

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th September, 1951

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. today.

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Messrs G. H. ADAMS, B.A., E. L. WARD, Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D. C.M., Messrs E. K. WALCOTT, K.C., H. A. DOWDING, F. C. GODDARD, F. E. MILLER, F. E. C. BETHELL and J. A. HAYNES, B.A.

Prayers were read.

Messrs GILL and F. L. WALCOTT entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 4th September, 1951, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. MAPP entered the House and took his seat.

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour to present from His Excellency the Governor Messages as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 29/1951.

*His Excellency the Governor
To*

The Honourable the House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that in exercise of the powers vested in him by the Letters Patent passed under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom, he has reserved for the signification of His Majesty's pleasure the Bill intituled an "Act to provide for the regulation of Public Utilities" passed by the House of Assembly on the 30th of January, 1951.

ALFRED SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados,
11th September, 1951.

MESSAGE NO. 30/1951.

*His Excellency The Governor
To*

The Honourable the House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to the Resolution passed by the Honourable House of Assembly on the 21st of August, 1951, expressing its profound sorrow at the Hurricane which recently devastated the Island of Jamaica, and to inform the Honourable House that he has been requested by the Governor of Jamaica to convey an expression of appreciation by the people of Jamaica of the Resolution of sympathy and their deep gratitude for the gift which has been voted by the Legislature for relief work in that island.

ALFRED SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados,
18th September, 1951.

PAPERS LAID

Mr. ADAMS: I also have the honour to lay on the Table of the House the following Papers:—

The Pensions (Amendment) Regulations, 1951.
Proceedings of the First Meeting of the Regional Economic Committee of the British West Indies, British Guiana and British Honduras.
The Animals (Importation) Control Regulations, 1951.

The Epizootic Abortion Regulations, 1951.
The Swine Fever Regulations, 1951.
The Anthrax Regulations, 1951.
The Rabies Regulations, 1951.

Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took his seat.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS for Mr. Cox: Bill to amend the Package Tax Act, 1941.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Pensions Act, 1947.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Pensions (Amendment) Regulations, 1951."

QUESTION

Mr. HAYNES: To enquire of the Appropriate Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House.

1. Is the Government aware that the tenantry roads under the control of the H. & T. Board are not being maintained and are thus getting into a worse condition than when they were reconstructed?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is in the affirmative: will the Government take steps to have this serious state of affairs remedied?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend the Package Tax Act, 1941, was read a first time.

Mr. REECE entered the House and took his seat.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend the Pensions Act, 1947, was read a first time.

Mr. ALDER entered the House and took his seat.

ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the honourable junior member for St. John be Chairman of Committees for today's sitting.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BETHELL: I beg to decline the office.

Mr. ADAMS: I am suggesting to the House that it should not accept that decline. The honourable member is always willing to do a good job on behalf of the House; when we wanted to send him to New Zealand he went faithfully to maintain the traditions of sport in the island. I ask the honourable member to re-consider his decision and become the Chairman of Committees for today. If the honourable member is not re-considering his decision I am moving that the hon junior member for St. George be Chairman of Committees for today's meeting.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. DOWDING: I regret wholeheartedly that I am unable to assist the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, not having any indication of what may be undertaken this afternoon.

Mr. ADAMS: I regret that and I beg to move that the honourable junior member for Christ Church be Chairman of Committees for today.

Mr. REECE: I am thankful to the honourable member for the honour he intends to thrust upon me; I know he appreciates the merit which is on this side of the Table. However, inasmuch as his Party happens to be the Party forming the Government, I suggest to him that this honour should be thrust on a member of his Party. I beg to move that the honourable junior member for St. Thomas be Chairman of Committees for the day's sitting; there is no honourable member who is more fitting to discharge those duties than the honourable junior member for St. Thomas who, recently, at the expense of the taxpayers of this colony, went to the United Kingdom and studied the procedure in the House of Commons. That is an advantage which I have never had; I am not a journalist and therefore I would not be eligible for the honour which was thrust upon the honourable member. For the reasons I have given, I again beg to move that the honourable junior member for St. Thomas be Chairman of Committees for the day's sitting.

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to second that.

The question that the honourable junior member for St. Thomas be Chairman of Committees for the day's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: If I am in order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement arising out of the remarks of the honourable junior member for Christ Church. It is that the taxpayers of this island did not pay for the recent visit of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas to the United Kingdom; it is to be expected that members of the Opposition will make mistakes of that sort.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. MAPP being in the Chair.

Mr. CRAWFORD came into the Committee and took his seat.

RESOLUTIONS POSTPONED

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I am asking leave to postpone the first two Resolutions—the Resolution for \$480 in respect of a loan to Mr. King, an Elementary School Teacher, and the one for \$7,800 in connection with the purchase of a State car for the use of the Governor. As regards Resolution No. 1, the position with Mr. King is still the same, and the attitude of the Opposition is still the same in respect of Resolution No. 2.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member.

GRANT TO CHAPTER OF ST. MICHAEL'S CATHEDRAL

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is one to place the sum of \$870 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1951–52, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1951–52, No. 24 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

As honourable members will see from the Addendum to the Resolution, "it is proposed to make a grant to the Dean and Chapter of St. Michael's Cathedral to cover

- (a) Expenses incurred in connection with the election, consecration and enthronement of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Barbados; and
- (b) Expenses incurred in the administration of the Diocese during the recent vacancy in the See."

If there is anything more I can say in respect of this matter I will say it; it seems to me that these are the sort of expenses which we have to incur when a Bishop who can be extremely useful to the island has to resign. This is a principle which has already been approved by the House. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BETHELL: Is this a precedent or is it only being done in the case of this Bishop? Has this been done before?

