

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.

10th Sitting

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House met at 2.30 p.m.

Prayers

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWER TO QUESTION

Federal Civil Service Establishment

Dr. Radix (Grenada) asked the Prime Minister to state the number of persons employed in the Federal Civil Service Establishment and to give the number from the various Territories.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member does not mind I would pass on the answer to him instead of reading it, the reason being that whenever one has a lot of figures to read out—unless the gentlemen beyond the gangway have pencils and paper, I am sure they would not remember what is read to them. However, for the benefit of the House I don't mind reading it.

"The total number of posts in the Federal Public Service is 392. Of these, 305 are in The West Indies (including personnel of the Meteorological Services stationed in the Bahamas and British Honduras), and 87 in Overseas Commis-

sions. The total number of posts of the entire Meteorological Service is 72.

Of the 305 posts in The West Indies, 288 have been filled and the appointees have been recruited as follows:—

Antigua	9
Barbados	43

Mr. Joseph: I beg your pardon?

The Prime Minister: Barbados 43; not 143 as it should be.

Dominica	6
Grenada	14
Jamaica	34

Why only 34 I don't know!

Montserrat

No alternate.

St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla 1

I really don't know from which of these three Territories he comes. Perhaps the Leader of the House would be able to tell us.

St. Lucia	5
St. Vincent	4
Trinidad & Tobago	131
British Guiana	3
The Bahamas	11

Strange to say!

British Honduras	2
United Kingdom and other overseas sources	24

In a few cases, officers originating from one Territory may have been serving in

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

another at the time of Federal recruitment. The figures are therefore subject to minor variation.

Particulars of the country of origin of all the staff of the Overseas Commissions are not at present recorded at Federal Headquarters. As far as concerns the senior administrative staff (i.e. Assistant Secretary and upwards), the distribution is as follows :-

Barbados	1
Jamaica	4
St. Lucia	1
St. Vincent	1
Trinidad & Tobago	4
British Guiana	1

I would like to give this supplementary information, Sir. The numerical preponderance of staff recruited from the Territory of Trinidad and Tobago is due to the fact that staff for Clerical and typing grades are largely drawn from the Territory in which they are based. It is only natural that it would be easier to get a Stenographer in Trinidad applying for a job than to bring one from the hinterland in Jamaica.

Mr. W. B. Williams (St. Catherine, Jamaica): Transportation is available!

The Prime Minister: I don't think that anybody could fail to realise that as you come to the lower ranks and the lower salaries nobody is going to pick herself up from some other Territory and come to Trinidad.

Mr. Sinanan (Victoria, Trinidad): Why not?

The Prime Minister: Because they are not always good friends with senior members of the Executive or the Opposition. Those are the actual figures that

we have at the present moment and I again say that these figures are given at the time of appointment. But it may be that somebody was appointed from a Territory who actually belongs to another Territory and was working in some other Territory at the time of appointment. But this is not the occasion to discuss that matter.

Dr. Radix: Sir, I would like to ask a supplementary question. I would like to find out from the Prime Minister if, as he says, a person is taken on in one Territory—if that person is taken on, let us say, in Trinidad and he or she comes from St. Lucia, does that person remain a St. Lucian?

Mr. Sinanan: You have to ask the hon. Member for St. Lucia.

Dr. Radix: I would like to get it straight, if that is how it is on his record.

The Prime Minister: These figures, I repeat, were given at the time of appointment. When the answer to this question was being prepared the necessary staff checked to see who had been appointed and from where. But just as I made the mistake yesterday of thinking His Honour the Speaker was born in a second-class parish when in fact he was born in a first-class parish, it may be that somebody got one of these Federal jobs when he was in Trinidad though he may have been born in Grenada. It is as simple as that. We can check it up by seeing whether he has a baptismal certificate and so on, but we can't just discover where everybody was born from their appointments. These figures are given as from the Territory in which the officers were living and from which they made applications for appointments.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

APPROPRIATION (1960) BILL

Order read for resumption of consideration of Bill in Committee of Supply.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Bradshaw): I beg to move that proceedings on the Estimates for 1960 be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order 9 (5).

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. Joseph: Who does he think is going to sit here 'till twelve o'clock tonight?

House resolved into Committee of Supply.

HEAD III—Legislature :

Mr. Cargill (St. Mary, Jamaica): Mr. Chairman, I have given notice of my intention to move that the total provided under sub-head 1, Head III be reduced by \$5.00. In point of fact, Mr. Chairman, I want to specify two particular heads, 1(d) and 1(j).

The position here is that the fiction of having to reduce these two items has to be used in order to give us an opportunity of discussing the matter. We feel, Sir, that neither the Speaker of the House nor the Clerk of the House, among other people, should have been fixed at the level at which they are fixed here. We have had considerable discussion in this House about the salary of the Speaker, but no opportunity has come up to discuss the salary of the Clerk. I am not proposing, and I cannot propose in this context, that there should be any increase, but I do use this opportunity of making a protest. The protest is that the Report of the Select Committee which was set up to look into

all these matters was rejected by the Minister of Finance after the House unanimously accepted it and after the hon. the Prime Minister had given this House the undertaking that the recommendations would be carried out. And I was hoping that as we had considerable discussion on this matter already in this House that perhaps today the Minister of Finance might have thought out the matter and might have come to this House in a—I won't say more penitent frame of mind, but more reasonable frame of mind. As I say, Sir, I use this opportunity of bringing the matter before the House for the third time in this Session.

Dr. Duhancy (Clarendon, Jamaica): Mr. Chairman, last year this hon. House received a Parliamentary Delegation from the United Kingdom and, among other things, they presented a Mace to this House. They made speeches and told us that the Mace represented authority. At that time we had a talk with them and they told us that the Legislature, and the jobs in the Legislature, should be as independent as possible from the other parts of the administrative force of Government. We bring this matter up now to see if we can do this and make it plain, since this is our Parliament, so that history can see what was done and other people who come afterwards can emulate us.

The Executive of a Government is divided into three heads—the Administrative, the Legislative and the Judiciary. The Executive runs the Government with the aid of these three heads.

Mr. Chairman, if at any time the Administrative part of this Government should undertake to devour up the Legislative and the Judiciary part we would

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[DR. DUHANEY]

have a colossal failure. It must feel free—this Legislative branch. If you turn to the book of laws so well drawn up, you will see that in the Civil Establishment law the first head is Governor-General; the second the Judiciary and the third the Legislature. From there on we have a slight control. But these three heads must be forever free from the domination that can occur coming down from the administrative branch.

It is only perhaps because we have such a just and fair Speaker that this matter has not come up before. We are speaking now of the post of Speaker and the other posts under that head. His authority must be carefully guarded by us because this is the only place in which we have a voice, and if we lose it we might as well not exist. It is only insofar as respect for authority in the United Kingdom, and respect for authority in The West Indies depends on salary scale that I mention the salary scale at all. But I only do this in order to bring a proper respect to bear on this Legislature. We think it absolutely necessary to scale the salaries and increase them so that this respect for authority will not be lost.

This is a very grave situation, Mr. Chairman, and I think that this is the post we are to look at, because the minute we talk about money somebody gets mad; but when you think about it, in the Legislature you exist; they tell you everything, they run this House and you run it, so that inside of this House you can talk but outside of it you have no voice.

If the administrative branch decides to gobble up the Legislature and the Judiciary you will certainly run into trouble

and for that type of trouble you have several names and one is Communism. Any time that one particular branch has the complete power over the three others branches of Government, you have Communism, not Democracy, because then you do not have the majority vote.

Hon. Members: Not Communism, Fascism.

Dr. Duhaney: I commend what I have said to Government and say to them, "if you don't see this point you are going to bring the whole structure of Government into a sad plight."

Mr. W. B. Williams (St. Catherine, Jamaica): Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity of saying that, as I revealed, sub-head 9, Head I, on the maintenance of furniture—

Hon. Members: How have you got there? Wait your turn.

The Chairman: We are dealing now with sub-head 1 of Head III.

Mr. Delapenha (Manchester, Jamaica): Mr. Chairman, I am glad for the opportunity offered me once again to further clarify, if I may say so, the position in regard to this matter, as I expressed it in this hon. House. There need be no heat in this matter, but, I would be wanting in my duty if I didn't reply to the remarks made by the hon. Member for St. Mary when he referred to me as a "Pettifogging Solicitor" in this hon. House. He did say so and it is in Hansard. I had not got up—

The Prime Minister: Go and see a solicitor and sue him.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

Mr. Cargill : On a Point of Order, Sir. I described the point taken, if I remember rightly, and said words to the effect that I was not concerned with a pettifogging point—

Hon. Members : No.

Mr. Cargill : — taken by pettifogging lawyers; but I do not believe I actually described my learned Friend as a pettifogging lawyer. I do not deny the possibility for a moment, but I do not think I did. If I did, I am glad to withdraw it.

Mr. Delapenha : Did the hon. Member say he would withdraw the remark?

The Chairman : Yes, but he does not remember making the remark.

Mr. Delapenha : Everybody said he did.

Hon. Members (Government Benches): Yes, he did.

Mr. Delapenha : Last night when the Leader of the Opposition made his brilliant speech in this House—

Hon. Member : When was that?

Mr. Delapenha : — he referred to the fact that I had made a *volte face* in this House on this particular matter by voting for my Party, voting with the Government. I want to make it clear that I had never at any time thought, indeed I would not be so naive—and I would hope nobody would be so naive—as to think it was my opinion that when this matter came to the House and I agreed and helped to see that Resolution put through this House, that I thought that was the end of it. I knew that it was not the end of it—that the full force and effect of that Resolution adopted by the

House, was no more than a suggestion by this hon. House. If I erred, I erred on the side of parliamentary procedure in England, the Mother of Parliaments. I prefer to err there.

Mr. Bousquet : In good company.

Mr. Delapenha : As I see Constitutional Law and the method by which Parliament is constituted, there is separation of powers which Members of this hon. House do not seem to realise—separation of powers, for it is constituted into three bodies.

There is the Executive side of Parliament, the Judicial and the Legislative, and if anything emanates from this House, the policy of Government has yet to be decided by the Executive.

The Council of State as we have set it up under our Constitution, is the sole and only body that decides the policy of the Federation. Points or matters which are initiated here, are sent to the Council of State and if the Council of State sees fit to adopt them, Bills will be introduced here.

That is the method as I understand it. There is no compunction upon any Minister to adopt any particular measure which actually concerns finance. Here we have one of those “abstract” Motions as *May's* puts it. I am going to refer to *May's* again. This is the 16th edition of *May's*, page 767 :

“Reports of select committees: By former practice, the House declined to receive a report from a select committee which proposed compensation for losses incurred by certain patents, because it had not been recommended by the Crown, but according to recent practice no objection has been taken to resolutions reported by select committees advocating an outlay of public money.”

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

Mr. Sinanan : Emphasise that.

Mr. Delapenha : Page 633 !

“Powers of committees to report their opinion: By Standing Order No. 75 a select committee of the Commons which has been invested with power to send for persons, papers and records, may report its opinion and observations upon the matters referred to its consideration, even though it is not expressly directed to do so by the order of reference.”

I go on :

“Consideration of resolutions recommending public expenditure: Select committees may consider and report to the House resolutions recommending an outlay of public money for the purposes therein specified without the previous signification of the royal recommendation, because such a resolution is regarded as analogous to those abstract resolutions by the House in favour of public expenditure which are in the nature of suggestions, and are not in themselves binding upon the action of the House.”

Mr. Sinanan : Of the House.

Mr. Delapenha : But it goes further than that. It has to go to the Council of State.

I will read here Wade and Phillips on Constitutional Law :

“Inasmuch as the Legislature...”

Mr. Sinanan : Will the hon. and learned Gentleman give way to a question? Does the hon. and learned Gentleman agree with what *May* says there, that a recommendation is not binding on the House? And will he produce an authority to show that when the recommendation is accepted by the House unanimously, it is not binding on the Government?

Mr. Delapenha : I continue, Mr. Chairman, with Wade and Phillips.

Mr. Sinanan : Wade and Phillips is a students' book.

Mr. Delapenha :

“Inasmuch as the Legislature rarely legislates without the guiding hand of the Government, the Cabinet in practice can prevent any legislation being passed by Parliament which it, or even the Minister chiefly concerned, does not wish to see passed.”

I leave it there, Mr. Chairman. Enough heat has been engendered on this Motion. In all fairness to the Cabinet and what has happened here, they have the last word, and I feel our Legislative body should accept it with good grace.

The Chairman : The last word, so long as the majority of this House accepts it.

Mr. Cargill : Mr. Chairman, I really feel very badly about wasting the time of this hon. House over such an elementary point. The Member for Manchester, Jamaica, seems to be under a very extraordinary misapprehension. One would have thought that the meaning of an ordinary English word would have soaked into him already; so that he would have seen that what he read to us does not apply in this case in point at all. What we want to tell him is that we quite agree that the Report of a Select Committee does not in any way bind the House; it is made purely at the request of the House in an advisory or informative capacity. But there are two aspects of this case which are quite different from anything my hon. and learned Friend has read out to us today. The first is that this was not just a Report.

There are certain aspects of this case which are different from any thing the hon. Gentleman has told us today. First

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

of all there was the Report. What we have condemned them about, Sir, is the Report. Once that Report was unanimously adopted by both sides of the House, including the Ministers of Government, it is a fact that it is a Resolution of the House. It is no longer the Report of the Committee. It is a Resolution of this hon. House, which has been adopted.

I have no doubt that there might be cases where, if a Resolution of this House were unanimously adopted, the Resolution could not be carried out. For example, I can visualise a situation where this House might unanimously resolve to indulge in one form of expenditure and then, when it comes to getting money from the Treasury, sees there is no money and the particular expenditure cannot be carried out. I see there is that possibility. I am not saying that because the House unanimously resolved to do something which is impossible it should be done. I am not saying you must do what was impossible. I am merely considering the matter theoretically and factually. But if the House decides to do something, which obviously cannot be done, it cannot be done. And what should happen in elementary customs of decency, as well as of procedure, is that the Minister, or Ministers, concerned should come back to the House and say to the House that those things which the House resolved to do cannot be done, and for reasons which should be given, and refer the matter back to the House and for the consideration of the Select Committee involved.

In particular is this true in the present case. In all I have said, Mr. Speaker, I have not admitted that this particular matter should not be carried out. I am

taking that as a postulate. If the Prime Minister gets up and makes it a point of honour, I could only wonder if the Prime Minister understands the meaning of the words he uses. I am even beginning to believe Members on the other side do not understand the ordinary meaning of English words. They seem to be suffering from some chronic semantic debility.

When a Member gets up and says, "I give this undertaking that this will be carried out," how can he say after that he does not have to bother because it does not mean very much.

The Prime Minister: If you could see the thousands of them!

Mr. Cargill: If the Prime Minister will take his proper seat we would all feel more comfortable. I agree his spiritual home may well be on the back benches, but we would feel more comfortable if we see him across the chasm.

If the Prime Minister comes to the House and says, "I give my absolute undertaking that this would be entertained," what does it mean? It means, at least, that if it cannot be done, a man of honour would come back to the House and explain to the House that it cannot be done. Nobody has come back and told us anything at all. The last thing we heard from the Prime Minister's word of honour was that the Minister of Finance came to the House by slipping in through the back door—without a word of explanation about something which changes the whole nature of the undertaking given to this House.

I am trying very hard, Mr. Chairman, not to use unparliamentary language. I am trying very hard to conceal by con-

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. CARGILL]

tempt for people who act in that way. If I were to show it, I might be ruled out of order. You can read all your little tomes which you like. But nothing can get you over this.

Having given an undertaking, the reasonable thing to do was to come to this House and explain why this undertaking could not be carried out. Your reasoning may be right or it may be wrong; but at least it would be telling somebody something about why you misled the House. But no! The Minister of Finance, in the Supplementary Estimates, slips in a little thing hoping, no doubt, that nobody would notice it there. He calls no attention to it. He hopes that nobody would notice it at all.

The Minister of Finance grins. I would not expect him to understand this point. But I look forward to the understanding of the other Gentlemen. This is no sniggering matter. Only when we caught them at it, and asked how this came about, did the very Gentleman who was courageous enough, in the first place, to put it there, show us a large number of books and try to prove there are legal reasons for behaving in a manner which I can only regard as dishonourable.

The impossibility of performing a thing has nothing to do with the manner in which it is carried out. I know the Prime Minister does not like this. But he would, nevertheless, have to take it.

The Prime Minister: The Lord made scorpions and centipedes. I don't have to like them. There is a lot I don't like but have to put up with.

Mr. Cargill: The Prime Minister has a remarkable sense of humour. Here we

are, discussing this business, and he is talking about scorpions and centipedes! I am sure the hon. Prime Minister is a great authority on scorpions and centipedes, but that is not what we are talking about. We are talking about the Prime Minister's word of honour. And I say, unless his conscience would sting him like scorpions and centipedes, there is no getting out of this by creeping out through back doors.

The Prime Minister: If the hon. Member would give way, I would say for the last time that I do not question the accuracy of the Report if it says I went so far as to say something on a matter which wasn't discussed by the Council of State. I say I was perhaps too generous in saying, "if the House says so, we would say so". I could not speak for the Council of State until it had met. It is not done even in England. In England you cannot say a thing like that. We have to come here and say, on the recommendations of the Council of State, we are bringing a money Bill.

I have had occasion to say before, the one word a gentleman never uses is "gentleman". The hon. Member is constantly referring to people's honour. I would like to see his.

Mr. Cargill: The hon. Prime Minister's explanation only makes it worse. What I gather he now says, or said last night or whenever it was, is that he gave an undertaking which he should never have given; that he spoke rashly and that he gave his word in a matter over which he had no control. And then he justifies this by saying, it is right to know nothing about it and to slip it through the back door of this hon. House.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

If it was impossible to carry it out, I don't think it is a matter my Colleagues could have taken objection to. One would have expected the Prime Minister to have come and said to the House, personally, or through his Minister, "We acknowledge we have given this undertaking, we told you most sincerely that we were going to do so and so, but we come now to apologise to the House for not being able to carry it out for the following reasons. And we are now asking the House to help us try and live up to the obligation we gave to the House."

