned;

but in the issues which we debated last night, that hon. Gentleman performed what we call in local legal circles a *volte face*. He will understand that, being a local lawyer; but he went completely against everything that he stands for. What he says is right, but what he did last night was completely wrong.

Am I to understand that we can embarrass the hon. Minister for Agriculture?

Mr. Speaker, my stand on this issue has always been the same. When, in the early days of this House, a similar Resolution was introduced by the then Deputy-Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lightbourne) I stood up and said what I had to say—and I have been saying so from the very first day, and I still maintain—that Federation will be a success only if Jamaica is in the Federation. Jamaica must be encouraged to remain in the Federation. Federation will succeed only if we surround ourselves with the wealth of talent that exists in Jamaica. And, believe me, there is quite a lot that the Territories of this Federation can learn from Jamaica.

I made a complete tour of Jamaica; I went to the highest hill and danced in the open road to a Jamaican tune at midday. I went into Manchester but did not see my Friend (Mr. Delapenha) because he was assisting one or two people to get married. I did not know that came within the functions and duties of an hon. Member of Parliament.

Hon. Member: What about Trelawney?

Mr. Sinanan: I remember Trelawney.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is important for every Minister of this Government to

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

visit every Unit of the Federation. They will get a greater understanding because the Jamaicans are the nicest people you can meet on either side of the political fence. Jamaicans are just as nice as Trinidadians.

The Prime Minister: You mean Barbadians?

Mr. Sinanan: They are just as nice as the people of Barbados. It is my opinion, Sir, that with proper understanding and with a good Federal Constitution, with a proper, strong Federal Constitution they would be allowed to take their rightful place as first-class citizens, assisting in propelling this Federation to success. A proper, strong, Federal Constitution.

Mr. Richards: Repeat it again.

Mr. Sinanan: My hon. Friend the Prime Minister puts forward an appeal to us not to take him seriously when he is speaking in a lighter vein. Now he wants me to take him seriously. He said people had taken him seriously when he was engaged in his customary sense of humour. Here now he wants me to take him seriously. Obviously he speaks with a sense of humour at the moment.

Whether you accept this Motion or not, it has served to clear the air. It is good to have these discussions. When I speak of Jamaicans, I believe I am correct in making that statement because I met people from all walks of life in that Island. While we are aspiring to nationhood we should, all of us, be fighting to go forward as West Indians. We would by our own clumsy methods, our complete lack of understanding, our unwillingness to tackle problems and challenges, be allowing

Jamaica to leave what could become one of the greatest nations in history.

Mr. Bradshaw: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before us could be intended only to muddy the waters of Federation and to insult the intelligence of Members of this hon. House.

The Resolution invites this House—
“to deplore the inconclusiveness of the Inter-Governmental Conference”.

How did the Conference come about, Mr. Speaker? The Conference came about because on the 21st of May this year this hon. House passed a Resolution which reads as follows:

“Be it further resolved that a Conference between the Federal Government and Unit Governments be convened at the earliest date convenient to the Governments concerned and that the Conference called for in Article 118 of the Constitution be convened as soon as can be conveniently arranged after the said Conference between the Federal and Unit Governments.”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 21st May, 1959; c. 1921.]

Mr. Hill: That is the genesis of the story.

Mr. Bradshaw: Whether it is the Genesis, the Exodus or the Revelations, it is the records of this House.—[Interruptions.]—You had a chance to speak. Sit down and take it; sit down and keep quiet too.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister must not address a Member by asking him to keep quiet. You must request him by addressing the Chair.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

Mr. Bradshaw : May I request you, Mr. Speaker, to order the hon. Member to keep quiet. You are charged with keeping order in this House. I apply to you.

Mr. Speaker : The hon. Minister has asked me to restrict the hon. Member for Surrey against interruptions. I am sure he will grant the Minister this indulgence, especially as it is in accordance with the rules of this House.

Mr. Bradshaw : Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to repeat the Resolution :

“Be it further resolved that a Conference between the Federal Government and Unit Governments be convened at the earliest date convenient to the Governments concerned and that the Conference called for in Article 118 of the Constitution be convened as soon as can be conveniently arranged after the said Conference between the Federal and Unit Governments.”

I submit, with the greatest respect, that the most that this House might do at this time, if called upon to do so, is to express regret that the Conference has been inconclusive and not “deplore the inconclusiveness of that Conference”. The Conference has not ended as yet. In truth and in fact it has dispersed, but into smaller bodies which are carrying on its work and which will report back to it some time next year. So rather than condemn, rather than deplore, we ought to be sorry that it did not conclude its business; but we must encourage the Conference to conclude its business with satisfaction rather than deplore the inconclusiveness of the Conference.