Mr. HAYNES: It seems to me that these expenses should be covered by the Diocesan Synod Fund. After all, the matter concerns the election of their Bishop and I cannot see why the Central Government should be called upon to pay these expenses when we already have to pay a lot of money to keep the Church in its present state. It seems to me to be a pity for us to add more to the present expenses of the upkeep of the Church; I should like to have some more information on the matter, otherwise I shall oppose this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: If it is true that a new broom sweeps clean, a renovated broom attempts to sweep even cleaner. The honourable member has come back here and he seems to be more energetic than before; the honourable member should use his memory and he will see that this is not any precedent.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Evidently, this is not a precedent; when Bishop Hughes was enthroned this House voted money to meet the expenses, and in the days of Bishop Berkeley when the father of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew was here, the House voted money to meet these expenses. I therefore counsel the honourable member not to let it appear that we would deny the payment in respect of the enthronement of the Bishop. We have discussed this matter from every possible angle and I think the honourable member knows that, as far as this Party is concerned, he has the free vote relative to the disendowment and disestablishment of the Church. Even if the Church is disendowed and disestablished, in the interest of the community generally, this sum of \$870 would be such a bagatelle that it should be passed without any further debate in this Chamber.

Mr. CRAWFORD: While it is true that this amount might appear to be relatively infinitesimal, I think that the queries which were made with regard to this matter, were inspired more on the question of principle than any attempt to be parsimonious. The honourable junior member for St. Andrew could well make the remarks which he made because we have become notorious for doing the things which we should not do, and leaving undone the manifold things which we should do. Nobody is going to say that the sum of \$870 is too much to spend on the Church, and any criticism which I may make is not inspired by any desire to be parsimonious or by any anti-religious spirit. What I feel about the matter is this: I am just as devout as anybody else in here and probably more so than many others, but I feel that this colony spends a lot of money on the Established Church, money which might well be spent in other directions, and even if there was a precedent in agreeing to expenditure of this sort on a similar occasion, nowadays we are thinking in terms of relieving the State of the burden of the upkeep of the Church and this is certainly a case for the Church to find this money from the Diocesan Synod funds. The Church authorities should not have sent to us for this money; this amount is so small that it should have been found from their own funds. Nobody is questioning the amount whether it is \$800 or \$8,000; the principle is wrong. The expenses incurred in the consecration and enthronement of a Bishop should be defrayed by the Church; and if the Church does not realise by now that the principle of establishment is wrong, we should take steps to make them realise that it is wrong. One good way to begin to make them realise that the principle is wrong would have been to let them understand that they have to provide these expenses themselves.

Mr. ADAMS: Perhaps I should remind honourable members that this is far from being a precedent; it goes back as far as the appointment of Bishop Swaby in 1900. In every case we actually saved money, because during the period between the death or resignation of one Bishop and the appointment of another, the salary lapsed. On the last occasion we voted money in connection with the enthronement of the Bishop and the payment of somebody who acted in the office. There is a letter from a former senior Canon to the Government asking that the Government be pleased to make a grant to the Dean and Chapter of St. Michael's Cathedral of £100 from the lapsed salary of the Bishop for ser-

vices rendered in administering the Diocese during the vacancy of the See which was caused by the resignation of Bishop Bentley. It was pointed out in the letter that a like sum was paid when the See was rendered vacant in 1927 by the retirement of Bishop Berkeley and the appointment of Bishop Bentley, in 1917 on the appointment of Bishop Berkeley and in 1900 on the appointment of Bishop Swaby. There were therefore three previous occasions on which money was saved during the death or retirement of one Bishop and the appointment of another and the Legislature voted money to the Dean and Chapter of St. Michael's Cathedral on their request. I am therefore suggesting to honourable members that they are not establishing any precedent; they are really following two, if not three, precedents, and today, as in the past, money is saved because the Bishop's salary has lapsed during the period between the resignation of the previous Bishop and the appointment of another. In short, we can go back for 51 years from the point of view of the establishment of a precedent. I hope that honourable members have got all the information they are requesting.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply and the postponement of two.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN, YOUNG PERSONS AND CHILDREN (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1951

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to proceed with Order No. 9 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Employment of Women, Young Persons and Children Act, 1938.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill is in connection with another International Convention; it is an amendment to an Act which was passed in 1938 dealing with the employment of women, young persons and children. This amendment differs from the original Act in that in the definition of young persons and women, the age has been extended from 16 years to 18 years, and the definition of night work has been made more flexible. In Article 2 of Part III of the Schedule to this Bill dealing with night work, it is set out that "for the purpose of this Convention the term 'night' signifies a period of at least eleven consecutive hours, including an interval prescribed by the competent authority of at least seven consecutive hours falling between ten o'clock in the evening and seven o'clock in the morning." Those are the amendments to the Act; I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This is a very useful amendment, but it does not go far enough. The honourable introducer of this Bill has explained that it arises out of one of the Conventions of the International Labour Organization, but I am at a loss to understand why the Government should only seek to implement this special part of the particular Convention. All the amendment before us seeks to do is to

regulate the night work for young persons and women in industry, but the particular Convention also went a little further and suggested maternity protection for women employed in industry. In Jamaica, for instance, in 1941 when a similar Bill was being introduced to implement the terms of the Convention relating to night work having regard to young persons and women, provision was included to afford maternity protection of women. In June this year, I gave notice of an Address which specified the principles under which the Convention itself should operate. That Address reads as follows:

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly respectfully suggest that provision shall be made at the earliest date for maternity protection for women employed in industrial and commercial undertakings and accordingly request the introduction of legislation to prohibit the employment of women in specific undertakings for a specified period before and after confinement; to afford them the right to leave work on production of a medical certificate stating that confinement will take place within this specified period and to entitle them to a percentage of their salaries for the entire period before and after confinement; maternity leave to be extended on the presentation of a medical certificate to the effect that as a result of pregnancy or confinement, the woman is unable to resume work at the expiration of the specified period.