What distresses me is the total lack of contrition; of any idea that wrong has been committed; the total arrogance which says, "I have done what I have done and everybody has got to like it, and if you do not like it you have got to lump it." Well I would like, Mr. Chairman, to assure the Prime Minister and the Ministers opposite that we neither like it, nor do we intend to lump it. I have tried to use words of not more than two or three syllables in order to get simple points soaked into the heads of hon. Members opposite. I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that they might have been able to see the point by now.

The Prime Minister : Are you going home tomorrow ?

Mr. Vaughan (Minister without Portfolio): The only House I know is the House in Barbados, and in that House we appoint our servants. Every servant of that House is appointed by that House. I would like to know if all the servants of this House are appointed by this House. The only one that I know appointed to this House, Sir, is yourself. But I am not

aware of anybody else. I am asking what servants of this House have been appointed by this House.

Mr. Sinanan (Victoria, Trinidad): I would like to refer, Mr. Chairman, to the point raised by my hon. and learned Friend from Manchester. My hon. Friend referred to *May's*, but when I asked him to expand a little on the point, he behaved not unlike a pettifogging solicitor and cleverly avoided my question. However, there are several questions I intend to put to him on this matter. Let us read it now.

Mr. Rose : What page ?

Mr. Sinanan : I have assumed that the Minister of Communications and Works knows everything about everything, so I will refuse to give the page. On second thought, Mr. Chairman, I think it is my duty to do so. I do not know what Volume he has, but if I should judge from his past record I believe he has the oldest volume.

Page 633. It was referred to by the Colleague of my hon. Friend, and it says here: "T. E. May's Parliamentary Practice". Then we have "Sir Edward Fellowes and T. G. B. Cocks, Lord Campion, 16th Edition." The same paragraph referred to by my hon. and learned Friend from Manchester reads :

"Select Committees may consider and report to the House Resolutions recommending an outlay of public money for the purposes therein specified, without previous signification of the Royal recommendation . . ."

And right there I would like to pause, as he did not pause, and ask if this is not in direct conflict with the point raised by

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

the Minister of Finance, when he read that section of the Standing Orders which said it should not be done unless there is Royal signification. And I am grateful to my Friend for having raised that point. All last night my hon. Friend was behaving in the same manner. He was behaving like that fish referred to by the Prime Minister—always jumping at the bait.

“ . . . because such a Resolution is regarded as analogous to those abstract resolutions by the House . . . ”

Why didn't my hon. Friend dilate on that abstract resolution ?

“ . . . by the House in favour of public expenditure which are in the nature of suggestions, and are not in themselves binding upon the action of the House.”

That is the first point I wish to make to my learned Friend. Because I am still sanguine, still confident that if he sees the light he would revert to his former stand when he stood up and actually guided the Government along the right lines. Fortunately the Prime Minister was not here.

The Prime Minister : You mean if I had been here I would have led them along the wrong lines ?

Mr. Sinanan : When this Select Committee is appointed, Mr. Speaker, it is merely the entire House but in a smaller way. When this House appoints a Select Committee it is the entire House only it is condensed into a few Members. Therefore, when a recommendation comes from the Select Committee, the House is not bound to accept it; the House can amend it; the House can throw it out completely; or the House can accept it unanimously. And that is what this House did. This

House sat down and accepted this Report unanimously. There was not one dissenting voice; there was not one dissenting vote. It was unanimously accepted. It was not binding upon the House to accept it; but when the House accepted unanimously it was binding upon the Executive.

The Prime Minister : Who says so ?

Mr. Sinanan : I am saying that it is binding upon the Council of State to respect the wishes of this House, because this House, when it functions in such a unanimous manner, is the supreme body.

Hon. Member (Government Benches) : On an abstract Motion.

Mr. Sinanan : The only association I have with anything abstract is that very loose association with my hon. and learned Friend the Minister of Communications and Works.

My Friend says that this was an abstract Motion; but if you would refer to Page 767 you would see that it has been described as an abstract Motion. So for the purposes of my argument I am accepting his argument, that it is an abstract Motion.

Mr. Chairman, who are these foreigners who comprise the Council of State ? Who are these strangers ? My learned Friend the Prime Minister attempts to make this argument nothing more than specious by saying that even though this House sits down and with complete unanimity agrees to something, some group of men, foreign to this House, could sit down and say “This cannot be done”. But who are these men ? These are the gentlemen who comprise the Council of State, and they themselves sat down here in this House and voted unanimously for this very Report.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

I am going to appeal to them, Mr. Chairman, not to justify the description that was given to them—that they were Jekylls and Hydes. The hon. Gentlemen sat here in this House as Members of this Parliament and joined with other Members on both sides of the House and unanimously voted for the Report, and then come here and say it is not binding on the House.

This is not a question of whether it is binding on this House or not. I agree with him entirely. When the Report came from the Select Committee it was not binding on us. It is possible that we might have followed the misguided argument of the Minister of Communications and at that time thrown out the Report; but for once he was not followed. And it is our respectful submission that when you have passed that stage and the House says although it is not binding on us—you have to read this argument into the lines, not everything is going to be put down in this text book. You have to read into it what it says here.

Mr. Lloyd (St. Kitts): You are not supposed to do that.

The Prime Minister: You can read into it whatever the Opposition wants to read into it.

Mr. Sinanan: I am saying that not every elementary point is going to be put in writing in literary fashion. My hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister knows that. I have got that experience by merely instructing hon. and learned men like himself and from time to time we have to keep on with these instructions to refresh their memories, particularly at certain times when lapses of memory occur. When

you have it stated here that it is not binding on the House, you have to go on to read into this Report that if it is not binding upon the actions of this House and the House having said whilst we are not bound to accept this Report we unanimously accept it, then when it gets to the Council-of-State it is binding upon the Council-of-State. No Council-of-State can disregard or flout the body that has created it. No Council of State can do that. The Council of State or a Cabinet is the creation of this House.

The Prime Minister: Whether the House destroys it or not?

Mr. Sinanan: I hope the entire Cabinet is not destroyed! But what we are saying is, that even though the Executive or the Council of State comes into being only as a result of hon. Members opposite, it is still the creation of this Parliament. Because it is voted and brought into being as a result of the majority of votes from the people as symbolised by the majority of votes of this House. How can my hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister and that Gentleman over there who objects to being called a pettifogging solicitor in this House—

Mr. Speaker: That is most improper.

Mr. Sinanan: That is why I say he is right in objecting to that; and if I were in his place I would object to it also in this House. In this Parliament I would object to being called so. But how could they contend and argue that the recommendations of the committee are not binding on the Council of State? What is the position if the Minister of Finance comes to the floor of this House and proposes a Bill involving finance and the House votes

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

unanimously against it, or even by a majority vote? Haven't you got to respect the view of the majority of Members in this House?

The Prime Minister: Not necessarily. You have to take your risk.

Mr. Sinanan: The Prime Minister is obviously being facetious. How are they going to introduce such legislation? What risk? I wish to tell the hon. Prime Minister that he is taking too many risks.

The Prime Minister: When Sir Winston Churchill wanted to fight the Duke of Windsor affair, the back-benchers didn't agree. How could they have stopped him?

Mr. Sinanan: I never thought my hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister would have introduced morganatic arguments here. I never thought so. I never thought consideration of the Duke of Windsor matter would come up here on such an issue.

Mr. Speaker, all I would say in reference to Sir Winston Churchill is that I am sure the hon. Lady Minister would not support the Prime Minister in that argument because, as far as she is concerned, Sir Winston so far hasn't done anything that is right. But Sir Winston's attitude has nothing to do with a Resolution brought to this House by both sides of the House asking that the Executive introduce legislation in accordance with those wishes, and the Executive flouting the wishes of this Parliament. It is a most dangerous precedent to establish.

The Prime Minister: It is not; everything depends on whether the Executive wants to take the risk. The back-benchers can say we can throw you out.

Mr. Sinanan: Now I understand the reason why the Prime Minister finds himself below the gangway. I understand his reason for going there. He can enjoy all the immunities associated with that position.

The Prime Minister: That is one of the merits of Parliament, you do what the supporters support you in.

Mr. Sinanan: I don't agree with that. Parliament must do what the majority of the people have asked them to do, and that is to rule and to rule properly in accordance with the dictates of the majority of the large masses of the people. That is what Parliament must do, and where the Prime Minister is faced with the completely unanimous wish of this House he must respect it.

Mr. Chairman, we say that what the Prime Minister said on that occasion is correct and is binding and we adopt his language for the purpose of our argument: "that if this House says unanimously—

The Prime Minister: I never said that.

Mr. Sinanan: It's on record in Hansard.

The Prime Minister: I said I thought that should be done; I never said it was binding on anybody.

Mr. Sinanan: The Prime Minister said that if the House said the salary must be increased then the Minister responsible for Finance must find the money. He must first tell us if he sent him on that treasure-hunt.

The Prime Minister: When it got to Council of State, we decided we could not find the money.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

Mr. Sinanan : But who are these people who constitute the Council of State? The Minister of Finance is a member of the Council of State and he is a Member of this House and he sits here and votes for a recommendation knowing that he hasn't got the money! I fail to follow the logic of this matter.

Mr. Chairman, there is a little confusion in the minds of certain Members and I think that confusion is more concentrated in the minds of the Minister of Communications and Works for the simple reason that he belongs to a particular Party that has spawned more committees than any other Government in the entire West Indies. They have spawned so many committees that they can now follow that famous author who wrote that book "Government by Committees". That is the whole argument that is misleading the hon. Minister of Communications and Works. If a committee outside of this House had been appointed, then the Government could have ignored the report and recommendations of that committee with impunity.

The Prime Minister : You are talking tripe!

Mr. Sinanan : The Prime Minister has made use of this word "tripe" so often in the House that I am beginning to feel that he has a very close association with it.

The Prime Minister : I haven't eaten tripe for forty years.

Mr. Sinanan : I believe he likes it, like all good West Indians, in a particular pot.

That is the confusion which I believe is affecting the Minister of Communica-

tions and Works. They have appointed so many committees in the Territorial Government of Trinidad and Tobago and they have refused to accept so many recommendations of those committees that now he has got into the bad habit where he feels that they can also ignore the joint recommendations of a Select Committee of the House.

I have great respect for my learned Friend both as regards his forensic ability and his good scholarship; but that he should stand here and make such a lame excuse for departing from his former stand—I'm afraid I cannot accept it. If he had said these are my honest views, and I think they are right, but we have a Party and Party discipline is party discipline, and I couldn't do otherwise, I would be the first to accept it. But don't stand up in this House and read the particular page of May's Parliamentary Practice and refuse to turn to the page that deals with abstract resolutions and forget the arguments he raised here sometime ago. I ask you to agree that if this Committee was an outside Committee, a Committee appointed by Government from outside this House, a Committee of independent citizens which reported directly to the Government, then the Government wasn't bound to accept the report. But even then a good Government, a wise Government a sensible Government would have come to this House and explained to us why they had refused to accept the recommendation of that Committee.

Remember it is this Parliament that created them, gave them a voice and keeps them in the Government front bench to introduce a policy which is subject to the review of this House; and I am afraid the

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

hon. the Prime Minister is still subject to the wishes of this House; so that even when he engages in those bits of humour, so characteristic of him both here and in other places, we can review even the reason for those bits of humour.

The Government front-benchers comprise the Council of State and this Council of State must remember that it owes its loyalty, owes its allegiance to this Parliament. When we say this must be done, it must be done, Sir. I hope that at some time not so far away the hon. the Prime Minister will realise his mistakes in flouting the wishes of this House.

The Prime Minister: You want to pack him up and send him away?

Mr. Sinanan: The Prime Minister expects his supporters to send him away because of this lapse!

The Prime Minister: Lapse?

Mr. Sinanan: Serious lapse.

I would like to invite my hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister to refer this matter to a prominent lawyer, one within these shores, certainly not the Minister of Communications because he has a personal interest in it being a Member of the Council of State, so that we can get an independent and authoritative opinion on it. However, we could do as the Trinidad Government did by referring the matter to a Commission of inquiry; but I prefer to refer such a matter to Sir Edward Fellowes. He likes to assist in any way he can the Parliaments of the Commonwealth on such issues. I think I will take it upon myself to refer the issue to him as a personal request and if he says we are wrong—for that matter whatever

he says we will inform this House; and if we are wrong I would personally come to this House and confess it, Sir.

The hon. the Deputy Leader of the Opposition quoted the words of the Prime Minister. We promised then that we would elaborate on this matter further and in accordance with that promise we are going to quote the Prime Minister again because, Mr. Chairman, we believe he is in a much better mood today, or shall I say that he is in a less ugly mood than he was then. If he says that *Hansard* is incorrect, then I think he will have to seek recourse in an appeal or petition to the Speaker and to this House to have *Hansard* corrected. This is what the hon. the Prime Minister said:

“I understand that somebody is drafting notice of a Motion that this House should fix the salary of the Speaker. I don't disagree with that.”

The Prime Minister said that. That is his language.

“ . . . If the House feels the Speaker should get \$12,000 a year and the House tells the Government so, it must be done and no one can stop it.”
—[OFFICIAL REPORT 9th December, 1958, c. 1386.]

When I stand here this afternoon and I say in this House he has told the House that it must be done . . . My Friend the Prime Minister says, ‘Who says so?’. My answer is, the Prime Minister said so and, when he spoke and emphasised those words he was, in our opinion, correct; his arguments were unassailable and up to the present time that is sound parliamentary practice binding upon this House.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

My Friend the Prime Minister is well aware that whatever he contributes as a statement, whatever a Prime Minister contributes in a Parliament as a statement of policy, the Prime Minister has the capacity for propounding and expounding what is of necessity instruction for that Parliament. Every word that falls from the lips of a Prime Minister in Parliament is an instruction, not only to the Parliament but to all those peoples outside of that Parliament for whom the Parliament stands and who voted for that Parliament. Everything stated by the Speaker, every ruling is a guide and an instruction to all the citizens who voted for that Parliament in which the instruction is given; that is a principle which is binding on that Parliament and this Opposition invokes this principle.

We say the Prime Minister was sound then, and when he went on to say—

... "the Financial Secretary will have to find the money" ...

Surely, on the basis of this instruction the Prime Minister has given to this House the undertaking that the Financial Secretary must find the money and the Financial Secretary had better find the money. Because I am sure he knows what is the result of going against the directives of the Prime Minister. I will say no more about the Financial Secretary, Sir, because he is not here within the Bar of the House where he could defend himself. I was hoping that *Hansard* would have read, 'the Minister for Finance'.

I believe that while on this same Debate the Prime Minister gave an assurance and, the Gentleman who was then my Deputy (Mr. Lightbourne) called across the floor of this House to the Prime

Minister and said, . . . "I want to point out to the Prime Minister that sometimes he can embarrass the Leader of the Opposition."

The Prime Minister : Not consciously.

Mr. Sinanan : I will point out to the Prime Minister how in his frequent, unconscious statements he has embarrassed me. My then Deputy Leader said, "We will never accept your word" or, "we have no confidence in your word"—words to that effect. The Prime Minister immediately got very annoyed, and quite rightly too, (any Prime Minister would) and thereupon threatened to break up the friendship and even never speak to him (Mr. Lightbourne) in his life again. During the night after the Sitting in question, like a good parliamentarian, I had a talk with my former Deputy. I spoke to him and informed him that whatever his feelings might have been he should not be guilty of that unparliamentary act, and next day he withdrew the remark that he had made against the Prime Minister.

3.50 p.m.

What caused me to tender such advice to him was the fact that I was convinced that when the Prime Minister stands in this House and gives a solemn assurance no Member of the Opposition or the Government should challenge that assurance; because what we are seeking to build in The West Indies is a Parliament that would be even better than the Mother of Parliaments itself. What we are seeking to build is that when men in public life stand up in Parliament and give an assurance it should be like the assurance given

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

by a member of the Bar to any member of the Judiciary. The Chairman will bear me out, having been a judge — when an assurance is demanded from a member of the Bar and is given, he does not have to go into the Witness Box. The position of a member of the Bar is analogous to the position of a Member of this House, and because of that position when he says this, that or the other it is accepted.

I accepted the statement of my hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister and I feel that it is more binding than all the rules that can be quoted in May's Parliamentary Practice and more binding than all the Standing Orders, because these Standing Orders and these rules can be changed and the basic pillars upon which we hope to establish our Parliament must never be changed nor the word which the hon. Gentleman has given in Parliament.

I did not know that my former Deputy was so prophetic when he made this statement—

“We should not have a great degree of confidence in the methods of the Government . . . ”

That is what he said. Frankly I did not share his views entirely when he made the statement, but I am afraid I am in a different position now where I must agree with what he said here. Because after all, Parliament functions upon an honourable understanding of the position of each other on either side of this House.

And then my hon. and learned Friend, the Prime Minister, rose from his seat and said this :

“Mr. Chairman, I apologise to the House for speaking again . . . ”

That is purely rhetorical, because the hon. Gentleman speaks five or six times on every subject—

“ . . . but I should think that hon Members opposite would have understood what I said. I said that we would work it out in such a way that it be clear to the entire world that the Speaker would be independent of the Executive. Yet the hon. Member comes here and talks about Ministers receiving \$900 for entertainment. The hon. Member is so insulting, that I ought not to have answered him.”
—[OFFICIAL REPORT 9th December, 1958, c. 1393.]

And then I think the hon. Gentleman for St. Thomas said what is now running through the minds of people inside and outside the House. He said—

“We have no confidence in you.”

But Mr. Chairman, those of us on this side of the House regard this as a most serious matter, because if the Prime Minister was forced to acknowledge in this House that this Parliament must always respect the independence of the Speaker, then by the Minister of Finance coming here and attempting to reduce the Speaker's salary by one cent, he is offering jurisdiction over the independence of the Speaker of this Parliament; he is assuming jurisdiction over the Speakership of this Parliament. He has no right to do that.