On this ground alone, Mr. Speaker, I submit the Resolution should be run out of court.

Mr. Sinanan : You are in court here.

Mr. Bradshaw : Mr. Speaker, Committees have been set up by the Conference with the terms of reference as are contained at pages 13 and 14 of the Report of the Conference which was laid on the Table of this House a few days ago. The Conference is still working but in smaller bodies, and it seems to me that it is a mark of disrespect to this House for any hon. Member to suggest and suggest seriously, as I think the hon. Mover of this Resolution has done, that we of this hon. House should “deplore the inconclusiveness” of the Conference. I think it borders on rudeness, it borders on impropriety, for this invitation to be extended to the House.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Surrey has accused the Federal Government of acrobatic tendencies. Surely, when one looks at the career of the hon. Member in question one will certainly conclude that he is capable of every possible acrobatic action in the world, political and otherwise. And when one studies his political career one must come to the same conclusion: that he is a political acrobat. It is nothing new in his accusing the Federal Government, the West Indies Federal Labour Party and the People’s National Movement of acrobatic tendencies.

Mr. Hill : I could identify the crooks from the virgins.

Mr. Bradshaw : Being one of the former, surely, the hon. Member must know. He speaks from experience.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

Mr. Hill: I am a very knowledgeable person.

Mr. Bradshaw: The Member went on to say that the Jamaica problem was more psychological than real. If that is so, why perpetuate this matter. Why not endeavour to clear it up, to set the whole thing at rest. Why not endeavour to apply his psychological skill in his own homeland and go and preach the gospel of Federation in Jamaica rather than come here and accuse the Federal Government? Surely the hon. Member should go and do his political homework.

He should do that in Jamaica. He should try and convince the good Jamaicans—all Jamaicans, I think are good, including the hon. Member, and understanding and cooperative and anxious to see Federation succeed.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member should go and preach that gospel in Jamaica and not, as he did in May and until July during the Jamaica elections, lambaste the Federal idea.

Mr. Speaker, one reads the *Gleaner*. The *Jamaica Daily Gleaner* carried a series of articles; a series of broadcasts were done by two hon. Members opposite. They were done by the hon. Member for Surrey and the hon. Member for St. Mary. They either spoke on the radio or addressed public meetings all over the place. The theme was against Federation.

Mr. Cargill: I would just like to say we never spoke against Federation. We merely said we felt Jamaica should lead it owing to the very slender talents on the benches opposite.

Mr. Bradshaw: The theme was either that Jamaica should lead the Federation or leave it.

Mr. Hill: You are quite right.

Mr. Bradshaw: Surely you were speaking against Federation. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, that the hon. Mover of the Resolution and the hon. Member for Surrey should, if they have any interest in Federation at all, show it better by going and spreading the gospel of Federation in Jamaica rather than in bringing Resolutions of the sort they are bringing before this hon. House.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition said, quite confidently, that he had to resist pressure, local pressure or pressure locally, to return to local politics, because he wanted to be here. I wonder whether the hon. Member does not in fact feel he should not risk resigning from his seat in the Federal House to lose in the local elections, because of the force of the P.N.M. in Trinidad? I wonder whether the hon. Gentleman is not afraid that he should keep the bird in the hand rather than go after those in the bush?

The Leader of the Opposition also suggested that there was no ulterior motive in the bringing of this Motion. But, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Mover of the Motion himself confessed either wittingly, or unwittingly, that he had brought the Resolution here for a certain purpose.

Mr. Speaker: Everybody seems to be misquoting what happened. An interjection was made, from the Government Benches, that the hon. Member was bring-

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. SPEAKER]

ing this Motion apparently to embarrass Members from Jamaica on the Government Benches. The hon. Member, who was proposing the Motion asked: "And why not?"

Mr. Bradshaw: Mr. Speaker, you are very good. And why not? Why not try to embarrass them? And for what purpose? For the need of making Federation succeed, or for the purpose of endeavouring to sow dissent, to cast suspicion on the hon. Members from Jamaica who sit on the Government benches? Let it be remembered that the former hon. Member for St. Thomas, after his Motion was lost here in this House in May or June of last year, went back to Jamaica and referred to those hon. Members on the Government benches as traitors because they did not vote for the Resolution.

Mr. W. B. Williams: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Speaker: That was in the electioneering campaign.

Mr. Bradshaw: Yes, Sir. The Federal ideal was to be used as a tool of the D.L.P. of Jamaica for their own selfish ends, in trying to beat an unbeatable P.N.P. But, Sir, the hon. Leader of the Opposition ventured to say hon. Members opposite, who hail from Jamaica, have got the full confidence of the people of Jamaica.