The Jamaica amendment of 1941 does what we propose to do today, but it goes further and includes in the same Bill suggestions which I made in the Address of which I gave notice in June this year. The Jamaica Act defines night work, it cites the cases in which the employment of women is allowed and it empowers the Government to make regulations which may restrict or prohibit the employment of women in any specific class of industrial undertaking. It also restricts the employment of women after childbirth and provides for the health and safety of women employed in any industrial undertaking. Other places like Ceylon and Nigeria have implemented this Convention in the manner in which Jamaica has done, and I believe that this Government would have been well advised to include in this Bill a provision which would have afforded maternity protection of women employed in industrial undertakings. In a colony like this there should not be any need for emphasising the desirability of protection for women who are pregnant; we are now implementing another Convention suggested by the I.L.O. and since the proposals I am making today are part and parcel of the Conventions out of which this Bill is before us today, and since other British colonies have found it expedient to protect women employed in industrial undertakings in the manner I have mentioned, I see no reason why this Bill should stop where it is and why the Government should not deal with the matter comprehensively. I am suggesting that since the protection of pregnant women in industry is just as important, if not more important than protecting women against excessive work at night, the Government should postpone the further consideration of this Bill so as to include an amendment to provide protection for women employed in industrial undertakings, and present a comprehensive Bill for the approval of the Legislature at the earliest possible moment. I therefore beg to move that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. MAPP being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were read and passed.

Clause 3 was read.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: I am grateful to the honourable senior member for St. Peter for drawing my attention to what, I must confess, I did not remember straight off; it is that there is a separate Convention concerning the point raised by the honourable junior member for St. Philip. There is a Convention of 1919 which deals with maternity protection and it is quite conceivable that we will ask the House to ratify it. In this Bill we are fixing the hours of night work for women and young persons; I think we should bring in the terms of the Convention dealing with maternity protection, but it does not necessarily follow that we should bring forward the terms of that Convention now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What is important is that the Jamaica Act of 1941 was so comprehensively drafted that it embodied the terms of both Conventions; it provided protection in respect of night work for women and also for maternity protection. There is no justification for making two bites at the same cherry, except the Government is admitting that the failure to implement the other Convention is purely an omission. (Mr. ADAMS: The I.L.O. made three bites at it). Then are we to make the same three bites? I think we should benefit from the mistakes of the I.L.O. As a matter of fact, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has forgotten that the I.L.O. Convention provides for a period of six weeks' rest before and after childbirth. The Convention to which the honourable member has referred is 32 years' old and because the Convention in respect of maternity protection was not brought forward at the same time as that with regard to night work for women (Mr. ADAMS: Both were dealt with in 1919) are we to implement one in 1951 and the other in 1961? Jamaica is not so backward as a lot of people would have us believe, because in 1941 that colony implemented all the Conventions and in 1951 we can only implement one of them. The Government feel that because they omitted to make any reference to maternity protection in this Bill, they should bring forward a special Bill to include protection for maternity cases; well, that is their prerogative, but since we have a precedent for the implementation of this other Convention by other colonies as long as 10 years ago, we are walking miles behind other colonies. We are dealing with this matter in a piecemeal manner; we are implementing one thing today with the understanding that in the distant future we may proceed with the implementation of the other.

The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Parts II and III of the Schedule were read and passed.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

FACTORIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Factories Act, 1947.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill is an amendment to the Factories Act, 1947, which was not workable without a Factory Inspector; efforts have been made to obtain the services of a suitable Officer but they have been unsuccessful so far. The Secretary of State for the Colonies has suggested certain amendments to the Act and the Labour Commissioner has suggested other changes. It is unusual to amend an Act before it has been brought into operation, but such action is considered to be justified in this instance in view of the Act being unworkable in its present form and the desirability of having workable legislation ready when the Factory Inspector arrives. This Bill seeks to abolish the Factory Board and to vest the powers of that Board in the Labour Commissioner, and a more comprehensive definition of a factory is given. The right is given to an inspector to remove dangerous conditions in a factory and there is also given the right of appeal to the Assistant Court of Appeal.

Clauses 25 and 26 of the Principal Act which provide for the notification of accidents are being repealed, since that provision will be covered by a separate Bill—the Notification of Accidents and Occupational Diseases Bill. As I have said, a more living definition of a factory is given. Clause 3 of the Bill provides a comprehensive definition of a factory and includes any factories owned or operated by the Government or by any parochial or other public body. This Clause is based on the definition of a factory in the Trinidad and Tobago Factory legislation. Clause 4 of the Bill repeals Clauses 3, 4 and 5 of the Act and substitutes three new Clauses which provide (a) that the inspection of all factories shall be the duty of the Labour Commissioner; (b) that the registration of factories, the establishment of the Factory Board and the Factory Appeal Board be abolished as I have already mentioned; and (c) that owners of factories shall notify the Labour Commissioner of the existence of factories within a time specified in the Bill. Clause 5 binds the Crown, but in case of any public emergency, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may by order exempt the Crown from complying with the provisions of the Act. Those are the main points in connection with this Bill which seeks to amend the Factories Act, 1947; I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second the motion for the second reading of this Bill. I have heard that some honourable members want the consideration of this Bill to be postponed, but I want to say that it is not the Government's business if honourable members do not pay more attention to matters which are to be dealt with by the House. If they have more important business to look after, they can gracefully retire. It is all right for the honourable senior member for the City to talk about postponing the consideration of this Bill, but he does not know the number of people who have lost their breadwinners through the old medieval system of running factories. We have had a state of affairs whereby we nearly had two deaths within two years in the year before last it was only the mercy of God that prevented somebody from being killed. The time has come when we must make provision for making workers safe while they are at work. When it

comes to the question of postponing this Bill, I want honourable members to realise that the Trade Union at the last Conference passed a Resolution pointing out to the Government the importance of appointing a Factory Inspector and bringing this factory legislation up to date. When honourable members say that they have not had the time to read this Bill, that is a joke because this Bill has been on the Order Paper for the last four weeks. I cannot agree to the postponement of this Bill.