That is why this matter was referred to a Select Committee; that is why this matter was taken out of the hands of the Council of State to remove any semblance of threat of control over the Speakership of the Parliament. That is why we say they are striking at the very roots and

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

foundation of Parliament when they assume jurisdiction over the Speakership of this House.

We are not going to occupy these Benches. Mr. Chairman, and allow any Member, however honourable his intentions might be, to do anything that has any semblance of jurisdiction or interference, over the independence of the Speakership in this House. That is why I contend that if the Government say they are unable to find the money, it is a perfectly legitimate excuse to go back to the Committee that made these recommendations, and let that Committee say: "Very well, we understand your plight, we will report to the House that we have further considered this matter and at the present time, this ought not to take place."

Mr. Rocheford (Barbados): The Committee will come back to this House?

Mr. Sinanan: The Committee.

Mr. Rocheford: I am sorry you do not understand me.

Mr. Sinanan: Don't make that mistake. I understand the Barbadian accent very well. My hon. Friend the Prime Minister will tell you I have spent many pleasant days in Barbados. It is not your language that I do not understand.

Mr. Rocheford: I don't mean the language. It is still supposed to be English.

Mr. Sinanan: Our argument, Mr. Chairman, is this—before we present the argument we ask if the Prime Minister is correct when he said—

"I said that we would work it out in such a way, that it would be clear to

the entire world, that the Speaker would be independent of the Executive"?

Was he enunciating a powerful precedent and powerful argument maintaining Parliament's prestige? The answer is "Yes, the Prime Minister was correct"; so that if the Council of State want to change this Report or disagree with it they must send it back to the independent Committee representing both sides of this House.

Mr. Rocheford: Why?

Mr. Sinanan: I can understand him even when he says "Why". And I will tell my Friends why: because we say that the Council of State cannot descend upon us here and throw out that role that distinguishes the Speaker from the Council of State and from Members of this House—in other words fulfil the words of my hon. Friend—Dr. Jekyll runs here and becomes Mr. Hyde. That is what I am saying. The Council of State cannot seek to reduce the Speaker's salary which is recommended by a Committee of this House.

The Prime Minister: Who says not?

Mr. Sinanan: The Prime Minister says so; every authority I quote here. I will not worry with *Campion* or *May's*—they are mere juniors when it comes to expositions on parliamentary practice in comparison with my learned Friend the Prime Minister! I agree with my Prime Minister. I am entitled to disagree with *Campion*! In quoting that authority you challenge the Prime Minister himself! [*Interruption*] I am not going to stop.

I don't know why my hon. Friend the Minister of Agriculture is getting confused

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

Let him send Mr. Manley a cable, he will get a sensible reply in five minutes.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Ricketts): I wouldn't take it from anybody.

The Chairman: If you resent it, you must go outside and ask him to follow you.

Mr. Sinanan: The Minister ought not to get so excited. The hon. Minister of Agriculture must contain himself. He is always in good humour and, he must get back to that humour. I was suggesting that his message should go to Jamaica instead of to Trinidad.

Mr. Ricketts: I am in good humour.

Mr. W. B. Williams crossed the Bar.

The Chairman: Hon. Members must not, for any reason at all, leave one side of the House and go to the other side. Not for any reason at all, unless he is crossing to change his Party.

Mr. W. B. Williams: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sinanan: That is why I have always said, when the Prime Minister comes back on this side of the House we would keep him here.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to appeal again to my hon. Friend from Manchester. I think the Minister of Finance was very wise when, at the beginning of this meeting today, he moved the suspension of the Standing Orders in order to carry us beyond the time limit, because we had promised we would go into protracted debate on this matter. It seems to me that even if I quote the Prime Minister

himself, when he said Members opposite will not be muzzled—but I am sure the hon. Prime Minister will suffer with bad digestion within the next 24 hours, because he could never masticate and eat all those words in this short space of time. He can never masticate sufficiently to enable him to eat and digest all these paragraphs of *Hansard* I will quote for him.

The Prime Minister: I never had bad digestion.

Mr. Sinanan: The Minister of Communications was most convinced that my hon. Friend was right when he made these statements. If I am to understand that my learned Friend will rise after me, I will terminate my argument, because I would really like to hear something new why this Government could justify its departure, or its stand, in emulation of parliamentary practice, and to justify this assault on its Members' own consciences.

The Minister of Communications and Works (Mr. Rose): Mr. Chairman, this Government welcomes the opportunity of disabusing the minds of the Opposition of this peculiar impression they have that the Government has acted erroneously.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition saw fit to quote from May's but I would like to say that the Government is bound by the Constitution, and this House is governed by the Standing Orders made under this Constitution. Whenever it's silent, then we may look to May's for guidance. That depends entirely upon the House. We may look for guidance as to the actual procedure which obtains in the House of Commons.

Mr. Hill (Surrey, Jamaica): That's a shame!

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

Mr. Rose : I would like first of all to refer to the references to this particular subject contained in May's and to show that if the hon. Leader of the Opposition had proceeded to trace and develop the points in accordance with the cross-references he would have come to an entirely different conclusion than the one which he propounded here today.

He has referred to a paragraph at page 633. I would like to read it. It is headed "Consideration of Resolutions recommending Public Expenditure." I quote :

"Select Committees may consider and report to the House Resolutions recommending an outlay of public money for the purposes therein specified without previous signification of the royal recommendation (see page 767) because such a Resolution is regarded as analogous to those abstract Resolutions by the House in favour of public expenditure which are in the nature of suggestions and are not in themselves binding upon the action of the House."

This is quite clear, Sir, but let us proceed to the reference on page 767. The relative paragraph refers to Abstract Motions—Motions to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition referred and which he attempted to use as authority for the peculiar theory which he has propounded. Abstract Motions differ, and I quote :

"Motions advocating public expenditure, or the imposition of a charge, if the Motion be framed in sufficiently abstract and general terms, can be entertained, and agreed to by the House (f) Resolutions of this nature are permissible because having no operative effect no grant is made or

burden imposed by the adoption. (see page 755)

Mr. Sinanan : What about the footnote ?

Mr. Rose : I am going to show you. There are two references in this particular paragraph, one is under (f) and the other to page 755. (g) indicates some of the abstract Motions which may be entertained in the House, in the words of this paragraph, because in their nature they have no operative effect and no grant is made or burden obtained by their adoption. One of these refers to payment of Members; that is to say, it is possible to have an abstract Resolution by this House fixing payment of Members.

Mr. Sinanan : That is where the Motion is brought by a Member of the House.

Mr. Rose : You had your chance. I am following. We proceed, from here, Mr. Chairman, to page 755 which makes the position quite clear. [*Interruption*]

The Chairman : I will ask hon. Members not to interrupt the Member. After all, he has to explain himself.

Mr. Rose : At page 755, Sir, the reference deals with monies to be provided by Parliament.

"A Resolution authorising such expenditure,"

and I am quoting—

"may be described shortly as a preliminary to the presentation of an estimate."

And it proceeds to say :

"Although a Resolution of this type initiates no immediate charge, but it is intended only to authorise the

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[Mr. ROSE]

eventual presentations of an estimate, it is in view of the terms of Standing Order No. 78 regarded as containing a "charge" in the technical sense and could not be brought before the House without the recommendation of the Crown."

Our contention has always been that it is impossible to bring any Resolution which results in a charge upon the Government, unless it is a recommendation of the Council of State.

Mr. Sinanan: That is in a Resolution.

4.10 p.m.

Mr. Rose: The point, Sir, is that it is quite clear, even from the references used by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that it is not possible for this House to adopt a Resolution which would bind the finances of the Government unless you have the consent and the recommendation of the Council of State. Indeed this is no way different from the provisions which we have here in our Standing Orders.

I have said, Sir, that the position is that we are not bound by this, we are bound by our Constitution.

Mr. Sinanan: What is that? You are not bound by May's? That is a shameful thing to say.

Mr. Rose: We are bound by our Constitution and our Standing Orders. The only time reference to May's holds is where our Standing Orders are silent or where there is doubt. Our submission, Sir, is that there are no doubts in this matter at all—that we have a Constitution and we have our Standing Orders by which this House must be guided.

Article 108 of the Constitution says—

"The Governor-General shall make and cause to be laid before the Senate and the House of Representatives respectively when they first meet such Standing Orders with respect to the matters mentioned in article 26 of this Constitution as appear to him expedient to enable the Senate and the House of Representatives to commence the transaction of their business in an orderly manner, but any such Orders may be amended or revoked by the chamber to which they relate."

These Standing Orders, Sir, were made by the Governor-General pursuant to Article 108 of the Constitution of The West Indies, and until these Standing Orders are amended this House is bound by these Standing Orders.

I would have thought, Sir, that it would have been no longer necessary to have to argue this point, particularly by virtue of the Ruling which Mr. Speaker gave a few days ago when he referred to Standing Order 45 (3), which reads:

"Except upon the recommendation of the Council of State, to be signified by a Minister and recorded in the Minutes of Proceedings, the House shall not receive any Government bill and shall not proceed upon any Motion for leave to introduce a Bill which, in the opinion of the Speaker, would make provision for imposing or increasing any tax, for imposing or increasing any charge on the revenues or other funds of the Federation or for altering any such charge otherwise than by reducing it, or for compounding or remitting any debt due to the Federation."

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

The point is, Sir, that it is entirely within the competence of the Council of State to decide whether a recommendation which leads to a charge should be adopted. Indeed, Sir, if we may finally refer again to May's at page 686, Members would see the procedure laid down there for dealing with financial matters. Rule (2) under "Financial Procedure" says that a charge cannot be taken into consideration unless it is demanded by the Crown or recommended from the Crown.

Our attitude, Sir, is simply this: It is for the Crown—the Council of State—to consider, to demand, to recommend to this hon. House, any matter which would become a charge upon the revenues of this Government.

Finally, Sir, there is one particular aspect of the matter with which I would like to deal, and that is, that while I would be the first person to admit that it is extremely desirable that the servants of this House should be servants in this House in the strictest sense, nevertheless, under the present system, under the present Constitution, these servants of the House are members of the Federal Public Service.

Mr. Sinanan: That is what we are trying to remove!

Mr. Rose: You have got to move it by a proper resolution, not bring it about like this.

Article 5 of the Constitution, Sir, makes provision for the Governor-General to make certain appointments. One of these appointments happens to be the appointment of the Clerk of the House.

Mr. Sinanan: The last time you gave an opinion in this House, it cost the House \$5,000; this is going to cost twice as much!

Mr. Rose: Mr. Chairman, may I, for the information of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, say that the opinion in the matter to which I am referring, the question of the position of people who are employed and who work in the House of Representatives, is based upon advice which we have from our Attorney-General?

Sir, I was saying, finally, that the position is that the servants of the House are Civil Servants in the sense that they are members of the Federal Public Service. This is confirmed by the fact that under Section 4 of the Civil Establishment Act of 1958, an Order has been made—Civil Establishment (General) Order of 1958, in which all the posts of the Legislature are listed.

Mr. Sinanan: Mr. Chairman, I was forced to remind my hon. Friend that he volunteered an opinion in this House which cost us \$5,000; and I remember well that when he got up and gave that brilliant legal opinion he said: "This is a matter of which there can be absolutely no doubt", just as he has said here today.

Mr. Chairman, let us now refer to Campion, and I am going to do what is almost contemptible, refer him to the contents which he would see under the heading—"Bills Introduced on the Order of the House". When this House accepts unanimously a resolution of a Committee it is the Order of the House which cannot be disregarded. But I will also refer him to "Money Bills"; and I know that he has a long and standing association with this book—which he never saw in his life—

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[Mr. SINANAN]

but I am going to refer him, nevertheless, to it.

Mr. Bradshaw: Mr. Chairman, may I ask, through you, Sir, what is the title of the book?

Mr. Sinanan: Do you expect me to refer anything to my hon. Friend which is an introduction? All I am saying now is that I am introducing him to the procedure of the House of Commons. What else can I do in the face of these arguments? It is an elementary book. Under the heading, "Money Bill"—

"A certain class of Bills whose main object is the expenditure of money or the imposition of taxation are still required to be preceded by resolution passed in Committee of the whole House and agreed to by the House on report".

Does that make any sense to you? And in this case the Bill is ordered to be brought in immediately after the resolutions are carried. Does that make any sense to you?

I would like to refer—you mean hon. Members are trying to find something contradictory in this? Didn't the hon. Gentleman stand up here and say that this was a Money Bill?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I may explain what, in my opinion, is the position. The procedure in England with regard to money for charges on the public revenue is entirely different from the procedure in the Parliament of The West Indies. They have a Committee of Ways and Means and a Committee of Supply, and before any Bill can be brought in at all the Government of the day must pre-

sent Estimates of Revenue, Estimates of Expenditure to these two Committees. These Committees are both Committees of the whole House and they then pass resolutions. If they do not pass resolutions the money cannot go into a Bill. When the Committee, whether it be of Supply or Ways and Means, has passed the Resolution, then the Bill is ordered to be brought in on the Resolution. But the charges on the revenue have the approval of the Cabinet. There is only one case in the Parliament of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in which it is possible for the House to proceed without the sanction of the Government and hon. Members have all missed it. It is on page 765 of May's Parliamentary Practice:

"A grant of public money can be obtained by a Motion made in accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders Nos. 82 and 83, . . ."

which we in this House have not got.

". . . for the appointment of a Committee of the whole House upon a future day to consider a resolution for an address to the Crown asking for a sum of money for the purposes therein specified, or for action involving expenditure, concluding an assurance that the House will "make good" the grant or the expenses attending the action desired. This procedure places the initiative for incurring expenditure on the House and has occasionally been employed in the past for suggesting expenditure against the wishes of Her Majesty's Ministers . . ."

May's gives an example in the footnote of a case in which one of these resolutions was sent to the House of Commons in 1811 and the Prince Regent declined to

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

issue the money as requested by the House of Commons. And he goes on to point out that these are usually used for purposes like providing public monuments or things of that sort, usually agreed to by the House and accepted by the Committee. As I understand the Constitution of The West Indies, the only body which can bring a Bill or a Resolution to this House which involves the expenditure of public money or a charge upon public revenue is the Council of State. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. Sinanan : As a matter of fact, Sir, I was about to refer my hon. Friends to page 207 of the same book. It says that there are several questions that you have to ask on the presentation of such a Bill. And here is one of the main questions :

“Is its main object to impose a charge ?”

And that is the very point hon. Members opposite have been trying to make.

“If so, unless introduced by the Government under Standing Order No. 80, it must be founded upon Resolutions of a Committee of the whole House.”

And in furtherance of what you have said, Sir, [*Laughter*] . . . I don't know why hon. Members seem to think that you are maintaining that the only authority to bring forward a Bill here for public expenditure is the Council of State under Standing Order !

Mr. Rose : On a Point of Order, Sir. Is the hon. Member contending that that is the correct interpretation ?

Mr. Sinanan : We contend and we argue that it is our point of view — and

they will never convince us to the contrary — that there are two methods of presenting charges and expenditure of public money : either by the Council of State under the relevant Standing Order, or if there is a Resolution passed by this House in accepting the Report of a Select Committee. Nobody will make us change that opinion and I read this again. Let it penetrate.

“Is its main object to impose a charge ?”

And it gives two alternatives. Each is binding on this House.

“If so, unless introduced by the Government under S.O. No. 80, it must be founded upon Resolutions of a Committee of the whole House.”

Which was done in this case. This Government did not come forward with a case to increase the Speaker's salary because they knew that that would be assuming jurisdiction over the Speaker. That is quite implicit in what the Prime Minister said. That is why they referred it to this House because the Speaker is the custodian of this House, and we cannot assume jurisdiction over someone who is our custodian. That is why the Prime Minister made that statement because he knew it. Nobody here knows Parliamentary procedure better than the Prime Minister—not even the hon. Minister of Communications and Works. And the Prime Minister knew what he was saying because it is not a new point; it is as old as the hills. That is why the Government did not come under that particular Standing Order, but rather referred the matter to a Committee comprising Members of both sides. They accepted that Resolution and they ordered the Government to bring the legislation and that is my authority

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

for it. They can say no, no, no as much as they want. You may behave like any Russian in the United Nations. We will never alter our opinion in this, and we challenge hon. Members, if they have any sort of commonsense to consult their legal advisers. The legal advisers are supposed to advise Government on these matters. Maybe it is the misguided opinion of a Gentleman who has misguided the entire House before on another matter. Or do they want to refer this to the Federal Supreme Court again? We say that there are two methods of meeting a charge on public revenue in accordance with our Constitution and in accordance with the authorities—either the Council of State under that provision of the Standing Order or by a joint committee of this House being appointed and a Resolution being passed unanimously to accept its recommendation. Those are the two ways. And that is our opinion.

Produce a legal opinion here, but I can tell my hon. Friends that within the short space of time, although we were busily occupied here, I took the trouble to consult two Gentlemen who are reputed for their knowledge of Constitutional Law and procedure and they didn't find the time to disagree with us. We will have to abandon the opinion of the Member for Tobago regarding the interpretation he sought to put on a particular section of the Standing Orders yesterday. It was so childish and so elementary that if the Speaker didn't squash him we would have picked our most junior Member to do it.

The Chairman does not differ with me, and if he did so it is with the greatest respect that we beg to disagree with him.

We are entitled to disagree with him. I did not understand the Chairman to disagree with me. We contend that there are two methods and we ask hon. Members again to let us adjourn this for a day. Let us adjourn for 24 hours and get a legal opinion. My Friends seem hesitant to get a good, sound legal opinion.

I joined issue with this Gentleman and his Party in another place on two or three very important and very complex constitutional issues and he is well aware of the results—that they have not yet proven me wrong on any one. Take the occasion when they were about to bring a Motion affecting the seat of my Deputy. We were only aware of it two minutes before and with those two minutes' notice we were able to provide the authorities that showed the utter folly of the Motion. The Minister of Communications for all his learning violated the rules and privileges governing Members of this House and the ordinary courtesy of Gentlemen by coming to this House, just two seconds before the Speaker came in, and telling the hon. Member he was going to raise the question regarding the vacancy of his seat.