Mr. Sinanan: They got 12 seats out of 17.

Mr. Bradshaw: That was 17 months ago, before July of this year. The electorate of Jamaica reversed their decision of March, 1958, so overwhelmingly in July of this year that they have placed the

P.N.P. in power and will keep them there for a very long time to come. They have put the D.L.P. in the shade, to which they belong.

Mr. Speaker: Will hon. Members cease carrying on this debate across the floor?

Mr. Bradshaw: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition certainly is speaking with his tongue in both cheeks. He suggested—

Mr. Joseph: We know you don't mean what you are going to say. Say it.

Mr. Bradshaw:—that anti-Federation sentiment was to be found on the Government benches. Perhaps he did not hear what the hon. Mover of the Resolution said yesterday, or the day before during the debate on the Budget. The hon. Mover of the Resolution said that he could only conceive the 1960 budget of \$16,000,000 in terms of a refinery. So far as the hon. Member is concerned, a refinery is of more importance to him than is Federation itself. What wonderful pro-Federal sentiments!

He may think that about the Federal Government, but surely he has not got the right to think that about the Federation itself and still sit there and claim to be the representative of Jamaica!

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution does more than insult this House. It invites us, more or less, to tear up this Constitution.

Mr. Sinanan: Williams has already done that!

Mr. Bradshaw: The Constitution itself confers upon the Federal Government the power to impose income and other taxes after a certain time.

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

Mr. Hill : Retroactive !

Mr. Bradshaw : This Resolution suggests that the Federal Government should not acquire lands under the Federal Land Acquisition Act in any Territory until after consultation and agreement with the Unit Territory concerned. Surely, Mr. Speaker, any Federal Government wishing to acquire land in any Territory should not go about it, and would not be expected to go about it, by taking such land without first acquainting the Unit Government in whose Territory the land is to be acquired. Surely a Federal Government must be expected to act after consultation; but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, there is this to be borne in mind: that the Federal Government is not expected to get cooperation from every Government; it cannot, for instance, expect cooperation from the Government of St. Vincent, or rather the excuse for a Government in St. Vincent. So that, if, as the hon. Member for Barbados, the Minister without Portfolio said, it was necessary for the Federal Government to acquire land in St. Vincent and that Government was obstructing the Federal Government, surely the Federal Government should see to it, under the Land Acquisition Act, that the wishes of the people of The West Indies, expressed by their duly elected Government, are not opposed.

Mr. Speaker, No. 4 of the Resolution refers to industrial incentives or protection. It says that there should not be enacted any law which would affect any Unit Territory without its consent. So far as industrial incentives are concerned the Prime Minister has already said something about that. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that on every count the Resolution

has defeated itself and, therefore, it should be discounted by the Government side of this House.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition endeavoured to lambaste the hon. Minister of Communications and Works and to distort what he said with respect to Parties—

Mr. Sinanan : And aeroplanes !

Mr. Bradshaw :—but I should remind the hon. Gentleman, through you, Mr. Speaker, of what he said here yesterday when we were debating the Budget. He said among other things: "I hope that the 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 Government, the better."

Mr. Sinanan : So you took my advice !

Mr. Bradshaw : Surely, Mr. Speaker, that advice should be repeated by the hon. Leader of the Opposition to his Colleagues opposite; because the Resolution was brought in an attempt to embarrass the Government. The hon. Member for Surrey gave a warning here tonight. I do not know whether or not that warning was intended to show his loyalty to the Parliament of The West Indies or to his Party in Jamaica. It seems to me, Sir, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition ought to direct his remarks to his Colleagues there across the Floor.

Mr. Speaker, may I end by quoting from the *Daily Gleaner* of Monday, October 28th, 1959, a speech delivered in the House of Representatives of Jamaica by the Premier of Jamaica. He did not say it in

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

[MR. BRADSHAW]

the House of Representatives, pardon me; he said it at a Party conference. He said :

"Turning to the question of Federation, Mr. Manley said the People's National Party had its own policy on Federation, quite unlike the Jamaica Labour Party, for 'all the Jamaica Labour Party had was great irresponsibility which masquerades as policy.' They attended the House of Representatives and spoke of a bipartisan policy on Federation. They passed unanimous resolutions and were paid the courtesy of forming part of delegations to Federation Conferences where they worked with the Government, agreed with everything they did come to the same conclusions about consequences and results of the work done. Then they returned to Jamaica and lied and betrayed and spread propaganda and behaved in the most irresponsible way possible.

"What a pity," Mr. Manley said, "that we have such a contemptible Opposition. What a blessing it would be for Jamaica if we had an Opposition that knew where to draw the line between national interest and political nastiness."