We are removing this old Factory Board and putting certain matters in the hands of the Labour Commissioner. Honourable members who are aware of similar legislation in Trinidad will realise that the Labour Commissioner and the Factory Inspector are independent in the carrying out of the Act, but the Factory Inspector is under the Labour Commissioner. Similarly in Jamaica there is a Labour Industrial Adviser and there are Factory Inspectors; it is better that certain matters should come under the scope of the Labour Commissioner than under the scope of a top-heavy Board. The main purpose of this Bill is to protect the worker and I do not see why any honourable member should want the consideration of this Bill to be postponed. The operation of this Bill will be under the control of the Labour Commissioner and that is as it should be, and in this island we have always liked the Courts to deal with matters such as those under the Workmen's Compensation Act. I say that the workers welcome this Bill because they want the Government to appoint a Factory Inspector to see that factories are properly run and so prevent us from writing to owners of factories on behalf of people whose bread-winners have been lost. With those remarks, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The honourable senior member for St. Peter is pretty fresh having just returned from his vacation. With regard to the suggestion that honourable members would have this Bill in their possession and not have enough time to read it and they should back down and let other people who have the time come forward, I take that for what it is worth. There are times when all of us in this House might be pressed with our business other than political business and we might not be able to get through the reading of Bills. I agree that we have had this Bill before us for some time. Nobody is saying that a Bill of this nature should not be passed; everybody will agree with that; but when you have a voluminous Bill with numerous amendments, it is a question of reasoning out the matter. The honourable member who has just sat down has studied the implications of this Bill more than any of us because it is a part of his business to do so, and if people want to go into this Bill with the honourable member who represents the point of view of the Union and the employees, there is nothing wrong in suggesting the postponement of this Bill. The passing of a Bill of this nature is necessary in a community where you have factories and undertakings in which people are liable to lose their lives; but the question of our going into Committee or Select Committee on this Bill now is different from postponing it.

I would not claim to know as much about the implications of this Bill as the honourable senior member for St. Peter because his job is connected with the working of the Bill: but although we may have read this Bill there will be something on which the honourable member or the honourable senior member for St. Joseph can enlighten us, and therefore there is nothing wrong in asking for a conference

in respect of this Bill. Surely there are honourable members on this side of the House, who have read this Bill and there are certain amendments which might be better made in Select Committee.

Mr. WARD: I do not think that any honourable member of this House would vote against this Bill; I feel that machinery should be so well protected that accidents or death would be prevented. The honourable senior member for St. Peter has said that we have had instances in which people have been killed or injured, but there is the question of the carelessness of the employees. Whatever happens at a factory is not the fault of the factory; therefore what the honourable member has said does not carry so much weight with me. Everyone knows that pure accidents will take place whether machinery is fenced or not.

As regards this Bill, I really did not expect that we would have got to it today and there are certain things which I feel we should check up; I started to read the Bill but I did not get through all of it. I feel that we should check the amendments and see how this Bill stands in relation to the other Bill. I do not think that the postponement of this Bill for a week could make any difference, and the consideration of the Bill could be made the first Order of the Day next Tuesday. Let us have time to go into the matter and have a Factory Bill which we feel will be for the good of the community. We cannot pass a Bill when we are not satisfied as to the changes which are being made; we are not here to kill the Bill; we are here to protect the community. It is in the interest of the community to have machinery fenced so as to prevent any damage from being done to any individual. I cannot see that we are trying to prevent this Bill from going through; we want to be in a position to say that we have a workable Act which will cover all the matters which may arise. I say that the postponement of this Bill for a week cannot harm the Bill; I therefore beg to move that the consideration of this Bill be postponed for a week and it can be made the first Order of the Day at the next meeting of the House.

Mr. DOWDING: When one uses the word "factory" in this island people immediately think of a sugar factory. I agree with the honourable member who has just sat down and I beg to second the motion for the postponement. There are a great many things in this Bill, which have been made into one; this is an amendment to a Bill on which there was a protracted debate which lasted for several meetings in 1947. The Bill was sent to a Select Committee that Committee presented its Report and eventually the Bill was passed by the House. I am at a loss to understand why, if the Bill was so urgently needed, it has never been put into operation. The fact that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has commented on the inspection of boilers is, in my opinion, a minor thing which can be dealt with at any later date. In the Bill before us there is going to be the abolition of the Factory Board the establishment of which was agreed to on the first occasion, and we are going to adopt a system of authority being exercised by the Labour Commissioner. Funnily enough, the Labour Commissioner, whose advice has been given to us, is also the gentleman who is responsible for a great deal of inaccurate advice. It seems ridiculous to me, as one who has some knowledge of a factory, that the Labour Commissioner should have authority in matters of fencing machinery, since I am certain that his office does not call for training in that technical type of work. There cannot be any doubt whatsoever that no one on this side of the House wishes to see this Bill pushed into any hole or postponed for any length of time, but this is a matter

which vitally concerns the industry of this island and it should therefore be given the greatest consideration. We are constantly placing more and more unnecessary work on this administrative office; I say it is unnecessary work because I have not heard the honourable introducer of this Bill say why the Factory Board should not be in authority. We are placing more and more work on this administrative Department because regardless of the type of Bill we are passing, we put some authority into the hands of the Labour Commissioner. I cannot see where this sort of thing is going to end because the members of the staff are crying out for overwork and underpay. We are placing more and more responsibility on this Department where there is not the necessary technical training, but the work could be more efficiently and economically carried out by a Board such as that which was recommended by this House in the first place. It seems to me ludicrous that after much discussion in Select Committee and protracted debate in this House, a Bill should not be put into operation because of a minor amendment recommended by the Secretary of State for the Colonies and a major amendment recommended by the Labour Commissioner.