Committee reported progress and begged leave to sit again.

Agreed to.

4.35 Sitting suspended.

5.05 p.m.: Sitting resumed

Mr. Bradshaw: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now resume in Committee of Supply.

Agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply

Mr. Sinanan: Mr. Chairman, when the suspension was taken I was actually

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

occupying the floor of the House, and I will now continue on the point on which I left off.

On the same page of *Hansard*, Sir, I made a statement to the hon. and learned Prime Minister which I would not read now, but I would like to read to this Committee what he said in reply to that statement. This is what he said :

I am sorry if my English was not clear enough. I never said that. I said that if we come here and say he should get \$10,000 the Executive cannot touch it. If the House once sends up a Resolution to the Executive, the Executive cannot alter it."—[OFFICIAL REPORT 9th December, 1958, c.1395.]

That is the language of the Prime Minister on this very subject.

Mr. Bousquet : And he was wrong !

Mr. Sinanan : My hon. Friend from St. Lucia says that the Prime Minister was wrong. Until the hon. and learned Gentlemen says that he was wrong—

Mr. Bousquet : He said so !

Mr. Sinanan : I am sorry, Sir, but the hon. Prime Minister did not say that he was wrong. He has not said so. He has attempted to throw doubt upon the authenticity of this *Hansard* Report. He has prefaced his remarks over and over by saying that he is not in a position to know and he will correct *Hansard* to say that that was not what he really said; but for the purpose of this argument he will accept what we are saying.

Mr. Bousquet : Well, he was wrong.

Mr. Bradshaw : Leave him alone.

Mr. Sinanan : Now the hon. Member for St. Lucia says that the Prime Minister was wrong.

Mr. Bousquet : I said that if he said so he was wrong.

Mr. Sinanan : That's what I'm saying, that the hon. Prime Minister was not wrong when he said so.

Mr. Bousquet : If he said so.

Mr. Sinanan : Am I to understand there is doubt about this *Hansard* report? Well, forget about the Report now; we will rely on our memories. Doesn't the hon. Gentleman from St. Lucia remember the Prime Minister saying so?

Mr. Bousquet : I don't.

Mr. Sinanan : I think he had better accept the advice of the Leader of the House. The Leader of the House is giving him good advice not to interrupt me when I am speaking.

That is what the Prime Minister said here and that is what I am going to quote again : his reply. The Prime Minister said, and I'm going to read it again, and I will read it again and again, because I know that hon Gentlemen over there are troubled and let them get troubled a little more in their own minds and in their own consciences. This is what the hon. Prime Minister, Sir Grantley Adams, the leader of all those Gentlemen over there, the leader even of Sir Oracle, the Minister of Communications and Works, said :

"If the House once sends up a Resolution to the Executive, the Executive cannot alter it."

And I will remind hon. Members opposite what the Prime Minister said sitting there

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[**MR. SINANAN**]

a few minutes ago, when I was reading and referring to *Campion's*. He said that he (the Prime Minister) is a better authority than *Campion*. I am inclined to agree with him. He is a distinguished parliamentarian with about twenty-five or thirty years behind him. The hon. Minister of Communications and Works has twenty-nine years to go in order to come up to him. Twenty-nine years! And for the Minister of Communications and Works they will be twenty-nine hard and laborious years to reach the standard of the Prime Minister as a parliamentarian.

Mr. Cooke : On a Point of Order, Sir. May I draw your attention to Standing Order 41 :

“41 (1) The Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the House, or of the Committee, to the conduct of a Member who persists in irrelevance, or tedious repetition either of his own arguments, or of the arguments used by other Members in Debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech and to resume his seat.”

Mr. Speaker : The essential words are “Speaker or Chairman”.—[*Laughter*]...

Mr. Sinanan : I hope that somebody reports to the Prime Minister that that hon. Gentleman said that I am repeating the “tedious arguments” of the Prime Minister. Anyway I hope he is not saying so, but I am very happy to see that it affects hon. Members.

I continue. The Prime Minister said :
“If the House once sends up a Resolution to the Executive, the Executive

cannot alter it.” You have got to find the money.”

That is what he said. Very strong language, Mr. Chairman.

“You have got to find the money”.

If you have to reduce your salaries, you have got to find the money. If even you have to cut out your allowances you have got to find the money. That is what the Prime Minister said—laid down here in law. Even if you have got to cut out some of those very valuable ministerial trips, you have got to find the money or if you have to reduce our salaries on this side of the House, you have got to find the money.

When I got a notice from the competent Government department deducting about half of my salary by way of income tax, I thought that it was in accordance with this edict of the Prime Minister that the money was being found. Because in the last few months hon. Gentlemen on this side have been having more than half their salaries deducted—

Mr. Joseph : Two-thirds!

Mr. Sinanan : —and we thought that the Minister of Finance was carrying out the mandate given by the Prime Minister. Is that the reason? Is that the way the hon. Gentleman has been finding the money? Although I question the word “finding” there, he has not made much effort to find it.

Mr. Chairman, that is what we say—even at this stage they have got to find the money. If they cannot find the money, go back to the origin of this Report. Hon. Members opposite cannot get away from it. They must go back to this Committee

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

and say that this House ordered legislation to be passed. They must go back to the Committee and say that this House—that is the language—ordered by way of a Resolution that the money could be found and these increases made. They must go back to the Committee and say that in view of that order the Minister of Finance has told us that he cannot find the money therefore we must send in an amended Report. And let the Members of that Committee know. If the Minister of Finance comes before them or sends a letter—I understand that is the practice, either by a letter or an interview—in which he tells the Members of that Committee, “These are the facts, we cannot find the money.” I ask you, as the Gentleman responsible for this Portfolio, to report to the House that I have given you the information and that you are satisfied that I cannot find the money in accordance with the order of the House”. And I am sure that every Member, once the statement is reasonable and acceptable, would want to report to this House that after further consideration the Minister begs leave to report that they would alter the order because we are satisfied that the Minister of Finance cannot find the money to act in accordance with the wishes and orders of this House. No other way. It can be done no other way. And it must come back to the House. The House is the only supreme authority to amend that order. No Government, no Prime Minister, no Minister of Finance, no Minister without Portfolio, not even the Minister of Communications and Works can alter the order of this House.

Mr. Rocheford : Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that the Question be now put.

The Chairman : I don't think we can interfere with the Ministerial side of the House—the Ministerial side of the House might wish to speak . . .

Mr. Rocheford : Indications have been made . . .

The Chairman : Nothing has been indicated to me.

Mr. Sinanan : If that Motion for the closure were put to the House, Mr. Chairman, I would vote for it and I would advise my Colleagues here to vote for it in order to support our argument that there is a considerable amount of intelligence existing on the benches of the Government. It is consistent with their attitude in this whole matter—not only to ignore the House, not only to ignore the order of the House, not only to bulldoze everything here in their own way, but to try to shut up those of us who wish to protest. Well, I was about to close my address but I have now started. I am now going to begin—move the closure every time, even when I am standing on my legs . . .

Mr. Rose : Filibuster.

Mr. Sinanan : Call it what you want. Call it filibuster, call it what you want. They are so brazen on the other side to stand up when a Member of the Opposition is speaking against a Government measure that is so reprehensible in itself, and attempt to shut him up! Well all I can say is that they are asking for it. Now let us fulfil the words of the Minister of Communications and Works—we will filibuster. I am going to send for the Bible. I will read every page of it for him.

I will respect your wishes.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

The Prime Minister went on :

“There is not a single Minister here who has not got to put his hand in his pockets for entertainment at some time or other. Just recently I had a dinner at the Normandie. There were only 17 people and I had to spend my money for the occasion”.—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 9th December, 1958, c.1395]

That is what the Prime Minister said in order to show that he appreciated the facts when we saw the need to increase the salaries of these people. At least, I hope, that was the reason. That is what he was saying—that even the Prime Minister has had expenses and had to put his hands in his own pocket. Of course, where the Minister of Communications is concerned, I could understand that he has had to go into his own pocket and may even have been out of pocket at some time or other!

Mr. Joseph : Greater love hath no man.

Mr. Sinanan : Mr. Chairman, we regret very much the fact that the Government has refused to carry out the order of this House. We are contending, Mr. Chairman, that that borders on a contempt of this House. We regret that Members opposite find it necessary to be so adamant on this stand of the Government's and refuse at this stage to resubmit that Committee which submitted this Report to this House so that we could have the matter re-opened and have the whole thing done in a more democratic fashion.

If they feel that everything that should have been done to bring this matter to a finality has not been in fact done then I commend to them that the solution is to

adopt the formula and the method which is most consistent with democratic parliamentary practice—not to throw out the order of this House or say we are not going to follow your wishes but that we would, in accordance with parliamentary practice, re-summon this Committee and refer this matter to them for consideration.

You must forgive us if we appear to be insistent, Sir. Hon. Members opposite must forgive us if we have trespassed upon their time, but we are anxious to adopt the best democratic principles and methods for our own people to follow and if in doing so we have used up some time, I think that for such a purpose we must spend hours arguing these principles even though they do not appear to be important to Government at this particular period.

It must be remembered that we will not all be here in this House in the next few years. We will not be in this House forever. When I look at the Benches opposite I feel and I hope that some of the Members there will not be here for the rest of the five years but will have their terms terminated. There are one or two Members in the Government Bench who should not be there much longer, and not only because of their obstreperous behaviour. Those Members obstruct the good business of the Government and the progress of the Federation. All that this Government is doing, Mr. Chairman, is to use their slender majority of one or two to actually throttle this House into adopting a measure that is going to be a lasting reproach to this House, unless some Member of this Government has the courage of his convictions to stand up in this House and correct it.

Mr. Cargill : Mr. Chairman, I make no apology for getting on my feet again

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

on this matter. We have heard a lot of learned arguments and a great deal of arguments that is not so learned, about the legal and constitutional position of this matter. I would like to bring the House down to earth again and get back to realities—realities of human beings, human undertakings, human honour and human decency.

Mr. Chairman, I hear an hon. Member opposite in the Government bench sucking his teeth or what we call in these parts 'chupsing'. Perhaps he is not old enough to understand that the only values that matter are human values. Probably he has to live a little longer to realise that the real attributes that people have are methods of expressing not their wisdom but their immaturity.

I have heard about the legal aspect of this issue. We are told that this Government cannot act in a certain way because when the proposal was taken before the Council of State, the Council of State said it could not act that way and the Council of State threw it out. We have heard argument as to whether that was constitutionally right or not; but I want to bring this House back to earth. Let us forget what the legal or constitutional position is? Let us, for the purpose of argument, say that everything said by the Prime Minister was perfectly right and make the extraordinary allowance to the Minister of Communications that he has said something that appears to make sense. It is quite possible to make any postulate for the purpose of an argument.

They say they went to the Council of State. But we must ask ourselves 'Who are the Council of State'? It consists, I understand it, of 11 people—three Senators, the

Governor General and seven Ministers and the Prime Minister . . . I hear the Attorney-General too. It does not matter whether he is a Member of the Council of State or not.

I do not suppose that they maintain that the Governor-General, by using some power of veto on the matter, threw the matter out, or that the three Senators had the power to turn it down. So that that really brings us to the position that the proposal was turned down by the seven Ministers and the Prime Minister. Nothing can get you away from this fact—that seven Ministers and the Prime Minister accepted something in this House, went to a meeting of the Council of State, put on another set of hats, turned themselves down, and came back to this House and said 'unfortunately we have been turned down'. By whom? Themselves. A split personality. That is all there is to it. It is differentiation. It may be described as Jekyll and Hyde. It may be uncharitable, but people who suffer from Schizophrenia are mad; they ought to be locked up!

How can they possibly decide themselves by going to themselves and saying "May we do this?" and answer themselves saying, "We can't" and then come here and say, "We are awfully sorry; we said you can do something, now we say we can't".

Hon. Member: That is puerile.

Mr. Cargill: What is so extraordinary, Mr. Chairman—when I look at the hon. Gentlemen opposite, I know they are honourable Gentlemen, decent honest men, who look after their families well and so on. I have no doubt that in their heart of hearts they understand what I am

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. CARGILL]

speaking about; but so rabid are their concepts on Party, so corrupted are they by the concept that they must have a loyalty to a particular section and must do things because of Party loyalties, that they cannot any longer see right from wrong.

It is a disease that seems to be occurring in the whole world, particularly in The West Indies at this moment. I am very sorry if I have to preach to the hon. Members opposite some very elementary things, but I would like to remind them that there is still a right and a wrong, there are still things called promises. Do not let them indulge in an attitude which is far too prevalent in our country: that if you are smart and you exercise a little cleverness you can get yourself out of some situation, that it is an admirable thing and you don't need to worry about things like honesty, decency that everybody will be pleased with you. I think it is a contemptible attitude, one which is far too prevalent in The West Indies today—an attitude beautifully presented in the Debate we have today.

It is a shame that we should ever have to discuss the legal aspect of this matter.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Communications reminds me of a book I used to read very much in my younger days, in which there was a character called the Cheshire Cat. It always used to grin and the extraordinary thing about this cat was that it had no reality outside of the grin. Once you talked to it at all everything about the Cheshire cat disappeared, except the grin. I am inclined to think that my hon. Friend reminds me of that cat because when I look up the only reality from him that I can see is this very inane grin.

It becomes extremely boring, Mr. Chairman.

As I was saying, I wish to remind the House that this, after all, is a matter of people, the people who turn this down are the very people who now come here and say, "We are not carrying this out because the thing was turned down". I personally don't give a rap about the legal position; what I do care about—the hon. Gentlemen can laugh as much as they like, that is all they have done today. The eyes of The West Indies are on them. If they think that is something to laugh about, go on my Friends and laugh as much as you like; but the country and you yourselves will be laughing on the wrong side of your face as the years go by. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves.

I am perhaps making the mistake of taking the hon. Gentlemen opposite too seriously. Perhaps I should not be so upset about the matter had it not been for the fact that I have a faint hope that it would be possible for them to understand and to act differently. If I realised that they did not know any better, then I would not be worried; but I keep on hoping that somewhere in their hearts there is some spark of decency that will let them understand what we on this side of the House are saying. If there is not, it is not my problem, it is not the problem of this House, it is their problem—grin and all.

Hon. Members (Opposition Benches):
Cheshire cat.

Mr. Cargill: I don't intend to speak any more upon the subject. I have had my say on more than one occasion, perhaps much too much.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

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

Mr. Cargill: I knew hon. Members would say that. Nonetheless, I have had my say. We are not finished on this side yet, but I hope that by the time we have finished some little amount of conscience, some little amount of something that must have been taught them at some time in their lives, will awaken and let them realise that no real advantage has been gained by their little "anancy" trick.

The Chairman: The question is that Item 1(d) —

Mr. Bryan: I am enquiring of the Chair — I didn't hear.

The Prime Minister: Order, order.

The Chairman: I am putting the question now.

Question put—that Item 1(d) be reduced by \$5.

Amendment negatived.

Item 1(e):

Mr. Bryan (Eastern Counties, Trinidad): Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer to this House some rather general remarks about the status and prestige of this House. I believe, Sir, they can very well be embraced under the Head which is now before the House—Head III, the vote for the Legislature.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, if you permit me I would like to say that I can now very well see the reasonableness of your calling me when I rose just now, because there is ample opportunity here for me to express the things I would like to say. As we come to approve the vote for the

Legislature, we like to think of this Legislature, of this Parliament as the supreme authority in the whole machinery by which we are governed in this new nation of ours.

When the last question was being debated there emerged one thing which to my mind stood out more pertinently than any other, and that is the fact that whether or not Members were prepared to recognise that this House—call it this Legislature, this arm of Parliament—is the supreme authority—this House to which people have been elected by the free votes, we hope in all places, of the people of the Territories. And we must in our affairs, especially at the incipient stage of our history, put into recognition, on a big board that the rest of the world can see, that we accept the fundamentals and traditions of this way of life, and that this House is the supreme authority in matters that concern the people of the nation.

When I say this, Mr. Chairman, I would like to recall one occasion, at our last session, when this House was involved, or embroiled, I should say, in a very sharp or acrimonious debate. Members had spoken on both sides of the House, but the question had not been fully ventilated, and I remember that the Government side found itself in deep waters and the hon. Minister of Finance rose to his feet, in the old parliamentary manoeuvre of asking for a closure, and asked to apply the closure simply because the Government had the majority and the Government was in a tight situation.

I would like to point out that the Speaker came to the rescue of the minority on that occasion, as he is supposed to do, and protected them by saying he did not

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. BRYAN]

think the question had been sufficiently ventilated and he would not put the question to the House.

The debate proceeded and during the course of that same debate, in an aside, the hon. Prime Minister committed himself to a remark, Mr. Chairman, which has haunted me all along since he said it and still haunts me up to this time. It was an aside, but it was so important that, I daresay, it was recorded in the Hansard of the proceedings of this House. Somebody on the other side said, "the House has got to decide it", and the Prime Minister remarked, as he usually does, "That the Government was the House."

Some of you will recall that. We found the Prime Minister brushing aside the House, as such, and saying, what matters here is the Government.

Does one have to argue? Is it really necessary at this stage of the evolution of political development in The West Indies? The most elementary politician must know, as the hon. Member for St. Mary so well said, that it is not only a question of law, or of the context, or of the function or the written facts of the thing. What is paramount in our minds, I believe, is that at this stage we must come to have sufficient respect for this House as to know that under all circumstances the House must be expected to do the right thing.

That is the point we want to get at. We must; no matter what it involves, no matter how precarious the situation might be for the Government; no matter how much the Opposition might lose faith on any one point they may be pursuing, when it comes to matters of the House, of the

Nation, the people the world at large must realise that in this Parliament the House must be expected to do the right thing.

