

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 25th 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*), Mr. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Messrs. M. E. COX, L. E. SMITH, (*Chairman of Committees*), F. L. WALCOTT, H. A. DOWDING, R. G. MAPP, E. K. WALCOTT, K.C., T. O. BRYAN, F. E. MILLER and J. A. HAYNES, B.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the 11th September, 1951, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. GODDARD entered the House and took his seat.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR

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

MESSAGE NO. 32/1951

*His Excellency the Governor
To
The Honourable the House of Assembly*

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to his Message to the Honourable the House of Assembly dated the 20th of June, 1951, on the subject of the death of Mr. Milton King, and to say that the firm of Solicitors in South Africa who have been retained to look after the interests of the family of Mr. Milton King, have been supplied with information necessary for the preparation of a claim against the Government of the Union of South Africa.

ca. The Solicitors are now preparing the claim which will be lodged formally with the Union Government.

ALFRED SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,
23rd September, 1951.

PAPERS LAID

Mr. ADAMS: I also have the honour to lay on the Table of the House the following Papers:—
Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received from His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act, for the period ended on the 30th of June, 1951, in respect of the several schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

Report of the Commission appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to enquire into and report upon the establishment of the "Princess Alice Playing Field" and other matters connected therewith.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$2,520 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, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to make it lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to lease to the Vestry of Christ Church that parcel of land containing by admeasurement one acre, two roods, ten perches, part of Kent Plantation, situate in the parish of Christ Church for the purpose of establishing a Playing Field.

Mr. GILL entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Bill to make provision for the execution of works necessary to prevent and control flooding and inundations caused by excessive rains and by high tides and by reason of the low level of various places, causing inconvenience to persons and injury to health and property and to authorize the Governor-in-Executive Committee to take all reasonable steps in connection therewith.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to confer powers, and impose duties and restrictions, in relation to gold, currency, payments, securities, debts, and the import, export, transfer and settlement of property, and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid.

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

A Private Member's Notice was given as follows:

Mr. MILLER: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly views with grave concern the savage conditions under which Quarry Workers are forced to earn a living, with inadequate compensation for their strenuous hours of toil.

The House is of the opinion that "Block-Stone" workers should be paid a rebate of one penny on every square foot of stone quarried, with the provision that this rebate be paid during the first half of December of every year.

In order to justify this rebate, simple calculations reveal that Quarry Owners who now receive 7c. per square foot would clear approximately \$15,000.00 per acre of Quarry Land 10 feet deep, even with an allowance of 50% loss, incurred through "depression" broken stone, chips, marl etc., even though the debris is sometimes sold.

The House also considers that a similar rebate be granted "Blast Stone" workers who are paid by the square yard or coil.

The House respectfully requests that legislation be introduced, designed to give effect to the above.

Mr. GARNER entered the House and took his seat.

QUESTION

Mr. MILLER. To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

Is Government aware that the district of "El-lerton" in the parish of St. George, is developing into what may some day be considered "the town of the parish"?

If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, inasmuch as there is a water-main in the area, would Government see to it that a Fire Hydrant be placed at a central point, which would offer some form of protection, in the case of Fire, seeing that most of the houses there are constructed of wood?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill to confer powers and impose duties and restrictions, in relation to gold, currency, payments, securities, debts, and the import, export, transfer and settlement of property, and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid, was read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Bill to make provision for the execution of works necessary to prevent and control flooding and inundations caused by excessive rains and by high tides and by reason of the low level of various places, causing inconvenience to persons and injury to health and property and to authorize the Governor-in-Executive Committee to take all reasonable steps in connection therewith, was read a first time.

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to postpone the first eight orders of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

FACTORIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is therefore to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to amend the Factories Act, 1947. On the last occasion the postponement was moved by the honourable senior member for St. Lucy and seconded by the honourable junior member for St. George. The honourable senior member for St. Lucy is not in his place and the honourable junior member for St. George is entitled to speak now.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker,—If I may reflect for a minute on what I was saying when the consideration of this Bill was postponed, this Bill seeks to give power to the Labour Commissioner, and the Labour Commissioner alone, to control the main industry of this island to a very great degree. In this Bill the Labour Commissioner is given the power which was given to other people in the original Bill, which, as I said, has not been proclaimed law, and I cannot understand why it has not been so proclaimed. I happened to attend a meeting of factory owners yesterday and that same question was asked by the factory owners. Nobody on this side of the House could or would disagree with the fundamental principle of the Bill, but the manner in which it is now proposed to carry out that principle is definitely placing in the hands of one man, a vast amount of power. We are too quick to hand over power which has been in our hands for years and years to a type of individual whose capabilities due to the lack of well-trained employees in the Civil Service today, should, in my opinion, be of great consideration in this matter. A Labour Commissioner himself does not have and obviously will not have, except in very rare cases, any qualifications whatsoever for carrying out the terms which it is necessary for him to carry out under this Bill. The Inspector is subject to the Labour Commissioner who makes the appointments. Mr. Speaker, the psychological warfare on my right tends to distract me but I shall be dealing somewhat lengthily with this Bill.