If honourable members were to refer to the debate on the original Bill they will see that practically every member of the House at the time spoke on the matter. It was fully debated and several divisions were called for; members representing all shades of opinion spoke on this matter. The Bill had been referred to a Select Committee, which was a very full and representative Committee—a Committee which in my opinion, was representative not only in intelligence, but it was also well-balanced in its representation of the people. But the Bill which was eventually passed, has not been proclaimed law. I regret if I am speaking at length on this matter, but I have not heard anything from the honourable introducer as to the discrepancies or the impracticability of the working of the Board, the establishment of which was agreed to when the original Bill was before the House.

There is a matter which was taken up on the last occasion, but which I find has not been taken up on this occasion; unless my source is incorrect, on the last occasion that matter was well debated by persons primarily concerned with it. In my opinion, it should always be the practice of the Government when introducing any legislation to have some communication with the particular representative body in respect of that legislation. In this case I believe there was one informal meeting with the President and the Secretary of the Sugar Producers' Federation, but nothing official whatsoever has been done. It seems to me that a Body such as the Sugar Producers' Federation which had fully agreed with the Bill on the last occasion, should be given the opportunity of having some say in connection with this Bill before it becomes law. I shall deal with the matters I have mentioned fully when the House goes into Committee on the Bill because I feel they need to be debated. For the reasons I have given along with the fact that this Bill will necessitate a long debate and we on this side of the Table are unable to remain here to-day to give the Bill the necessary attention, I am seconding the motion for the postponement of the Bill for another week.

Mr. MILLER: I do not know if my effort to get this Bill through this Chamber will have any special effect on honourable members. I think the postponement of this Bill which is an amendment to the Act of 1947, could be likened to a crime. If you examine the sugar industry you will find that it has

claimed more victims than any epidemic has claimed in this colony. I am thinking in terms of the manufacture of sugar in Barbados, and I say that it has claimed more victims than any epidemic in this island has claimed, including cholera. It is still believed up to to-day in some quarters in England that the manufacture and crystallization of sugar could not take place without the presence of negro blood. I speak with feeling on this matter; to-day honourable members who find themselves in this House on the popular vote, and who enjoy the running of factories at the people's expense are saying that this Bill should be postponed. I own and operate a factory myself and I will say that there are members in this Chamber who are equally as interested in the people, as those who own and operate factories if not more so, and I say that to postpone this Bill for a day is a crime. To-day in any country where factories are operated you must have protection for people; I have often heard that machinery had to be stopped so as to take a man out of it. It is not reasonable to believe that a man will sleep all day and if he is called upon to work for 16 or 17 hours, obviously he will sleep. He is open to the loss of his life and it is felt that that man should be protected from the loss of his life. Do honourable members want to postpone for another week this Bill which has been before them for four weeks? Nobody who has any connection with a factory should want to postpone this Bill. I hesitate to say what I feel about this matter. I repeat that it would be a crime to postpone this Bill; we do not want to continue with conditions under which we always have victims being collected.

Mr. ADAMS: We know that an Election is around the corner, we know that some of the honourable members of the Opposition will not be coming back and therefore they are having their last fling in this House. However, I am appealing to them as members of the community, if not future members of this Assembly, to see that they will not do this island any good if the only reason they have for asking for an adjournment of this Bill is that they have not had the opportunity of reading the Bill during the past week or two. It is not that this Bill has come to them like a bolt from the blue; they knew that we were about to proceed with this Bill. What is the point that the Government is asking honourable members to accept to-day? The point which was raised when the Bill was first discussed was in connection with the appointment of a Factory Board: we now feel on mature consideration and on the advice of those who may have to see after the working of the Bill and on the advice of those who have seen the working of Factories Acts in other colonies, that it is better not to have the cumbersome machinery of the Board but to leave the matter with the Department of Labour as is the case in some other countries. That is all that honourable members are being asked to agree to in this Bill; but just because they can get a majority to out-vote the Government, they are asking for the postponement of this Bill.

As regards the honourable junior member for St. George, it is a pleasure to listen to him; when I am listening to him it is the same thing as if I am reading about the French Revolution. That is all amusing, but it does not get the business of the colony any further. If honourable members have any point to make let them make it and let the Government answer it; if they are points in this Bill which honourable members have to raise, the Government will give a guarantee that if we cannot satisfy those honourable members with the answers,