I will say now why that remark of the Prime Minister, "that the Government is the House," still haunts me. I never expected such a statement could fall from his lips or the lips of Members opposite at all, formally or informally. It points to a very dangerous situation. If the House was not the supreme authority, why would it be necessary for all Governments to seek to get a majority in the House? If the House was not the supreme authority, why is it necessary in all these Parliaments for the Government of the day to try to ensure they come to the House with a majority? The only reason why they must come to the House with a majority is that the majority can get the last word in the House. Your word as a Government does not matter in here unless you have the majority. Even if Government consisted of all the Members of this House it would still be necessary, before passing anything into law, to get the approval and the authority of the House; even if it is constituted of Members who are all of one Party. How can the Government be the House?

I reiterate the point. I would like Members to understand it. If they don't, it surprises me. It is because the House is the supreme authority—this Legislature—that the Government of the day must seek to get a majority in the House so that it can be assured at all times of the approval of the House for its actions.

Mr. Cooke (St. James, Jamaica): That is all right.

Mr. Bryan: Nothing like breaking it down for the Member over there. I remember the Minister of Finance endea-

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

vouring to put the closure so arbitrarily and we having suffered from that. It is a good parliamentary manoeuvre. I have tried it in my time and got away with it. Let anybody try it, if they can. But nowadays the House is a little too alert. There is nothing wrong with trying, however. It shows you know.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that as we are going to have these rather substantial sums of money for the Legislature, for the two Houses, that we should do nothing which would create suspicion that Government intends, because it has the majority in the House, to endeavour, at any time, to discredit the House as the Supreme authority.

5.50 p.m.

If I may be allowed, in passing, Mr Chairman, I would like to say that no one really expects that we would come here at this early stage of our history and walk along the road leading to a bright future without meeting some hurdles along the way. When these hurdles arise because somebody has made a mistake, it seems to me that all that is necessary is for that somebody to come here and admit—and only big people could admit—and I believe the other side, be it the side of the Opposition or the side of the Government, would always take that admission graciously and would move aside to allow the traditions of Parliament in the British Commonwealth, the traditions of Parliament of the Mother of Parliaments as we know it, to really solidify and guide us.

Let us not push aside one of those fundamentals and set any precedent which may be very awkward, if not in our time, then in the time of the generation to come.

It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that I feel I must vote on these Appropriations for the Legislature, and when I come to vote on the matter, I will do so with my conscience clear, as I have put on the records of this House my growing fear that the Government of the day, although knowing what the facts are, although knowing what the traditions are, have decided to put their power as a Government in advance of the power of this House, in advance of the power of this Parliament.

If the House was not the supreme authority then the Government could come in here and would not care less what this House feels on any matter; and this entire Parliament would be farcical. Even if all 44 Members of this House were members of the same Party, we should all put this House as the supreme authority. Nowhere along the road should we allow Party feeling or Party victory to get into the way of those foundations of democracy without which we would be a people worthy of no respect at all.

Mr. Hill (Surrey, Jamaica): Mr. Chairman, like the hon. Member for St. Mary who spoke under a previous heading, I wish to ask this hon. House to try, as far as possible, to get away from justifying on legalistic or constitutional grounds, any decisions on any matter capable of a political decision. In other words, in my view, most of the matters, particularly those matters complained of by the Member for St. Mary, involve issues that are capable of political decisions. It is in that area that I have been accustomed; and I think progressive political parties, parties founded upon popular movements, upon adult suffrage, have pursued their political

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. HILL]

activities and the justification of their political claims in popular Parliaments.

So, Mr. Chairman, first, because I am not a lawyer and have no pretensions like my hon. Friend the Minister for Communications and Works to invade that area, and, secondly, because we as the first beneficiaries of the fruits of adult suffrage and belonging to popular political movements, can better confine ourselves to the purely political area, or arena, whether dealing with a matter which is the subject of a Special Select Committee, or the subject of a Resolution, or a promise made from the Government Benches, or Motions moved by Members of the Opposition, or Back-benchers of the Government, I would prefer — and I recommend it to the Minister — to see decisions treated as being political decisions as they really are. And I would hate ever again to see any repetition of the hiding behind constitutional fences, or the invoking of procedural niceties, such as we are growing accustomed to experience from the hon. Member for Manchester, Jamaica. I am not blaming him personally. Far be it from me to do so. But it shows that there is a misunderstanding by Members of the Government about the way that a Parliament founded on adult suffrage functions.

So, Mr. Chairman, whether it is a Motion for a bridge or for telecommunications, where this Federal Parliament can only act in an advisory capacity, that limited capacity of giving advice, or whether it is the Unit Territory Parliament which has the power to do the concrete work, I would prefer to see the Ministers, when they make a decision, come to the House and confide, or at least explain to the House, the reasons why they come to the decisions that they have reached.

In this case, I submit that one of the reasons is — and I can only hope that I am wrong, but it is my personal view — that the Government is neither Nationalist nor Labour —

Hon. Members (Government Benches):
Nor, nor, nor —

Mr. Sinanan : Nor sensible !

Mr. Hill : — because if it were nationalist it would not try to treat this Parliament as a Colonial Parliament, in the sense that they seek to entrench themselves behind the limited constitutional procedures that they may enjoy — or suffer from — without being manly enough to say: “We considered this matter in the Council of State and we ask you to accept that these are the reasons why we came to these decisions.” The same thing would be done in the case of salaries, in the case of the acceptance of any Motion, the implementation of which might depend upon money. It is in that spirit, Sir, that I prefer to express deep and growing concern that the Government Benches are contaminated with Colonialism: for it is the colonial mentality that seeks to hide decisions behind limited Constitutions, nice points of procedure, legalistic arguments, instead of coming forward and saying: “We have asserted our rights”. If you believe you have the right to say “no” to this hon. House when the House previously said “yes”, then come and say “We assert our right to say ‘no’, and we have said ‘no’ for the following cogent reasons.” And I would hesitate to believe that any Opposition would do more than treat it as a political decision. Political decisions are explored on the floor of popular Parliaments, but the decisions are settled finally in the field

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

among the people and by the people whose will is supreme, far more supreme than Parliament.

That is why I submit that this Government appears not to represent labour.

6.00 p.m.

The Chairman : May I call the hon. Member's attention to Standing Order No. 64, Rule 3 which says:

"... unless an amendment is proposed under the provisions of the next succeeding Order, a debate may take place on that question. Any such debate shall be confined to the policy of service for which the money is to be provided and shall not deal with the details of any item or sub-head but may refer to the details of revenue or funds for which that service is responsible"?

That is the matter under consideration at this stage, not whether this Government is Labour or otherwise.

Mr. Hill : I was coming to that point, Mr. Chairman, and I was going to show where my reference links up with it.

One of the reasons why the Council of State, the elected segment of it, has not carried out the unanimous decision of this House, did not go the whole way in accordance with the express wishes of this House, is because they think of this House as a Colonial Parliament. They do not fully understand the functions of the Speaker in a Parliament that represents a people of an embryonic nation. They do not understand that it is necessary to free their Legislature and the Legislature's officers from the control of the Minister in charge of the Civil Service. They simply do not.

While they prattle, boast and preach loudly about the Mother of Parliaments and refer glibly to May's Parliamentary Procedure and invoke constitutional niceties, they are still content to keep this House as a Colonial Parliament. They do not know that they should treat the Speaker of this House and the officers of this Parliament in the same way similar persons are treated in the Mother of Parliaments. They do not find it necessary to give to the Speaker the status enjoyed by his counterpart in the Mother of Parliaments. They wish to exercise their intensive powers in order to subject the officers of the Legislature to the control of the Minister in charge of Finance and Civil Servants. I am very alarmed at that.

It is one thing to talk about being an emergent nation but it is another thing to take steps to understand what is involved in becoming a nation.

I hope that, after this debate which shows and proves to me that the Government has lapsed and is not willing to admit its lapse, this year will not pass away before the Council of State takes into profound consideration the status that should be enjoyed in a Parliament of an emergent nation and the status of officers of a parliament which they hope will be the pride of a free nation. Freedom! Freedom is not what is written, it is not written into constitutions. Freedom is what moves people and what is written in their hearts and in their minds.

I condemn this Government as not being sufficiently progressive. I condemn this Government as guilty of being colonial in character, colonial in thinking and in its action, although it is loud-mouthed in its profession of freedom,

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

Question put and agreed to that Head III stands part of the Schedule.

Heads IV, V, VI and VII agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head VIII :

Mr. Cargill : Mr. Chairman, I am bound to say that in moving an amendment to sub-head 1 (a), which is a reduction in the hon. Minister of Finance's pay by the sum of \$2,400.00, I do so with some embarrassment because I understand — and I know that the Minister of Finance has done his best — that he has great expenses — he has to buy a large amount of elegant clothes; he has heavy expenses of high quality rum with which to dilute the coffee when he is making his Budget Speech; he has to provide himself with a button-hole every day — but I see that he has left his button-hole off today. As I say, I know the hon. Minister of Finance has a great deal of expenses and I move to reduce his pay with some reluctance; but the reason why I am going to do so, Sir, is that there comes a time in life, however much we try to avoid doing it, when we have to make comparisons. We have to say to ourselves, in considering the value of something, however much we may like it — my affection for the Minister of Finance almost knows no bounds — but nonetheless when I have to evaluate his work in this House, whether I like it or not, I have to compare him with somebody else; and when I compare him with the Speaker of this House I am bound to come to the unfortunate opinion that the hon. Minister is not as valuable to this House as the Hon. Speaker.

Now it is a fact that all the Speaker of this House is allowed is the salary of a Minister without Portfolio, which means

that the Speaker's salary is less by \$2,400 than that of the hon. Minister of Finance. So the only possible way that I can attempt to redress this obvious wrong, this obvious lack of equity — I cannot successfully propose from this side of the House to increase the salary of the hon. Speaker, although God knows we have tried our best, so the only thing that is left for me to do is to move a reduction in the Minister of Finance's salary and so put it in line with that of the Speaker of this House.

It is a most unfortunate spot into which we on this side of the House are being put. I have no doubt that the Minister of Finance will have lined his Party up and by the sheer weight of numbers, in due course, will be able to see that his salary remains as at present. In the meantime, and for quite a considerable time — three weeks or more — we can, on this side of the House, keep the matter going to make it extremely difficult for the Minister of Finance, or any other Minister for that matter, to draw any salary at all. We are quite prepared to do that. We feel that this matter is so important that we are quite prepared to take the matter to very great lengths — this and all the other amendments which I have proposed for today.

The hon. Minister of Communications and Works says that he thought I was going tomorrow. In order to disappoint the Minister of Communications and Works I am prepared to stay here until January or February. I do not wish the Minister of Finance to think that this is aimed in any way at him personally, but I do feel that it is very unjust indeed that he should be receiving more than the hon. Speaker of this House. What after all is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander, and

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

I don't see why hon. Ministers should propose to pay larger salaries to themselves and less for the Speaker of this House unless they, in fact, feel they are worth more than the Speaker of this House. If they feel that way, I will say that they have an inflated view of their value.

I understand that they receive — anyway I can't deal with that now but I will in due course study the question of Minister's gardeners and chauffeurs. We can consider that *ad nauseam* if put to it. In the meantime, Sir, I say that I will ask the Minister of Finance to let me have his view on this matter. I suppose that in fixing his salary at \$2,400 more than the Speaker of this House, he considers he is worth \$2,400 more, and I would like to have the view of the hon. Minister of Finance as to exactly what has led him to that somewhat distorted opinion. So in order to give the hon. Minister a chance to answer I will sit down.

Mr. Sinanan: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Bramble) calls out to me and says he is losing confidence in me. But I am trying to retrieve my lost confidence in him and his Colleagues, and if his anxiety to stop my hon. Friend on my left is to enable him to obtain the important post of Chief Minister of Montserrat, I suggest to him that he stay where he is and try to pick up some of the lofty ideals that we are trying to inject into their thick skins.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to ask the one who has led the Government so far in these arguments, the Minister of Communications and Works, if he is aware of the fact that even in the Trinidad Government, where there were two reports — the King

Report and the Lee Report — I understand it is called the "Dr. Lee Report" and it does not refer to the Member of the Opposition in that Parliament, I believe they have joined two personalities together — the Trinidad Government has taken out the recommendations for Ministers, for the Legislature and for the Speaker. They have refused to act on those portions of both reports and have referred them to a Select Committee comprising Members of both sides of the House — a Legislature that is fast moving from colonialism to a free, independent thinking body. They have done it. Hon. Gentlemen opposite cannot produce an example of even one Colonial Legislature that subordinates its Speaker to the whims of the Executive. If this passes, this House will be putting on record the fact that the Executive can fix the salary of the Speaker. They cannot produce one book on Parliamentary Practice not even a detective book to justify that. Not even a western magazine. They cannot produce one authority.

Again I am going to draw upon the fund of knowledge and experience of one of The West Indies' greatest parliamentarians, the hon. and learned Gentleman, who, when he speaks here, speaks as the Prime Minister of The West Indies, and who did not fail to remind us that when he gave his solemn assurance, he was the Prime Minister of The West Indies.

If that hon. and learned Gentleman, my very good friend, wishes to trifle with the imposing office that he occupies I am not prepared to trifle with it. We know that no Member on this side of the House will allow anything to be done that will detract from the high office which he occupies, and even if they want to do it we would prevent

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

them; because we owe it to this House and to this Nation — [Interruption] We will not prevent my hon. Friend from becoming the first Chief Minister of Montserrat, but we will prevent the Prime Minister himself from bringing his own high public office into disrepute.

This is what he said:

"I have been hearing that for more than 20 years...."

He is always saying that.

"...and it has never worried me. On this question, Mr. Chairman, what the Government has suggested is the best method. In any case, hon. Members are bound to vote on it, but they have got to make recommendations as the Minister of Finance has already said. You have got to make recommendations so that the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker be paid a stipulated allowance, thus following the Barbados principle...."

"The Barbados principle" mark you! We are not going to allow him to detract from this great Barbados principle. I will ask my Friends to allow me to finish quoting this very distinguished son of the soil:

"... The House would automatically vote for it because you could draft legislation laying it down." — [OFFICIAL REPORT, 9th December, 1958, c. 1393.]

My hon. Friend did not at that time need the law books quoted by the Minister of Communications to refresh his memory. He was speaking because of his 20 years of experience and knowledge, and what he said there is precisely what we said tonight: I quote him again:

"The Executive will have to pass down the Resolution for the two Houses just as we have been doing for years and years in Barbados. There is nothing in the Estimates giving allowances to the Speaker of Barbados...."

Mr. Husbands, I presume.

"We pass a Resolution for whatever the House say they want in order that the Speaker may entertain them.

I do not have to go into details, but I have already given the House my solemn assurance on the matter." — [OFFICIAL REPORT, 9th December, 1958, c. 1394.]

"My solemn assurance". That is what the Prime Minister said. And he continued:

"However, the hon. Member for Jamaica has not accepted it. I was crudely insulted. Here am I as Prime Minister of The West Indies..."

that is what the Prime Minister said —

"... giving a solemn assurance to make it as clear as possible that the independence of the Speaker is to be maintained and the Member being crude enough to say that he does not believe me."

Hon. Members: Shame, shame!

Mr. Sinanan: The majority of Members opposite will regret the day if any Member of this House, either from the Government or the Opposition side, hears our Prime Minister give an assurance and tells him that he does not believe him. — [Interruption].

Mr. Sinanan: That is not true. I never stood in this House and told that hon. and learned Gentleman that I did not believe him. I hope that the Minister of Communications will not engage in these deliberate lapses of memory. He cannot accuse me of ever getting up in this House and doubting the word of the hon. and learned Prime Minister. He could never accuse me of saying that. If the Minister of Communications says so, then it is unparliamentary — but it is unparliamentary, so I cannot really call him a liar.

You have already said, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot call Members liars. Make no mistake about it, Sir, what he is saying would justify anybody calling him a liar.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

The Chairman : The hon. Member cannot, by twisting words, say that. He must withdraw the remark.

Mr. Sinanan : I withdraw the remark. As a matter of fact, I regret the fact that I must at all times speak the truth in this House. What else is there for me to say, because, even when something is truthful it is unparliamentary to say it and therefore it cannot be said. The Chairman says I must withdraw the remark. I withdraw it. But I am astonished to hear the Minister of Communications say that I said last night that I did not believe the Prime Minister. I must confess that we would be guilty of considerable weakness in the future, particularly when we receive assurances from my hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister. Because when the Prime Minister gave his assurance, I distinctly remember — and I will repeat it — that I advised my hon. Friend, the then Deputy Leader to withdraw the remark he made. I tendered that advice because I felt he was not justified in suggesting to the Prime Minister of The West Indies that he was saying something that was false.

I would accept the assurances of any Member of this House once he gives assurances and more so when he says it is a solemn assurance. But when that solemn assurance comes from the Prime Minister himself one strikes at the very root and foundation of our people and our Parliament if one does not accept the assurance.

I do not want, Mr. Chairman, rules and standing orders and written testimonies for me to accept the word of the Prime Minister. Until the Prime Minister realises this, I will have to say that he has broken that solemn assurance. The Prime Minister

made it clear that he was going to follow the established practice of Barbados, and he has never failed to remind us that Barbados has

The Prime Minister : It is a law.

Mr. Sinanan : I don't know what happens in Barbados, and I know still less what happens when people leave Barbados. I have always understood that Barbados didn't have this sort of written, rigid Constitution, but that it is built up in consequence of all the established usages of Parliament, because it is supposed to be one of the oldest Parliaments in the Commonwealth.

What has an Act to do with it? I am now quoting the solemn assurance of this Government as given by the person occupying the highest office in that Government. In the past few weeks, wherever I went I was able to pin-point and belabour the fact that in this Parliament there is a considerable amount of respect existing on both sides, and that whilst the Opposition was prepared to fight the Government every inch of the way we respected them, and the hon. Gentlemen are entitled to carry out the mandate of the majority in The West Indies.