But as regards the P.N.P.'s federation policy he described this "in very simple" terms: "We conceive that in the long run there are real and great advantages in Federation but those advantages cannot be accepted at the price of anything that would destroy or injure us in a fundamental respect. That is a workable policy and that is the policy I propose to fight for."

Mr. Cargill : Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to amuse myself at any rate, if not the House, by replying to one or two of the rather unimportant points that were put up but I see the time is coming up to 9.30 p.m. and I don't want to discommode the House by having this Debate carried on for another day, and in any event I find that I shall have to leave for Jamaica on Friday, due to very pressing matters that have arisen at home. So, with your permission, Sir, I will not exercise my right to reply.

Question put.

House divided : Ayes 16, Noes 24, as follows :

AYES	NOES
A. S. Sinanan	Sir G. H. Adams
M. Cargill	Dr. C. G. D.
K. G. Hill	Le Corbiniere
L. J. Adams	R. L. Bradshaw
Archdeacon L. A. Lennon	F. B. Ricketts
C. W. Swabey	W. Andrew Rose
R. A. Joseph	Mrs. P. B. S. Allfrey
Dr. F. R. Dubaney	N. H. Richards
W. B. Williams	H. F. G. Rocheford
S. Mathura	D. P. Pierre
E. W. Wakeland	D. S. Lloyd
C. T. Afflick	D. H. L. Ward
M. H. Shah	H. F. Cooke
S. B. Stone	R. M. Cato
L. U. Densham	E. O. LeBlanc
M. A. Hector	J. M. D. Bousquet
	R. E. Brown
	A. U. Belinfanti
	L. P. Delapenha
	T. J. Gibbs
	V. B. Vaughan
	R. J. Williams
	A. N. R. Robinson
	W. H. Bramble
	B. T. Carrott

16

24

Motion negatived.

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. Bradshaw : Mr. Speaker, I beg to name tomorrow, Thursday, 3rd December, 1959, for continuation of consideration, in Committee of Supply, of the Appropriation Bill, 1960.

Agreed to.

PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL (Second Reading)

Order read for resumption of Second Reading. —[See OFFICIAL REPORT, 1st December, 1959, c.502.]

Mr. Bradshaw : Mr. Speaker, as I was about to say last night in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, its object is to make it possible to grant to an officer in the Public Service a house allowance which is non-pensionable. As the law now stands, all house allowances must be pen-

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1959

sionable. I commend it to the consideration of the House.

The Minister of Communications and Works (Mr. Rose): Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment to this Bill changes the definition of 'house allowance'. If Members would look at the Act they would see that the definition of 'house allowance' includes allowances which are paid to Civil Servants. I am speaking about the Pensions Act, 1958.

By this amendment, it will be possible for certain officers in the Federal Service, for example those officers who are attached to the United Kingdom Commission to get a house allowance without such allowance being considered pensionable. If this amendment is not made it would mean that pensions will be paid on the basis of the salaries of the officers in addition to the house allowances they now enjoy. The intention is that these allowances should not be considered with salaries in the computation of pension as the present situation would seem to imply, except in such cases where these allowances are especially declared pensionable by special provision.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read a Second time.

House resolved into Committee, and Bill approved without amendment.

House resumed.

Bill read a Third time and passed.

GINGER INDUSTRY IN JAMAICA

Dr. Duhaney (Clarendon, Jamaica): Mr. Speaker, the matter that I had hoped to raise on the Motion for the adjournment is of such vital importance to Jamaica that as a result of the late hour of this sitting, I am begging leave to bring it

up on the Motion for Adjournment tomorrow.

Mr. Bradshaw: What is it about?

Dr. Duhaney: It is a matter of the ginger industry in Jamaica.

Hon. Members: Go ahead now.

Mr. Speaker: I understand from the Leader of the House that it is his intention tomorrow to move that the Rule of the House that calls for the interruption of public business at 9.30 p.m. be suspended so that the House could complete consideration of the Appropriation Bill 1960 in Committee of Supply. He desires that consideration of the Estimates for 1960 be proceeded with without any interruption of business at 9.30 p.m. So we can interpret from that, that we may go on until 12 o'clock or until whatever time the matter is concluded.

Mr. Sinanan: But surely, Sir, that could have been communicated to me. I know nothing about such intention of the Government. The Minister of Finance is the Leader of the House and we would expect to hear that direct from him. It is time that the Government understands and appreciates our position. There is a system laid down. Is that system now breaking down? I am going to get a book and . . .

Mr. Speaker: If you would like to have the matter postponed until Monday, Dr. Duhaney, I think the House will be able to accommodate you.

Dr. Duhaney: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Monday will do.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Adjourned accordingly at 9.45 p.m.