we will postpone consideration of the Bill. The Factories Act was passed by the Legislature four years ago and it has been pointed out to us that it is not as workable as this Bill. To-day, after this Bill could have been dealt with a few Tuesdays ago, honourable members are saying; "Let us adjourn it again." That is not good enough. I appeal to the honourable senior member for St. James, who has tremendous influence with his Party, to see that there is no substantial reason for the members of the Opposition asking for a postponement of this Bill. I appeal to him to get them to see that there is no point in postponing this Bill without any real reason for doing so. If those honourable members say that they want more time to see the implications of this or that Clause, that would be a different matter. When the members of the Opposition say that they are anxious to get measures of social reform on the Statute Book and they are anxious to have a coalition to-morrow, do they mean it? God help us if we have a coalition with them; I am perfectly willing to have a coalition with them if they will carry out Labour principles, and they will have to show that they really understand social principles. So far, the members of the Opposition have not said anything reasonable as to why there should be a postponement of this Bill; the Act was discussed at great length four years ago and we came down on the side of the Factory Board. It has now been pressed upon us that we should not have agreed on the establishment of the Factory Board, but we should have the Labour Commissioner in control. That is all which is before us; we have come back to what we discussed four years ago. The Crown is made liable to a prosecution in the same way as a private employer. Are honourable members still asking for a postponement? Why should we postpone this matter? Let honourable members raise every point and ask the Government for an explanation.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I have been trying to avoid saying anything about this matter. We agree that there should be a Factories Act in operation; a Factories Act was passed in 1947 but it has not been put into operation. This Bill which is now before us is Order No. 11 on the Order Paper and when we have a Bill like this we should like to give it the consideration which it should be given. If the honourable member had intimated to us that he intended to deal with Order No. 11 to-day I would have called a meeting of our members for the purpose of going through this Order and getting the necessary advice as to whether there is anything in the Bill which would make any difference. That is the position in which I find myself. There is the disapproval of the Labour Commissioner taking the place of the Factory Board; that has been the subject of hours of debate and the honourable member has just said that other colonies have decided on the Labour Commissioner taking the place of the Board. We should like to check up with other legislation and to delay the consideration of the Bill for a week for that purpose. We on this side of the House have strong objection to putting the Labour Commissioner in charge of anything except what he is in charge of now; we do not want to refer the Bill to a Select Committee so that the charge should not be made that some delay would take place in Select Committee. I think that the postponement of this Bill for a week should be allowed so that we can pick out any item which we want to check and see how it works.

I should like to say that there is no intention on this side of the House to have anything to do with any coalition. I have never heard of it; that must have been said after a drink had been taken

and we wanted to be merry; that is more likely to be a matter of being genial and friendly but not to be taken in any serious manner. I say that there is no desire to postpone this Bill indefinitely; it can be made the first Order of the Day at the next meeting, and nobody would be able to say that he was not aware that the Bill would be dealt with. I repeat that I have not had any meeting of the members of my Party to discuss this Bill.

Mr. BRANCKER entered the House and took his seat.

The question that the consideration of this Bill be postponed for a week was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. MOTTLEY, DOWDING, GODDARD, REECE, HAYNES, E. K. WALCOTT, BETHELL, WART and GILL.—9.

Noes: Messrs. MAPP, ALLDER MILLER, BRYAN, F. L. WALCOTT, DR. CUMMINS, Messrs. ADAMS and BRANCKER.—8.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT. I beg to move as an amendment that the words "half an hour" be deleted and the words "this day week" be inserted in place thereof. The reason for moving that amendment is, I think, known to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, and I hope he will agree to the adjournment for a week.

Mr. ADAMS: For many years many of us with a smile used to agree not to have a meeting of the House on a day when there would be a clash with a meeting of the Barbados Turf Club because the honourable member was a prominent member of that Club. We always did that with a smile and it did not matter; but to-day there is very little time before the dissolution of the House and there is still much to be done. I believe that honourable members on that side of the House want to attend some private function, but they did not have the decency to tell me that they want an adjournment for a week because somebody is having a cocktail party and they want to attend it. Honourable members are being paid for coming here and carrying on the business of the House and honourable members over there have the effrontery to ask for the adjournment of the House for a week at this stage to go to somebody's house and drink a little rum. If the honourable member who is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had told me that the members of the Opposition wanted to attend a private function and asked if the Government would make it convenient for them to attend this function, that would have been all well and good; but I have not heard that from one single member of the Opposition. The members of the Opposition have not paid me the courtesy to come and say; "We propose to leave the House early because we should like to go to a private function; do you mind granting an early adjournment?" I now see why those honourable members were opposed to going on with the Factories Act; they do not want to stay here, they want to go to somebody's home. This is not a question of a bereavement; this is a rum spree. That is not good enough and the worst thing about it is that they have not notified the Government about the matter. I am asking the honourable senior member for St. James to consider this matter and see that the position is not good enough; they are using the strength of their members to get this adjournment for a week.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This Government has always made it clear that no private function should be allowed to clash with a meeting of this House. In so far as I am concerned, there is no person who would cause me to put any occasion in front of a meeting of the House. It is now clear why honourable members of the Opposition did not want to deal with the Factories Bill; we can go right around the country and let the people know what the position is, because those honourable members do not represent the masses of the people. This in an indication that they are more concerned with their private business—they even put a cocktail party before the service of the people, and the honourable senior member for St. James has moved the adjournment of the House for a week at this stage. When it suits the honourable member, he jumps up and asks that a matter be removed from the Order Paper, although he had nothing to say on that matter.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Is there not a Rule of the House which says that honourable members cannot refer to any matter which has been decided by the House except for the purpose of revoking the decision? The honourable member is referring to a previous decision of the House.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I just want to say that it was agreed that the House should be adjourned at 5 o'clock for half an hour because honourable members have said that after five o'clock it was hard on them to continue sitting without an adjournment, but now they want the House adjourned for a week because they want to attend a private party, and the whole business of the House must be stopped. If they were running the business of the House and one of the Clerks asked for time off to attend a private party, they would say that he should be fired or he would have to look for a job to-morrow. Who are the people who are asking for the adjournment of the House for a week at this stage?—The same people who are telling the electorate to return them to the House.