I feel very sorry and regret the fact that we have had such a long and heated debate and that I have had to go on record as quoting the language of the Government as given by the Prime Minister on a matter which could be so easily solved by not breaking a solemn assurance. I have the highest regard and respect for the hon. and learned Prime Minister but he could never convince me that these statements recorded in Hansard, which we know we heard from

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

his lips, are not inconsistent with the actions of his Government today.

What are they going to do? Are they going to put us in a position where in the future every time they give us an assurance we cannot accept it well knowing that the whole success of parliamentary life depends upon the word of hon. Gentlemen opposite and the word of hon. Gentlemen on this side?

When the Leader of the House told me last night, "I want you to accept my word that," — that is what he said — "I did not realise that we were going to suspend the Standing Orders tomorrow in order to prolong the Debate," my reply to him was, "Your word is accepted. We realise that what you are saying is correct; we do not accuse you of a breach of faith."

Parliament functions on such solemn assurances. He cannot come here as Prime Minister of The West Indies and tell us in solemn tones:

"Here I am as Prime Minister of The West Indies giving a solemn assurance to make it as clear as possible that the independence of the Speaker is to be maintained . . ."

and then go back on that. By fixing the salary of the Speaker, they are going back on this solemn promise; they are destroying the bulwark of democracy; they are removing the independence of the Speaker.

The Prime Minister: How much money makes him independent?

Mr. Sinanan: Money does not make him independent. If the Executive says £22,000 or £100,000 they are still wrong; they cannot fix the salary of the Speaker. The independence, integrity, the impartiality of the Speaker must be independent

of the Executive. Lives were lost to protect this principle, the independence of the Speakership even against the Sovereign. Because the Speaker demands of the Sovereign the ancient rights and privileges of Parliament.

We will go down fighting, we are going to argue and convince them, as stubborn as the Members of the Government might be — I know the Prime Minister is one of the most stubborn of men in The West Indies, which is perhaps responsible for the success he has achieved in public life.

Mr. Bradshaw: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Committee of Supply report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Agreed to.

House resumed.

Progress reported and leave granted for Committee to sit again.

6.35 p.m.: Sitting suspended.

8.35: Sitting resumed.

House again resolved into Committee of Supply.

Mr. Sinanan: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to say that I left the Hansard Report of the Prime Minister's speech together with my notes and that both have disappeared. I hope that is not an indication to me from Members opposite to resume my seat.

The Prime Minister: Where were you during the interval?

Mr. Sinanan: That is another one of the Prime Minister's incriminating questions. Before the interval I was quoting my hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

I was reminding him of an assurance which he gave this House and I regret very much that the Minister of Communications and Works should have, from his seat, said to me that I said last night that I did not, and would not, believe the Prime Minister. And I am going to ask him to withdraw that statement, that allegation, because he knows very well that I did not say it and that I've never made such a statement in this House. I will resume my seat in order to allow the hon. Gentleman to speak.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Chairman, what I stated was that last night the hon. Member said he would not accept the assurances of the Prime Minister.

Mr. Sinanan: But even that I did not say. Even that I did not say and I am going to ask him to withdraw that because dependent on his withdrawal are a number of things that I propose to say.

Mr. Rose: In true and strict parliamentary tradition, I will accept the assurance of the hon. Member that he did not say that.

Mr. Sinanan: For that I am particularly grateful because I would like to withdraw the remarks which I made about my hon. Friend the Minister of Communications and Works.

I think we departed from the very high standard which the Opposition normally introduces into this House. I would like to point out to my Friend, the hon. Gentleman opposite that I have been always completely kind in my references to the hon. Prime Minister and I express the hope that in his presence and in his absence the same kindness and respect would be shown to him by the Minister of Communications. I

express that hope to him and I say in this House that that is the stand we propose to take: that is the stand that we have always taken.

I say to hon. Members opposite — and we are doing so more in the form of an appeal — to maintain that standard and carry it out to the letter because we feel that the Prime Minister knows quite well that what he is doing here tonight is a departure from the things he propounded. I am at a loss to know why Government is persisting in maintaining this attitude? I cannot understand; I am unable to understand . . .

The Prime Minister: You will never understand.

Mr. Sinanan: I agree entirely with the Prime Minister that I will never understand this persistence of the Government in this attitude tonight, because it seems to me to be so simple. That they should think it wise that another course is much better and much more desirable to take, I cannot understand. We have argued. We have repeated all the arguments *ad nauseam* and we have done everything possible to convince them of their wrong. We have quoted all the passages we know in the books and quoted the language which they have used. Yet they persist in their conduct.

If we take the latest example — in Trinidad they referred both reports to a Select Committee of the House. I remember when I was a Member of the Trinidad Legislative Council, just before coming into the Federal Parliament, I raised this very point in a private conversation with the then Chief Minister of Trinidad — that he could not

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

have an independent Commission of Inquiry to consider and make recommendations on emoluments of the Members of the Legislature. He disagreed with me that night but the very next morning he called me and told me that he agreed with me. It just cannot be done and it just is not done. Could you imagine an independent Commission of Inquiry fixing emoluments for Members of this House? If that should be done, every Member of this House would feel he was being subordinated; that Members were in a subordinate position and that the very authority delegated to them was being delegated to independent persons.

Can any Member really and honestly stand up in this House and say he will agree to the setting up of a committee or a commission comprising even the greatest gentlemen in The West Indies or, for that matter, the United Kingdom or any other part of the world to fix their salaries, emoluments and allowances?

The Prime Minister : A Commission to make recommendations.

Mr. Sinanan : This Council of State could appoint a Commission from outside to recommend what the emoluments of the Members of this House should be?

I have never lost my temper with the Prime Minister yet . . .

The Prime Minister : You couldn't.

Mr. Sinanan : I hope not. I hope I never will. I will not be provoked on this occasion, but it is very exasperating to hear the hon. Prime Minister say that a Commission might be appointed.

The Prime Minister : A fact-finding Commission. A fact-finding Commission was set up to find a suitable Capital for The West Indies.

Mr. Sinanan : A fact-finding Commission is a different thing. A fact-finding Commission to fix the Capital site is quite different from a commission to fix salaries for Members of this House. It is not possible. It cannot be possible. It is impossible to appoint any sort of fact-finding Committee. We think that it is time that we appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the misdemeanours of the Prime Minister tonight and that is a commission that is very necessary at this stage. You are making it extremely difficult. We have only a few more years to run this Parliament during which, from time to time, Members of this Government will have to rise in their places and give this House assurances . . .

Mr. Rocheford interrupted.

Mr. Sinanan : No sensible word seems to emanate from the Chief Whip on the Government side.

Mr. Pierre : Not the Chief Whip, take it back and apologise.

Mr. Sinanan : I apologise to the Chief Whip. I really thought that he was the Chief Whip. . . . But during the course of the next few years, situations are bound to arise, incidents are bound to occur when the assurances of the hon. the Prime Minister and Ministers of Government will have to be hurled across the floor of this House. Only this week the Prime Minister gave us an assurance about a speech which he made in the United States of America.

Mr. Rose : Mr. Chairman, will the hon. Member give way?

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

Mr. Sinanan : Did the hon. Gentleman give way the last time? I want an admission from him before I do. If he answers me honestly and truthfully I will give way.

Mr. Rose : On a Point of Order. I wonder if the hon. Member will give an assurance that he is debating the Motion under Head VIII—Finance Department, that the amount provided under item (a) of sub-head 1 be reduced by \$2,400.00?

Mr. Sinanan : Obviously, it is a parliamentary device, in order to allow the Opposition to present its case. As a matter of fact, the Government ought to know that they could even go further and imitate other Parliaments by actually setting aside a day for the Opposition to present its case. That is done. But I give him the assurance that I would be the last person, my hon. Friend and Members of the Opposition would be the last to seek to reduce the Minister of Finance to an impoverished state. How can they? Do they think we would really vote for a reduction of such a substantial amount of the Minister's salary? My hon. Friend on the left made it clear that he selected that particular sum merely to pin-point the fact that if reduced by that particular sum, the Minister's salary would be on par with the Speaker's. We argue that the converse is the proper approach as obtains in the Mother of Parliaments—the Speaker there is on a par with a Minister of the Cabinet without Portfolio.

I don't know whether the Prime Minister brought back the documents that were given to him in Australia. I know what is wrong with my hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister, but I cannot disclose it. No amount of provocation will make me

disclose it; but I know that sooner or later he will calm down. In a week or two he will calm down and regain his perspective and sense of balance. There is nothing sinister about it. If hon. Members want to know I will not tell them.

That is an assurance that they can accept and it is one that we will not willingly go back on. We will not break our word. We will see to it that the hon. Minister of Finance continues to come in here with all his customary elegance. We will not reduce his Ministerial vote by that substantial amount. But we say it is good parliamentary form.

There is nothing to prevent the Government, even at this stage, referring this matter back to the Committee.

There are several other statements which the Prime Minister made, but he says that he suffers from indigestion once a year—

Hon. Member : Once in five years.

Mr. Sinanan :—and I know that, by what I am doing tonight, he has been having the greatest amount of indigestion on account of the words he has eaten during the last few hours. I will not provoke him any longer.

The Prime Minister : We can't stop you. Go on.

Mr. Sinanan : Every Member on the opposite benches—and I think I know them well and can judge from their countenances that all of them are not very happy, especially those who are chubby—but they are in the same predicament as we are in over this issue. I predict that some

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. SINANAN]

day in the future, right here in this House, they will be embarrassed just as much as we will be, because the time will probably come when the Prime Minister and his Government will be really placed on trial and will want every member of this House to say that we have unqualified confidence in his direction of this Government.

Mr. Bramble (Montserrat): Mr. Chairman, we are tonight debating a very distasteful matter. It is made more so for the reason of the respect and esteem in which you, Mr. Chairman, are held by both sides of this House.

I appealed to my very good Friend, the Leader of the Opposition, to stop his Colleague when he was making what I would term a very futile speech, without any sense, whatever, in it. I whispered across the Table to the hon. Leader of the Opposition to stop his Colleague.

Mr. Sinanan: The hon. Member did not whisper; he bellowed.

Mr. Bramble: The Leader heard me ask him to stop his Colleague. The Leader of the Opposition is a very knowledgeable person. There is no gainsay about that. Even if I don't like what he is saying, I am inclined to like his way of saying it; but I would have thought that he would have stopped his Colleague from making the speech on this Motion.

The hon. Member from St. Mary said in his speech that he realised that he was not able to move a Motion to the effect that he desired — to increase the Speaker's salary — and therefore he resorted to moving a Motion to reduce the salary of the Minister of Finance.

9.00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the hon. Member for St. Mary if it is a fact that he has brought this Motion for certain reasons. He has no numerical strength to effect his decrease, so how can he expect in this House to be able to effect this decrease?

The hon. Member from St. Mary says he wants to have this decrease. The Leader of the Opposition says it is not the intention of the Mover of the Motion that the emoluments of the hon. Minister of Finance should be decreased, yet in truth and in fact, they would like to see the emoluments of certain hon. Ministers here decreased. It is believed this is due to the fact that the Member belongs to a clique who believe certain things are for certain people.

One must realise that this West Indies Federation is for West Indians. I am trying to be very clear. There is no sense coming here and wasting the time of the House with nonsense. There is no sense in coming here and moving Motions which are nonsensical.

I am not at all disappointed in the hon. Member for St. Mary, but what I would have thought was that my hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition would have directed him in this turn which he has taken, because one must come to the conclusion that the Motion brought by the hon. Mover amounts to nonsense. It does not make sense.

The Chairman: The hon. Member must not say it does not make sense.

Mr. Bramble: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but it certainly does not

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

make sense. Not so long ago I heard my very good Friend the Leader of the Opposition quote from textbooks to this House to show that the duty of the Opposition is to oppose. That is what he said. I heard him. He probably forgets, but I remember. He said in loud terms that the duty of the Opposition is to oppose.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that we need to quote textbooks to say the duty of the Government is to govern. Therefore, when the Government reaches a decision, on various occasions. I don't see much sense in my very good Friend trying to oppose, because you must remember that the duty of the Government is to govern. And that is what the Government is doing.

Mr. Chairman, in the light of what has been said, I hope that the hon. Member for St. Mary would withdraw all the amendments he has on the Order Paper because one need not wonder . . .

Mr. Hill : You have no date tonight ?

Mr. Bramble : I can understand the feelings of the hon. Member for Surrey, but I will not be detracted by him. He must take it easy. Mr. Chairman, at this stage I will appeal to my hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition, whom I regard as a very knowledgable person, to instruct his Colleague to withdraw his amendments which are on the Order paper.

Mr. Sinanan : If you refer the matter to the Committee !

Mr. Swabey (Westmoreland, Jamaica): Mr. Chairman, I have listened to my hon. Friends on the Government front benches. The thing that ran through my mind was that these Gentlemen allowed the promises of the Prime Minister to go, just like when

you smoke a cigarette, like smoke in the air. I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Gentlemen who sit beside the Prime Minister realise that when the Prime Minister of The West Indies makes a promise in this hon. House to fulfil the desire of the House, they should not let him down by failing to support it when they got to the Council of State.

Mr. Chairman, whether or not my hon. Friends on the other side agree with me, I would say that not even in private enterprise would anybody allow the head of a department to give an undertaking and then go back on his word.

I feel to myself that this is something which is passing through the mind of hon. Minister without Portfolio and I accept the view of the Leader of the Opposition that when you allow any Speaker of the House to be dictated to and his emoluments controlled by the Council of State, you are taking the joke a little too far. I am asking the hon. Gentlemen . . .

Mr. Hill : Don't forget the Lady.

Mr. Swabey : . . . and the lovely Lady to see that the respect the Opposition has for the Prime Minister is maintained in accordance with the dignity of the position he now holds.

I have noticed the countenances of the hon. Gentlemen on the other side. They want to bend. They realise the danger because the hon. Leader of the Opposition has given them food for thought, has quoted all the parliamentary procedures, and has proven to them that no Speaker of the House should come under jurisdiction like ordinary civil servants.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. SWABEY]

I could never, and would never, be convinced that the Council of State would let down the words of the hon. Prime Minister; words placed in Hansard; words that were repeated over and over again in this hon. House. And I am appealing to the hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, and to the charming Lady Minister too, to use their influence to see that the dignity and integrity of this hon. House is maintained.

My hon. Friend from Montserrat has made his speech. I am going to remind my very good friend that he has not brought one point of substance to help him in his election when he returns home.

I am looking to see whether or not those hon. Gentlemen on the Government Benches would let down the words of the hon. Prime Minister; because when I return to Jamaica I shall say that the Prime Minister of The West Indies has not got as much power to rule his Cabinet as a manager. The Prime Minister, Sir, is a manager, for he is the head of this Government.

Mr. Richards (Minister without Portfolio): He is not a dictator.

Mr. Bousquet: Mr. Chairman, I have to ask once again what is the matter under discussion; is it the Speaker's salary or is it a Motion to reduce an amount as set out in the Budget?

The Chairman: The Motion before the Committee is —

“That the amount provided under item (a) of sub-head 1 be reduced by \$2,400.00.”

As I understand it, it is the customary parliamentary practice all over the world for

the Opposition to raise a point of principle by moving the reduction of an item of expenditure, as this Opposition has done, in order to debate the Head.

Mr. Bousquet: I think, Sir, that it is irrelevant.

The Chairman: I have not ruled it to be irrelevant because I do not think it is irrelevant. I think the matter was simply stated.

Mr. Swabey: Mr. Chairman, I sympathise with the hon. Member for St. Lucia. I would not say what I am tempted to say because I feel I have something of much more importance to tell this House.

When I leave this hon. House I shall give a lot of thought to the fact that the hon. Gentlemen opposite have let down the words of the Prime Minister — the words which came from the hon. Prime Minister's mouth and which have been recorded in Hansard and read over and over by the able Leader of the Opposition. I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that the dignity of this hon. House is at stake, and I am appealing to the hon. Prime Minister to discuss this matter again with his Ministers and so settle this burning question. We are prepared to give him a few minutes to do so.

It is not the dollars we are worrying about; what we are thinking of is the principle involved. I do not feel that it is right that when the Prime Minister has given an assurance to this hon. House he should allow himself to be belittled and let down by his Council of State. Knowing the hon. Prime Minister as I do, I do not think that he has gone back on his word because he wanted to. I think there is something wrong

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

in the camp. I am tempted to say something, but as I am not a wonderful parliamentarian I am afraid that I might let down this hon. House, and the Leader of the Opposition may say that I am out of order; so I shall refrain from doing so.

Mr. Chairman, I am making this appeal to the hon. Gentlemen in order that they should uphold the words of the hon. Prime Minister; not because there may be a little trouble in the camp — we are not responsible for it — and maintain the dignity of this hon. House.

I see my hon. Friend the Minister of Finance sitting back with his eyes closed. I am certain that he poses this way because his heart is very soft. What I would suggest is that he should not sit beside the hon. Minister for Natural Resources and Agriculture who tries to interrupt everybody, and who, when he looks at you, expects you to hide underneath the bench. I think that the hon. Minister of Finance should remove the Minister of Natural Resources and Agriculture from beside him and put the Minister of Communications and Works in his place; because it seems to me that the Minister of Communications and Works is always in a pleasant mood whenever financial matters are being discussed in this House.

I make this appeal to the Prime Minister: that when he has reconsidered all the aspects, even if he finds that he has blundered in the first instance, he should try to live up to his manhood.

Amendment put and negatived.

Sub-head 2:

Mr. Cargill: Mr. Chairman, we on this side feel that we have rapped the gentlemen's noses enough. We feel that if we

have not managed to make our point now, no human agency would be able to do so. We feel, Mr. Chairman, that as we have exposed this matter as much as we can — for the Press and for the public, and in the hope that perhaps the hon. the Prime Minister might have had some remnants of a conscience that might have been moved, we feel there is no point in going on any longer. I therefore beg to withdraw the Amendments which stand in my name.

Am I able to withdraw them all at once, or shall I withdraw them one by one?

The Chairman: You may withdraw now all the amendments under Head VIII.

Mr. Cargill: I beg to withdraw all amendments under Head VIII, of which I gave notice.

Amendments withdrawn.

Head VIII agreed to and stood part of the Schedule.

Head IX — Trade & Industry:

Mr. Cargill: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could deal with the matters I have in mind, as indicated by the amendments of which I have given notice, by asking a question. I should like to have the assurance of the Minister of Trade and Industry — I notice that under all these headings — under sub-head 2, for example — the amount of \$960 is drawn for a chauffeur. I think this House ought to be assured that there is a chauffeur, and I would like to ask the Minister of Trade and Industry if he has a chauffeur.

The Prime Minister: I don't always drive with a chauffeur.

The Minister of Trade and Industry (Dr. LaCorbiniere): The allowances which Ministers are given, both in respect

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[DR. LACORBINIÈRE]

of chauffeurs and gardeners, are contributions really in aid of chauffeurs and gardeners. The allowance of \$960 towards a chauffeur cannot pay for a chauffeur in Trinidad, so I hire a chauffeur when I need one and I make up the difference by driving myself.

The Prime Minister : Mr. Chairman, I am so busy doing something more important than listening to this debate that I am surprised I have got up at all. But I must protest against the indecency of the suggestion that hon. Members may be taking taxpayers' money — [Hon. Member: Who said that?] — The mere question being asked, "Have you got a chauffeur?" means why do you draw \$960 and yet don't employ a chauffeur. A nasty thing like that could only come from the hon. Member for St. Mary, Jamaica.

Mr. Cargill : On a Point of Order, Mr. Chairman —

The Chairman : The Prime Minister is withdrawing it.

The Prime Minister : Let me remind hon. Members that nobody else but the Member concerned can ask that it be withdrawn. It is for the Member to ask it.

The Chairman : I ask it. It is most improper.

The Prime Minister : The other night he called me a liar. Why should I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. Cargill rose —

The Prime Minister : If the hon. Member asks for a withdrawal I will withdraw it. You can expel me if you like. If it is the wish of the House that a Member withdraws a remark that is objected to, or

considered offensive, then the Member withdraws. I have a little eighteen cents book copies of which I must really get and send to hon. Members.

Mr. Joseph : One for the Chairman too ?

The Prime Minister : I wish some of these Members opposite would address the Chair. I have never lost my temper in my life, and I've been married for thirty years.

Mr. Joseph : Will you congratulate Lady Adams for us ?

The Prime Minister : All I'm saying is this, Sir. I hate to say it because it affects me personally and it almost looks like a reflection on the Council of State. When we were told about \$100 a month for travelling in one's constituency, I felt it difficult to spend \$100 a month — \$100 a week might not be enough for travelling in Jamaica because those constituencies are 300 times the size of those in Barbados; and the only reason why I draw my \$100 is that my entertainment allowance doesn't begin to pay for entertainment. It doesn't begin to pay for entertainment, and certainly if a Member can save money on a chauffeur and spend it on entertainment what has he done wrong?

I could well understand a Member from Dominica in the same position as one from Jamaica—it might not be as big, it is more important, but it is more difficult to get about in Dominica; therefore, you spend your money on travelling. But I wouldn't like the public and the Press to get the impression that hon. Ministers or back-benchers or anybody else is drawing money which they shouldn't draw. Even though I get about twice as much as I used to get

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

in Barbados, it doesn't pay me to live in Trinidad. It costs me twice as much and I think that is perfectly true of other Ministers too.

I am sorry I started, but all that I would like to say to the public is that not a cent goes into the pocket of any Member of Parliament that he hasn't to spend. He has got to spend it and very often to spend some of what he has in the bank. That's the only reason I got up.

Mr. Cargill: Mr. Chairman, this is the most extraordinary thing I've ever heard in my life. The most extraordinary argument. I hesitate to repeat what the Prime Minister has just said, but I gather that what he said is this: "That it is quite wrong of me to ask whether any of the Ministers have gardeners or chauffeurs for which the public pay them an allowance, because if they haven't gardeners or chauffeurs for which they are paid allowances by this House then there is nothing wrong in that because, although they are not spending it for that, they are spending it on something else". I find it difficult to take the Prime Minister seriously or somberly. I think it is quite extraordinary that we have reached the point in this Parliament where the hon. Prime Minister can get up and make a statement of that kind.

First of all, I never suggested that any of the hon. Ministers were not having chauffeurs or gardeners for which they were each given an allowance. I merely wanted to know whether they had. It is the right of the Opposition and the people of The West Indies to know. If it is not our right to ask these questions, there would be no possible reason for going through the Budget item by item, I asked this ques-

tion and the hon. Prime Minister jumps up, obviously in a great rage, and says two contradictory things. He says it is indecent of me to suggest that any hon. Minister draws the chauffeur allowance without having a chauffeur, and then in the next breath he says there is nothing wrong with that at all because if he hasn't got a chauffeur he can spend it on entertainment

The Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, we must admit that I did not say it in that vague way; I specified it could be spent on entertainment. I said you will have to spend it on something that is necessary to spend it on as a parliamentarian.

Mr. Cargill: Will the Prime Minister define for the House what it is necessary to spend a chauffeur allowance on, other than a chauffeur?

The Prime Minister: Entertainment.

Mr. Cargill: What kind of entertainment? Is it wine, women or song? Entertainment covers several things. Any how, Mr. Chairman, I would leave the matter there, because it is obvious that the Prime Minister has been so grossly illogical and so very nervous to prevent any such question from being asked or being answered! So I will leave the Prime Minister to his nervousness and sit down and say nothing further.

Mr. Cooke (St. James, Jamaica): Mr. Chairman, usually I am very quiet and like to listen because I hate to be drawn into any sort of heated debate. There are occasions, however, when I am constrained to make my contribution.

During last year, and on several occasions, I heard Members on the other side make very unusual remarks about a

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. COOKE]

gardener's allowance and a chauffeur's allowance. I am becoming a little impatient about how we have drawn out this debate. I wish to say one or two things, and I trust the House will forgive me if I join the ranks of those who speak very frankly.

There was a time when parliamentarians were not paid, but in those days only the plantocracy and people belonging to vested interests could have gone into the parliaments. It was not necessary for them to get paid from the State because there were devious routes and devious means by which they, as some parliamentarians still find, could get sums far larger than they could have got in salaries. These people did not have to go to the Government of the country and say we need so much for so and so project. When you see today the people who enjoy the amenities in Federation Park or elsewhere—[*Interruption*]. The Minister has not got the position forever, and if he gets a gardener allowance it is used for gardening. The term of a Minister's office is five years.

Another thing, chauffeur allowance. I do not know if Ministers use chauffeurs, but I know that I get an allowance which is too small having regard to the area I represent. I have to spend quite a lot more.

Hon. Members (Opposition Benches): Not travelling allowance; they get that too.

Mr. Cooke: I heard references made to the eloquence of the address of the Minister of Finance. I do not know why the Opposition continues to harp on these little allowances. I am sure there are Members on that side who know that these allowances are not so great at all.

I know that people follow the things said by Members in this House and these people expect a certain understanding about Ministers of this House. Some people feel that Ministers occupy an exalted position from a financial standpoint; an exalted position it is, but not very much so financially; and certainly Ministers should enjoy some sort of comfort. Others feel that such positions belong only to the people who can say that, 'My ancestors came from over there'.

This is a serious matter and I want it to be viewed seriously. The time has come when our people who are put at the reins of Government should be enabled to live well, so that they will have no need to resort to the sort of back-door deals which others before them, in similar capacities, have had to resort to. I don't want people to come here in the House and speak scathingly about little allowances. We should put the Ministers of Government in a position so that they can live honourably in the communities where they live and as the communities will expect them to.

Dr. LaCorbiniere: Mr. Chairman, a question was addressed to me under the Head affecting Trade & Industry. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that among the allowances afforded me are garden allowance, chauffeur allowance and travelling allowance. My gardener's allowance is something like \$900 per year. I spend well over \$1,000 a year paying my gardener, because a gardener cost more than \$900 per year in Trinidad. I have to make up the rest from my salary.

I also draw a chauffeur allowance. I cannot afford to also subsidise the cost of a full-time chauffeur. I have said before,

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

and I say again, that I hire a full-time chauffeur when I need one and I drive myself the rest of the time. I hope the House will accept that. I will not subsidise both.

Mr. Hector (St. Andrew, Jamaica): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask this question. This amount allotted for chauffeurs and gardeners, is it not a fact that somebody should sign a slip or some declaration made that these monies are being paid to these people by Ministers?

Hon. Members (Government Benches): Oh Lord!

Mr. Hector: We came into this House by the votes of poor, unfortunate people and we are trying our best from time to time to give jobs to these people. We vote money here from time to time to give these chauffeurs and gardeners. I do not think it is fair to them that monies voted to be paid to them should be drawn by Ministers and then these people do not get the jobs these monies are supposed to provide.

We talk about trying to reduce unemployment and I really think that Ministers should employ somebody. Now for them to come and tell us otherwise! We should have some means of knowing that the monies have in fact been received and in fact paid out to these people. It is not fair to these unfortunate people who need these jobs badly.

That is why this House passes this money from time to time. I notice most Ministers driving themselves and I know they are still drawing the allowances.

9.40 p.m.

Mr. Cargill: Mr. Chairman, as we come to each Head under which I have

an amendment to make, please note that I propose to withdraw the amendment and all other amendments standing in my name on the Order Paper.

Amendments of which notice was given by the Member for St. Mary, (a) "That the amount provided under sub-head 2 be reduced by \$960.00", and (b) "That the amount provided under sub-head 4 be reduced by \$5.00" as well as other amendments accordingly withdrawn.

Head IX agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head X — Communications and Works :

Mr. Densham (St. Elizabeth, Jamaica): Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that sub-head 1 of Head X be reduced by \$5.00.

Sir, I am seeking to draw the attention of the hon. Minister for Communication and Works to this. He said that there was going to be a Conference in the early part of this year with regard to airlines, and I wish to bring two things to the notice of the Minister so that he could have them 'roughed' out at the Conference.

The first of these is that throughout The West Indies there are several people at the moment who are Directors of Aircraft, or Directors of Civil Aviation, and the consequence of that is, I am told, that there is a varying degree of standards in the aircraft personnel and in the ground personnel. I am told by people who should know, that these standards should preferably be kept at the same level for the whole West Indies, and the level should be as high as that in the United Kingdom and America, in order that

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. DENSHAM]

licences can easily be substituted so that West Indian licences can be regarded as high as the licences of the United Kingdom. I am told that at the moment this is possibly not the case.

I particularly want to mention this, because I understand that one of the new air routes that have just been taken up by one of the smaller airlines is being flown with a two-engined aeroplane—I think it is a four-seater—and it is particularly in those smaller categories where it is most important to have a licence that is of true international standard. Perhaps later on the Minister will give me an assurance.

The second thing that I want to bring forward is this. I think all of us here in The West Indies, at some time or another, have had a rather difficult job in getting between the Islands, and this was particularly noticeable to me the last time I came down from Jamaica with the local carrier, B.W.I.A. We hope that the hon. Minister for Communications and Works, who is almost the supreme authority here, would carry some weight with both B.W.I.A. and B.O.A.C. in an endeavour to get their services a little more suitable for both businessmen and politicians visiting The West Indies.

If hon. Members have seen the newspapers for the last three or four days, they will realise that both the big aircraft on that line from the United Kingdom have been late and also the aircraft going away, and this is not the only occasion. It has happened time and again, and I feel if it is put to the highest authority that we have, the Parliament of The West

Indies, possibly those in charge of the airlines will take more note than they do of the ordinary complaints.

Having said that, Sir, I wish to withdraw the amendment with your permission.

The Chairman : With the permission of the House.

Mr. Densham : With the permission of the House, I wish to withdraw the amendment standing in my name.

Mr. Rose : The hon. Member has raised two points of policy. I am afraid he has not been paying careful attention to what I have said in this House. He understood that I indicated to this House that I intended to attend a Conference. That is quite true. In May I proceeded to the United Kingdom to attend the Conference, but earlier in the debate on this particular matter I indicated that the result of the Conference was that it was agreed that there should be a full-scale investigation into the problems of civil aviation by a Commission of Inquiry to be appointed.

I indicated that we were hoping to make an announcement soon with respect to persons on that Commission of Inquiry, we hoped to do so early in the next year. But I would like first of all to say that it is not true that there are varying standards. All the regulations which govern the licensing of pilots, aircraft, aeronautical engineers in the region are made under the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Act and those regulations are the same in all the Territories. The standards are therefore the same. It may be that sometimes in the interpretation of

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

the regulations a particular Territory will vary in the interpretation by putting emphasis on one place as against another.

I would like to disabuse his mind of any idea that our standards are in any way lower than the standards which obtain in international places. Indeed it is within my knowledge that pilots who obtain commercial pilots' licences in the United Kingdom have found difficulty, until they have passed a local examination, to be licensed to fly commercial planes in this Territory.

With respect to the fact that B.W.I.A. and B.O.A.C. are found to be late from time to time, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members to the fact that both these airlines have very high records of safety. It is because of the very high standards that obtain that there are delays. I for one, and this Government with me, would prefer to have these delays and to be sure that they maintain their very high records of freedom from accident, than to have no delays and then this record deteriorates.

Mr. Hill : May I ask the Minister of Communications whether in the light of this explanation that the policy of this Ministry could be summed up in the phrase "Delay before death" ?

The Prime Minister : The hon. Minister concerned made an adequate explanation and therefore I am going to ask you to forgive me for adding to it.

I could not help noticing a few things when I last travelled and so I think you ought to thank God for B.W.I.A. I have compared their service with others. Some

people go out of Puerto Rico hanging by straps. It is the only country in the world that allows people to travel in that way in a 'plane. Some of these Puerto Ricans are so anxious to get to New York that they are just glad to get into a 'plane. I remember that on one occasion my wife happened to be going to New York on a Pan-Am 'plane with a Pan-Am pilot. She told me that nearly everybody after a couple hours, were on their knees praying to be saved from the effects of a storm, but B.O.A.C. and B.W.I.A. were grounded at sea.

Mr. Sinanan : What was a greater disaster ?

The Prime Minister : I will answer the hon. Member outside just now. I myself have never come across anything that would make me feel — barring Air France — that a better service with cleaner 'planes and giving more attention to passengers could be found than B.W.I.A. And I think we ought to say so.

When we come to our own people — and when I say our own people, I mean people working in The West Indies — we should say, when it is so, that they are better. I don't want to make invidious comparison by calling names. I came down, first class, from London a few months ago — June, I believe — and I could not help making the comparison between the 'plane I travelled in with a B.W.I.A. 'plane. It was bigger and that was all. The hostesses tried to be nice too.

Mr. Joseph : What ?

The Prime Minister : I had never seen them give better service in my life.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

They tried to be nice. In fact, they were nice.

Mr. Joseph : Oh !

The Prime Minister : But I could not help feeling the difference in the atmosphere. I only got up to say that what the hon. Member said is excellent, but I also want to add my contribution. I have been discussing this earlier with Mr. Watkinson, the Minister of Transport in England, and some of the local directors. This is a very serious matter, and I wanted to convince them that this Parliament is supporting B.W.I.A. as much as possible.

Mr. Hill : Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the appropriate Minister, the lack of facilities, or proper facilities, at Antigua where 'planes land en route between Jamaica and Trinidad. I believe this lack of facilities is partly due to the fact that the present airport is outmoded and there are plans, or a plan, to bring into operation a new air terminal. But, on the last occasion that certain hon. Members of this House were proceeding from Trinidad to Kingston, a number of us got a good wetting — a good soaking by the rain, due to the fact that the 'plane landed several hundred yards from the air terminal.

I believe this House should be told whether this lack of facilities and this handicap will be removed, and if so, when. In other words, I would like the hon. Minister of Communications and Works to tell us when the new airport at Antigua is to be put into operation.

Mr. Rose : Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the hon. Member that the new terminal building is at present under construction. The building will have all modern facilities for handling passengers and for refuelling aircraft.

There has been some difficulty in that the plans have had to be altered during the course of construction of the building. There have been some amendments and then the Antigua Government had to find additional funds. I think they have succeeded in overcoming that difficulty and will be proceeding immediately to continue construction.

I cannot at this stage say how soon the building will be completed, but I give hon. Members the assurance the work will be expedited as much as possible.

Mr. Hill : Will the Minister say whether the facility afforded at the Airport at San Juan, Puerto Rico, of providing umbrellas so that passengers may be prevented from being soaked by rain between the terminal building and the airship, will be extended at the Antigua airport ?

Mr. Rose : As far as I am aware, umbrellas are provided by the Airlines themselves. It is customary for the Airlines to provide umbrellas for their passengers. I do not know what the position is in Antigua, but if it is that they haven't got this facility then I give the assurance that I will make representations in the proper quarter.

The Prime Minister : A lot depends on whom you are. Sometimes the Police come forward.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

Mr. Bradshaw : May I be permitted, Mr. Chairman, to add something to what has been said by the hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and the hon. the Prime Minister? I happen to know Antigua very well, and I happen to know that the reason for heavy aircraft like the B.W.I.A. Viscount and Pan American airplanes having to stand far away—as the hon. Member for Surrey said, a few hundred yards from the terminal building—is due to the clayey nature of the Antigua soil.

I have seen aircraft with wheels sunk almost to the ground in the clay there. They have had to be dug out. And the Antigua authorities took the necessary precaution of having the aircraft pull up some distance away from the terminal building. I have seen them use umbrellas at Antigua, and I believe the assurance given by the Minister of Communications

Mr. Hill : What?

Mr. Bradshaw : The assurance . . .

Mr. Hill : The only assurance I will take is that from the Minister of Labour and Social Affairs.

Mr. Bradshaw : the assurance given by the Minister of Communications and Works, Mr. Chairman, I am sure, will have effect in a very short time.

Amendment accordingly withdrawn and Head X stood part of the Schedule.

10.00 p.m.