The honourable junior member for St. George is singing his last amen; there is a certainty that he is not coming back here, unless he brings a message to the Speaker. The people of St. George will know about this matter. Honourable members on that side of the Table did not think of giving courtesy to the Government, and even then I would have objected to the adjournment for a week now, because honourable members have much to be done under Private Members' Business. However, Mr. Speaker, I hope that those honourable members over there will vote against the adjournment for half an hour and let it be made public to-morrow that the House was adjourned for a week because members of the Opposition wanted to attend a cocktail party and no more business could be done. With those honourable members the Races come before the business of the people; a cocktail party comes before Government business. I hope that honourable members will realise that the people cannot be represented at the cocktail party.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member may not make such unbecoming remarks in reference to honourable members.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: We are aware of the tactics of the members of the Opposition not to come back in the House when it suits them not to come back in. I am told that last Tuesday night they did not come back in after dinner. We are dealing with the Factories Bill and there are also on the Order Paper, the Public Health Bill, a Resolution in connection with the Civil Establishment, a Resolution dealing with the lease of land to the Vestry of St. George for the purpose of establishing a playing

field and other matters; but honourable members want the House to be adjourned for a week at this stage. There is the Old Age Pension Bill, and honourable members have been asking the Government to give the pensioners more money; Then there is the Local Government Bill which I suppose, honourable members will say should be referred to a Select Committee; but because the members of the Opposition have an extra member to form a majority, they can decide to adjourn the House to attend a cocktail party. I want to say that there are, in this island, interested persons who will come here and serve the people. Everything must be postponed when a race meeting is on; Bridgetown must be shut down for one-half of the day for the Races and now because those honourable members want to attend a private party the business of the House must be postponed and other honourable members must be told to go to their homes because there is still the ruling of the old days. I want to tell those honourable members that this is 1951 and they must realise that this is a different day from the old days; there is now adult suffrage and they will be asking people to vote for them.

Mr. MOTTLEY. By force of circumstances I am not one of those who drink rum. I should like to say that I have never heard in this House a debate which went lower than this one. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that this House was adjourned on more than one occasion when social functions were being held. I have had the surprise of my life this afternoon; I have never been so shocked as I have been this afternoon, to hear remarks such as those I have heard come especially from the honourable Leader of the House and the honourable senior member for St. Peter. It is true that members of this House are paid for coming here; I have had to be away from this House for six months through no fault of my own, something which any honourable member may have to experience, and then an honourable member gets up and says that members of the House get paid for coming here. But the honourable senior member for St. Peter has just returned from four weeks' vacation and he is fresh. It must be obvious that the members of the Opposition have done everything in the past year to co-operate with the Government, because on nearly every occasion during the past ten months we had a majority on the floor of the House; therefore it is not decent to say — it is a lack of decency to get up in the House and say — that the members of the Opposition want to adjourn the House because they want to drink rum. I have seen this House adjourned for members over there to go and eat food and drink rum. All this rum drinking might be a spree; however you must let it appear that you are decent.

If the honourable senior member for St. Joseph feels hurt, possibly rightly so, over the fact that he has not been acquainted that the members of the Opposition would like to leave early, that only shows that the Opposition members have so much strength in this House that they can cause an adjournment of the House. When it is said that the Opposition do not want to do their work, I should like to remind honourable members that my colleague happened to be on sick leave, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and the honourable senior member for St. Thomas had to be away on State business and the members of the Opposition had a majority in this House. On every occasion we came in here with a majority and the business of the House still went on. To say that an honourable member from this side of the House got up and moved the adjournment of the House for a week because honourable members on this side want to go and drink rum is out of place;

if you want to have a showdown you can have it. I am saying that during the past ten months the Opposition had in their hands the running of this House, but we did not take advantage of that; nobody takes advantage of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and members on that side of the House having to go away on State business or private business. When it is said that honourable members over here are getting paid for coming here, honourable members over there are also getting paid for coming here: when an honourable member is on holiday or is ill, it is unbecoming and indecent for an honourable member to get up here and say: "You have been elected here and you are being paid to do your job in representing the island of Barbados." I have seen the honourable Leader of the House leave here and go to a social function and on that occasion the Opposition had a majority in this House, but we did not say that the honourable member can go out of the House and we must sit here like children; we stood here and formed a majority in this House.

What the two members of the Government are telling the public this afternoon is that they are running the Government, but they were in the hands of the Opposition for a long time; that is what they are saying. If the honourable senior member for St. John had made a speech such as either of those which we have heard and had sunk to such depths, one would have heard the honourable senior member for St. Joseph dealing with him.

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of order. Is the honourable member saying that I would make such a speech? (Laughter).

Mr. MOTTLEY: No one knows the capability of individual members of this House until they are confronted with certain circumstances. I can make as good a billingsgate speech or a Conch Alley speech on the subject of eating food or drinking rum as anybody else in this House. I believe my position in the Opposition is one to which every member of this community looked forward, but I still realise whence I came. I want to say this: if any member of this Opposition, be he the Leader or not, had got so drunk as to get up in this House and make a speech, such as either of those we have just heard, about the members on that side of the Table, that would be one time when I would strip myself of this Party and say: "If you say that about other people you will say the same thing about me." Mr. Speaker, you know I would tell him so. I am telling you, Sir from the floor of this House, that I have had all sorts of difficulties with hon. members and this is the first time that I have felt hurt to find that a debate could have sunk to such a depth.

Mr. ADAMS: I apologize to hon. members for using the word "rum;" you can drink whisky or grape fruit juice. I used the word "rum" comprehensively for what is drunk at a cocktail party: I have seen lemonade being drunk: I have seen the honourable junior member for Christ Church drinking coca-cola.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—What are the true facts of this case? There is in this country from the U.K. a member of the House of Commons who must be considered a very important person as far as the British Government is concerned, because the Government has been notified that he is on an official visit here. Members of the House of Commons of the party constituting the Government have paid visits without this Government even having been told. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said that this party wants to go and drink rum; and it is well that we clear that up. If the Governor was giving a cocktail party

for this member to-day the honourable senior member for St. Joseph would have fixed the time to adjourn the House early. If there was a cocktail party for Sir Lennox Boyd at Government House the honourable member would adjourn the House early and go.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member should not make personal accusations of that sort. I have never done what he is accusing me of having done.