Head XI—Natural Resources and Agriculture :

Mr. W. B. Williams : Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the total provided under sub-head 1 be reduced by \$5.00. I do so, Sir, in order to discuss what I consider a top-heavy administrative staff. While I am satisfied with the capabilities of the hon. Minister of Natural Resources and Agriculture in his duties and his devotion to his Portfolio, I must say that the monies to be spent under this Head should be better distributed. I have all along criticised what I consider a top-heavy administration and I would like to invite hon. Members to consider the figures with regard to this Head which I have before me. Already \$41,484 is provided from our revenue in addition to grants from C.D. & W. funds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have never heard of any business—and I am thinking now of a very successful one with which I had been connected—that has ever had this sort of supervision and succeeded. This Department which the Minister has the honour to lead appears neither on the Exclusive nor the Concurrent List. It is merely an advisory department, and one would believe, Mr. Chairman, that provision would be made for the Minister to have sufficient and efficient assistance. I understand that the Minister could do more if he did travel more and had the necessary technical assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that agriculture plays a very vital part in the existence of The West Indies and will help to build an economic Federation which would lead us towards Dominion status. Therefore, it is my feeling that the Minister should

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[**MR. W. B. WILLIAMS**]

be afforded every opportunity to travel throughout the respective Territories of The West Indies with sufficient and efficient persons, instead of having them in this Federal building.

Hon. Member (Government Benches): Which Minister ?

Mr. W. B. Williams : The Minister of Natural Resources and Agriculture, of course !

As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the Minister should go about The West Indies and look into the various agricultural problems. Jamaica has the problem of rice, a subject on which I spoke during the Debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, and on which he promised to make a statement in reply. I understand that the Chief Minister of British Guiana went to Jamaica recently to make some arrangements with regard to a rice agreement. I would like very much to see something being done in Jamaica, especially in St. Catherine where we reclaimed much land, with regards the rice industry in that Territory, rather than having people nicely dressed up and drawing salaries of \$6,320 in Federal House, especially taking into consideration the fact that only \$60,000 is being spent on the Advisory and Technical Experts, of which Colonial Development and Welfare grants amount to within the vicinity of \$48,000. I think that the money spent could assist in accelerating the efforts of most of these Islands which need advice to improve their agricultural programmes. Because if the economy of The West Indies is to be improved this

Federation should not have all these expert people dressed up about this building; they should be required to go out and look after building up the Territories of The West Indies. It is the only way that we could really build up the economy of the Islands and make them self-supporting.

I am insisting, Mr. Chairman, that in the same way we have come here to agitate in order to put our Speaker on the same footing as other Speakers in all parts of the world, and the same way we are worrying about having the proper Staff for the Legislature instead of picking up all sorts of people off the streets —

Mr. Rocheford : All sorts of people ?

Mr. W. B. Williams : Have you ever seen the same set of people here ?

I am thinking, Mr. Chairman, that we should spend this money in a better direction. Agriculture should be on the Exclusive or Concurrent List in order that it will become a full-dressed Department.

While I do not disagree with the total sum allocated to this Department under this Head, I think that the money should be better spent. I say this with all sincerity because I am serious about this matter. There is no business in the world that can be run with a top-heavy administration, and I don't see why the Federal Government should be any exception.

Since this Department is merely an advisory one, I believe that the Minister — who has shown some enthusiasm — should be afforded the technical assistance necessary, and that monies should be

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

spent in the right way. We have never objected to spending money—the little money that we have—in the right way. I have always said that the money should be spent for the purpose for which we federated. It is my opinion that you cannot be a Federation that would be acceptable in the eyes of the British Government, from whom we must get our advanced Constitutions, by building a political Federation instead of an economic Federation. I think there are a lot of things, obligatory on the Members of the Opposition to point out, which exist in this Government.

Mr. Bradshaw: I wonder whether the hon. Member would give way? I would like to know whether he is endeavouring and labouring to suggest that the Federation is going to be framed to suit the wishes of Her Majesty's Government at Westminster, or Her Majesty's Government of The West Indies?

Mr. W. B. Williams: I would like to answer the Minister of Finance. In the first place we must convince the people of The West Indies, who are federated, that the burden they now have can be lessened and it can only be lessened by improving our economy. May I pose this question for the Minister then: when the Federation is advanced and when the respective Territories all have advanced Constitutions, who will pay the deficit? Will it be the Colonial Office or The West Indies? I think, Mr. Chairman, that we in this hon. House must convince the peoples of The West Indies and convince those politicians who come from the various sections, convince everybody includ-

ing ourselves, that we can improve the economic structure—and in agriculture we will be able to do that.

Take Dominica now, inasmuch as the Prime Minister is keeping the Jamaican Members from visiting this Island, from what we have heard of this Island it is much under-developed. The Member for Dominica has told me time and again: we have 363 rivers—a river for every day, but no accessible roads to the virgin lands in Dominica; and he has got to use a jeep to go about his area. Now, had we provided adequate roads for Dominica

Mr. Bousquet: Who, we? We, the people?

Hon. Member: Hush up!

Mr. W. B. Williams: Why you say hush up? If the Minister of Agriculture was afforded greater opportunity to spend the little money he had in the right direction

Mr. LeBlanc: I wonder if the hon. Member would give way? I wonder why the hon. Member insists on mentioning the name of Dominica? Is it because he intends to say, as I've heard him say on several occasions, that he understands he could get about 10,000 acres at about 10/- an acre? Or is it to tell the Dominican people, who will be hearing about this, that he is so interested in them. I think he is misguided in that.

Mr. Bradshaw: May I suggest that it is because the hon. Member, who is on his feet, suggested that Dominica has virgin soil.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

Mr. W. B. Williams: I have a very bright vision and the Member who has just got up to speak should realise that we are here to federate and bearing in mind the motto of the Federation "To dwell together . . . in unity". I envisage the day when we can. I will not stress the point any longer with regard to agriculture and this new post of Permanent Secretary. I think the good Minister would wish to give us some explanation as to why this post has been created. But I do say that if more money could be given to carry out this big task of improving agriculture for the Federation, the money would, in my opinion, be spent in a better direction.

The Minister of Natural Resources and Agriculture (Mr. Ricketts): Mr. Chairman, I heard somebody say that the Member for St. Catherine is the best dressed man in the House this afternoon. You should give him a special look and then you should allow us to ask him why he wants to be so neatly and tidily dressed, and yet doesn't want other people to look neat and tidy but simply looking like what he wants them to look like. My Friend clearly stated that he does not want to see well-dressed people in my Ministry

Mr. W. B. Williams: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that about the existing staff in his Ministry. What I did say was that I wanted an answer to the question: why should there be an additional Permanent Secretary in his office when already \$41,484 is provided for a staff, in addition to \$4,320 provided from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds. If you want

to increase those salaries by half of the present amount it doesn't matter, but this is a Ministry which merely goes about to advise. It is not a full-dress Ministry. I am satisfied that my Friend is doing a very good job but the money should be spent in another way.

Mr. Ricketts rose —

Mr. Hill: Tell the truth now.

Mr. Ricketts: My Friend spoke for over 20 minutes and now he tells us that he only asked one question. I will give him the answer.

My Ministry found it very necessary to employ the services of a Permanent Secretary for more than one reason. In my Ministry there are quite a lot of advisers, some are being paid from C.D. & W. Funds, and I think one or two are being paid from Canadian Development Funds. We found that it was a real necessity to have a man right on top who would be able to collate all the advice being given by these advisers and submit it to a Senior Assistant Secretary who would carry on the work in the lower bracket. So that is why we have to have so many top-ranking, top-bracket men. You could never just carry on with a Senior Assistant Secretary to do the work at the bottom stage and have the top just left without somebody to keep it fully balanced. That is the reason why we have appointed a Permanent Secretary.

My Friend referred to two Clerks. I would like to assure him that the two Clerks that he noticed there are being paid from C.D. & W. Funds.

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

Mr. Chairman, if you would allow me, I would like to give an answer to the rice question which my Friend asked. The Rice Agreement of 1958 was made between the Government of The West Indies and the Government of B.G. It was agreed, *inter alia* that British Guiana would supply from production within its Territory and the Federation would take from B.G. all the rice required to be imported in the Federation for local consumption during the period of the Agreement—that is to say to the 31st December, 1962.

Of the Territories in The West Indies, only Jamaica and Trinidad produce rice for local consumption in any quantity. Experience has shown further that these Territories have been unable, in the present circumstances, to produce rice at a price which is competitive with that of British Guiana. So far as is known there is no area in any of the other Territories which is suitable for the successful cultivation of rice on a scale large enough to meet the needs of the Territory concerned.

In these circumstances the Federal Government has not considered it necessary, at this stage, to formulate plans for encouraging rice production in The West Indies.

That is the answer to my Friend's question, Sir.

Mr. W. B. Williams: I would like just to ask the Minister this: Is he aware of the fact that in the past year, 1958 crop, we had more than 40% decrease in our rice production in Jamaica?

Mr. Hill: That is what he said.

Mr. W. B. Williams: Well, if that is so, I would also like to know from the Minister if he is prepared to have an expert go into the reasons why we had this decrease.

Mr. Ricketts: I can answer that. It does not need an expert. The answer is very simple. My Ministry is prepared at any time and every time to satisfy the wishes of Unit Governments and when Unit Governments ask for advice from my Ministry, I am always willing and ready to have them assisted.

On this issue the Jamaica Government has already procured advice from my Ministry.

Mr. W. B. Williams: But the advice did not work.

Mr. Ricketts: I am not saying that our advice has failed or that it has profited them. A solicitor's advice sometimes fails.

Amendment withdrawn.

Head XI ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head XII—Labour and Social Affairs:

Mr. W. B. Williams: Mr. Chairman, I have just spoken on the other Head, but there is my Colleague, the Member for Clarendon, Jamaica (Dr. Duhaney), who would like to take up this matter for me. It is on that point in the Estimates which refers to the same question of a Permanent Secretary. I have been told the same thing by the Minister of Labour and Social Affairs.

Dr. Duhaney: Mr. Chairman, Sir, we know that education is the greatest thing that is going to amalgamate this Federation. Under this Head we find Education

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[DR. DUHANEY]

Adviser. We have noticed that during this Session not one word in this House has been said about education. It seems that everything is dead.

We would like to know what has been done with the Cato Report and all the statistical data procured during the year. We would like to know what has happened to them.

The Education Adviser is listed under this Head; we want to get some idea of what has been going on. What he has been doing and what he intends to do. I do not know if under this Head we could discuss the U.C.W.I. But we have really got to discuss it because we have had such glowing reports concerning Universities from the Duke of Edinburgh when he opened the University of Ghana. He said that the University of Ghana is one of the greatest things in the big upsurging movement that is going on all over that country and the University is going to place Ghana among the great peoples of the world. It is putting out leaders to take their rightful places. Here in The West Indies we need expert advisers and I am sure that if the University College of The West Indies could shake up themselves they could produce just as good advisers as we have had to hire from outside.

We know that at the University College today there is a great big programme going on. The young men shave their heads like Yul Brynner and cultivate beards like Santa Claus. That is what the U.C.W.I. is producing today in Jamaica.

We would like to know if the Minister for Social Affairs has been made aware of

this progressive movement that is going on there and what she could tell us to help in this big effort for education that is supposed to open up new vistas and place our men so that they will be able to dwell together in unity.

The Minister of Labour and Social Affairs (Mrs. Alfrey): Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. Member who just spoke was rather inviting me to make a speech at a time when everybody wants desperately to go home.

However, I see, Sir, that since before this afternoon's recess there has been a white bromide tablet on the Table, not a tablet or plaque attached to the Table, but a small medicinal tablet which I am sure is not really there by Standing Orders but was dropped there among the other bromides cast across this Table by Members on the other side of the House during the Debate.

(Minister not audible).

I would like to reply in a straightforward manner to the hon. Member for Clarendon, Jamaica. He referred to the Cato Report which was laid before this House some months ago and was since laid before the Senate and was the subject of a very lively debate a few days ago. If hon. Members were present there on that day they would have heard quite a lot. I understand that a Senator from Trinidad (Senator Wyke) gave a long and interesting discourse on the subject. As regards this Report, some of the recommendations have been already implemented by Government and others are being implemented. An important one of these recommendations is the Faculty of Engineering on

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

which action has been taken. Another is the Institute of Economic Research which is being built up and is becoming one of the most important and popular Faculties of the University.

I feel happy to tell you so because it is a special department which holds, perhaps, my greatest and deepest interest in the whole educational field. It is true that the University College of The West Indies is an educational excelsior symbol. That is what it stands for. I quite share the hon. Member's sentiment on that, and some day before very long, we may be able to draw most, if not all, of our Advisers in the educational field—we only have one at the moment in my Ministry; he is a Jamaican—but I hope that we shall draw our technical experts from the graduates of the University College of the West Indies.

I don't remember what other questions the hon. Member for Clarendon, Jamaica, put forth. I didn't quite get his point about Father Christmas and white beards. I really didn't quite understand what it was he was driving at.

I would like to report—I was asked what has been happening in the educational field—that our Education Adviser went to Oxford this summer. He was present at the great Commonwealth Education Conference. As a result of this, it is hoped that we may have discussions with Unit Directors of Education and others, on the agenda which was drawn up at the Oxford Conference.

I think that you may realise that education as such is now a Unit concern, and that we are not really supposed to be med-

dling in High Schools and Primary Schools. These are matters for the Unit Territories, but many Unit Territories have asked for the services of the Education Adviser and he has gone whenever possible with the greatest alacrity and eagerness, and given them of his wisdom and knowledge.

I regret that I have at present no Technical Education Adviser. This gentleman was on loan from Canada and returned to his homeland, and there is no replacement for him so far. I hope that one day we may have a replacement, perhaps from the U.C.W.I., Sir.

Dr. Duhaney : Thank you very much. I would like to know if any action has been taken by the hon. Prime Minister in relation to his statement about one of the facts that was causing the greatest unrest in The West Indies—bad reporting in the newspapers. Has anything been done, or is anything planned to be done about journalism in the near future.

Secondly, in his statement about what he found out from enquiries from all the big industrialists who would like to set up business in The West Indies. Is it a fact that they will come if we have a stable political climate? We would like to know if anything has been done along these lines.

Mrs. Allfrey : Mr. Chairman, I don't think the questions can possibly be directed under Head XII. The questions are for the Prime Minister's Department, and they come under Information as such.

Mr. Bradshaw : Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the Prime Minister, I

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

[MR. BRADSHAW]

should try to answer the hon. Member's question in respect to journalism. An application is being made, or has been made, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies for a Colonial Development Welfare grant for the purpose of enabling the University College of The West Indies to organise a course in journalism; and the newspapers, persons and bodies interested in The West Indies will be invited to nominate people to take the course. The course will be organised next year.

The Prime Minister : I understood the hon. Member from Jamaica to be referring rather to the type of journalism that we have, not to the question of training. I am going to say this: The man who is not courageous enough to brave even the Press, shouldn't be in politics. It is lamentable that the Press, far more so than any politician, is hurting the Federation. I can only state what I have been told. I say again that I saw a most distinct change between last June when I was in London and when I passed through a few weeks ago. I heard it over and over again, "But look what the Press said". I had more people, more newspaper men, coming to me about the future of the Federation than at any time since Federation started, and I make an appeal again to the Press tonight. Attack me as much as it likes, because attacks by the Press are the last things that would worry me. I had a lot to do with the Press in the old days.

Mr. Sinanan: Which was your paper?

The Prime Minister : The hon. Chairman and I used to attack each other,

with due respect. We made up long ago. We had different points of view but just to throw mud, sometimes to throw vitriol, does not do The West Indies any good. I appeal to the newspapers, chiefly of Jamaica and Trinidad; let them attack me as much as they like—it does not hurt me; I don't even read a lot of these things, but it certainly hurts the Federation.

Mr. Sinanan : What do you do with them ?

The Prime Minister : I put them aside.

Mr. W. B. Williams : Mr. Chairman, before I withdraw the amendment which is before us, I would like to be afforded an assurance. I am very happy that the Minister of Labour and Social Affairs has promised us that she will entertain the complaints of the nurses at the University College Hospital in Jamaica.

Mrs. Allfrey : To a Point of Order. I did not say I would entertain them. I said I had not so far received any.

Mr. W. B. Williams : Must I understand that you will not entertain their complaints if I were to have them sent? I know you have received them. I saw it in the Press. You gave me the understanding you will entertain them if they are sent. I am going back to Jamaica to see to it that they are sent to you. There are nurses working 18 to 19 hours a day. As a result of many patients from all over the Island of Jamaica seeking specialist service and treatment at the U.C.W.I. Hospital, the demand is such that the nurses cannot cope with the situation,

Thursday, 3rd December, 1959

At the Hospital of the University College of The West Indies there are twice as many out-patients as there are persons seeking specialist treatment. They come from all over the Island of Jamaica. The demand is such that there should be adequate staffing to cope with the situation.

Mr. Pierre : Nonsense! That is the teaching staff.

Mr. W. B. Williams : That is not the teaching staff. There are people who are trained employed there. I am not talking about trainee nurses. I am talking about certified nurses. Anyway, I am very happy the Minister for Labour and Social Affairs has consented to entertain complaints. I now ask that the Motion under this Head be withdrawn.

Question put and agreed to.

Head XII agreed to and stood part of the Schedule.

Heads XIII to XX ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head XXI :

Mr. Bradshaw : Mr. Chairman, with your permission I propose to change the

wording of Item 1 under this Head. Instead of "Rental of Federal House", it should read, "Rental and maintenance of Federal House".

Question put and agreed to.

Heads XXI to XXIII as well as the Schedule stood part of the Bill.

House resumed.

Mr. Bradshaw : Mr. Speaker, I beg to report that the Bill has passed the Committee stage and I now move that the Bill be read a Third time.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read a Third time and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Bradshaw : Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to state that the debate on the Speech from the Throne and the debate on the Report of the Inter-Governmental Conference will both be set down for Monday.

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

Adjourned accordingly at 10.45 p.m.