VOICE: You have.

Mr. ADAMS: I will say this: If the Archbishop of Canterbury makes a denial it would not prevent the honourable member from saying that the Archbishop is a liar. I, for my own sake, am making a statement that a similar clash of dates has already occurred and I remained here, let alone asking that the House be adjourned. I remained here and went next day and apologised to the holder of the party for not being able to be present.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The honourable member has adjourned this House before for the same reason. I have not got to worry. I say something when I know that it is so. The honourable member has done it already and he would do it again.

Mr. SPEAKER: You may say what the honourable member has done; not what he might do.

Mr. MOTTLEY. He would do it. The position, therefore, is this. The Honourable Lennox Boyd has got to leave to-morrow, and a cocktail party has been arranged for him. If some of the members of the Opposition are invited to the party is it decent for members on the other side to get here and make the remarks they have made? The honourable member talked about letting the public see that we have left the House to go and drink rum. We will be only doing what members on the other side have done before. They have left to go and drink rum and eat food. I am saying, Sir, that I think this is a most disgraceful thing. What they should tell the public is that the Opposition for the last year or ten months at least, on several occasions had a majority of votes in this House, and as a result of the Opposition being loyal they came here and remained here. They did not say "we will not do any work; we will embarrass you, or hold you up." We did not do that on one occasion, and the Leader of the House knows that. Last Tuesday night their members were out spreeing. They want to go out and do as they like, and everyone else must remain. Whose fault it is if they have not got a quorum?

Mr. SPEAKER. The honourable member is speaking in reply to asides.

Mr. MOTTLEY. They are supposed to have a majority, and therefore I am going to vote for the adjournment. Members of the Opposition have just as great a sense of responsibility as anyone else when it comes to doing our job.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker—

A VOICE: Stop wasting time.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker—I cannot be accused of wasting time in this House because if the honourable members on the other side who have a majority this afternoon persist with their motion it is obvious that we will not have any time to waste after this debate. Therefore, if I fight their proposal to have the House adjourned for a week at this point, I cannot see how I can be accused of wasting time. For honourable members of my party to blame me for wasting time is unfair. I am acting in the interest of the Government. If the honourable members opposite want to go to a party at this stage let them leave now. The very fact that they are trying to force an adjournment means that they do not want to leave the House in session. They do not want that.

Sometimes they fight other people's battles and cannot fight their own. I cannot leave unanswered certain accusations that have been made especially by the honourable senior member for the City. I have never seen this House adjourned so that members could go to a private dinner or party. I challenge the honourable member to say when that happened. There seems to be the misconception that because this party forms the Government it is our business to form a quorum to carry on the business of the House. Everyone knows that the other side has a favourite tactic of persuading some members to stay outside the House. It would be very poor tactics for them not to come to the House when they know that we do not have a majority and may be discussing something that is against their interests. On the occasions when one or more of us have to be away from the House or from this colony on private or public business it was to the interest of the other side to come here and form a majority to see that measures which did not suit them did not go through. It is no question of being loyal. Loyal to whom? To the people? What do they think they were sent to the House for? Last week we had the spectacle of there being not enough members to form a quorum after dinner. They did not even come in. They simply stayed away. I ask, Mr. Speaker, how can any public spirited person feel comfortable to see the business of the House held up by such tactics? How can any honourable member who takes his work seriously not object to such tactics? This evening they are trying to force an adjournment for private reasons and they want to convince the public that they are doing so because it has been done before. But that is not so. I was hoping that honourable members would be most anxious to allow the House to get on with some Private Members' Business; but they have other private business to attend to. The honourable member does not drink, so he could remain in the House, and let those who have to go to meet this Conservative Member of the British House of Commons go. I was expecting that some of them might have crept away and attended to that aspect of their business, and we could have carried on in a family atmosphere. But it does not seem as though they are taking this private party very seriously. Seeing that they were so anxious to have an adjournment and go, why are they still here? They only have to leave and let us carry on the business of the public. I do not see anything hard in that. The argument of the honourable senior member for the City that the House has been adjourned for this purpose before does not carry any force with the thinking public. I think that this debate has served a very useful purpose. If we who represent the Government did not sound a protest against this attempt to adjourn the House we would not deserve to be sent back here by the electors. Only last week those honourable members on the other side tried to frustrate the business of the House. Must we not question their motives in that respect? If some honourable members are not willing to accept their responsibility and carry out their duties, surely we who have some sense of responsibility should protest against it. I am not saying that all the members who may vote for the adjournment do not have a sense of responsibility, but they are allowing their desire to defeat and obstruct Government's business to outstrip their sense of responsibility. If we were so foolish as to make a motion of this sort, I am sure that the honourable senior member for St. James would be the first to get up and speak in the same terms in which the honourable senior member for St. Peter has

spoken this afternoon. I have seen it written in the Press that it is the duty of the Government Party to form a quorum. That could only be written to justify the actions of certain honourable members when they want to frustrate public business.

The motion being put that the words "half an hour" be deleted and the words "this day week" inserted in place thereof, the question was decided in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. Ward, Mr. Mottley, Mr. Bethell, Mr.

Dowding, Mr. Goddard, Mr. Reece, Mr. Haynes, Mr. E. K. Walcott and Mr. Gill.—(9).

Noes: Mr. Mapp, Mr. Alder Mr. Miller, Mr. Bryan, Dr. Cummins, Mr. F. L. Walcott, Mr. Adams and Mr. Brancker.—(8).

ADJOURNMENT

The motion that the House do now adjourn to this day week being put and carried, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.