We are told in the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has advised that the 1947 Act, which was exhaustively debated in this House for over a period of nearly two months, which was gone into in detail by a Select Committee comprised of members representing both the interests affected by the Act, is unworkable. The minor amendments which the Secretary of State has recommended could easily have been incorporated in the 1947 Act; then the Labour Commissioner has pointed out that the administrative machinery for carrying out the provisions of the Act are cumbersome. I know that Your Honour does not like any allusion being made to those who cannot represent themselves on the floor of this House; it is therefore difficult for me to deal with this matter, but I shall try to deal with the office of Labour Commissioner. What Labour Commissioner could be expected to know anything about the fencing of machinery and the inspection of boilers? You can quite see what the position of the factory owners and managers will be when you have a Labour Commissioner who does not know about this technical business. The powers of the Inspector can be the same as those of the Labour Commissioner because, in this Bill, the Labour Commissioner can delegate any of his powers to the Inspector. If there

is anything in this Bill which is liable at any time to impede the progress of the sugar industry in this island, you can quite see what a difficult position you will be placing this island in. The Inspector can go before a Police Magistrate *ex parte* and the Magistrate can decide against the owner of a factory whether it is a sugar factory or a beverage factory. I am against those Clauses of the Bill which can be administered by one man. I wonder what the Government is willing to pay the right man for this engineering work; because when it comes to a man who is properly qualified in this department of engineering, I should be very dubious if he can be obtained under a salary of £2,000 a year.

That bring us to another point. Wherever you turn today whether it be in the medical profession—in every profession except the legal profession—people are in very short supply, and naturally the question of supply and demand controls the salary. I hear some mention made of somebody being already obtained, but I hope that we will be able to obtain a man whose qualifications are those which are necessary for doing this technical job and we will pay him the necessary salary in order that this Bill will operate successfully. Today we can look around and see young and inexperienced officials holding high offices in this island, and very rightly so in my opinion because the salaries as they are today are not sufficient to attract experienced and qualified men. When one takes all these things into consideration, it is difficult to see how it could be recommended that the Labour Commissioner be appointed under this Bill with such powers as he is being given and then these powers can be delegated to any Inspector. As I said before, there is no doubt that a Bill of this sort is necessary in this island, and legislation in this connection has been passed by this House and in the Other Place since 1947; but there seems to have been some impediment in the way of this legislation being put into operation. It is only too obvious to me after reading this Bill to see the impediment; the impediment is that all the power must be placed in the hands of one man. I cannot repeat that too often. In every Clause of this Bill, in every amendment, the Labour Commissioner is given full power except where the shutting down of a factory is concerned. I think that even the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will agree with me that it might take months before the final decision is reached in the Courts where a matter affecting a sugar factory is concerned.

The 1947 Act provided for a Board comprised of the Labour Commissioner, the Colonial Engineer, the Chief Medical Officer, the Government Electrical Inspector and I think, two other persons appointed by the Governor. You can quite see the wide experience which that Board could apply to any case; it would not only be a matter for the Labour Commissioner, but for the Board as a whole. There was another safeguard in the 1947 Act, a safeguard that a particular job is not given to any unscrupulous, untrained person, and it is very difficult to get properly trained people today. Then you had a Factory Appeal Board, a body of persons appointed by the Governor, persons who had a knowledge of local conditions and they would be far more efficient and they would be able to deal much more speedily with matters than the proposed set-up in this Bill. I believe that there are some factory owners who would be very capable of giving advice on that Board in the making of decisions, and I take it that there might have been Presidents and Vice-presidents and Secretaries of Unions who might, quite rightly, have been appointed. If I were the Governor I would have seen that both types of people are appointed on that Board. Now

you are taking away machinery which has never been put into operation.

On the last occasion I spoke at some length on this Bill and I asked for a postponement in order that more consideration could be given to it. I do not intend to speak at such length on this occasion; I hope that honourable members will give this Bill their keenest deliberation because it is going to have far-reaching effects on the main industry of the island. As regards the matter of accidents taking place in sugar factories in this island, I challenge any honourable member to produce figures to show that the number of accidents occurring in factories in this island within the last 20 years are greater as compared with any other country which has legislation of this sort in operation: I am saying that in this island the percentage of accidents taking place in the sugar industry is very, very small indeed as compared with those occurring in other places. That is no reason for not having any legislation to control the running of factories; it is necessary for us to have legislation to provide for the safeguarding of workers in the factories. Although I intend to give a great deal of opposition to the matter of delegating the power under the old Act to the Labour Commissioner, I shall endeavour at every stage when we go into Committee on this Bill, to give of my experience to the greatest degree in order that a workable Bill might be placed on the Statute Book of this island for the purpose of protecting the workers in the various industries in this island. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I shall take my seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The principle of this Bill is one which every responsible member of this Chamber should readily support. I believe that honourable members are aware that when the original Bill was passed in this Chamber, it received the support of all sections of this House. At least the principle of this Bill, I take it, will also receive the same support; but, like all Bills which are brought before this House, you must expect that certain objections will be made to paragraphs which do not work well. Nobody objects to the principle of this Bill, least of all the members of the Opposition, when we have been clamouring for industrialisation. If you are going to have new industries or any sort of industrialisation in the country, you must enact legislation for the protection of the people who must work in those industries. As I read this Bill, I do not think only of sugar factories, because there are other factories in which people can be maimed, disabled or disfigured or made impotent for life. I have given some thought to this matter since last Tuesday when we adjourned, and I feel that as soon as we go into Committee on the Bill, those of us who are not so well acquainted with the working of factories will offer some objections and we hope to hear explanations from those who know more about the matter than some of us know. We will rely on our local knowledge to make amendments and we hope that we will be able to get in any amendments which are necessary.

The honourable member who has just spoken mentioned that the 1947 Act has not been proclaimed law up to now, and there must be some reason why that Act has not been so proclaimed. I think that with the advent of new industries in this colony, such as the laundries and knitting mills, the sooner we get this Bill through the better it will be for us; when people run the risk of being hurt in factories, I think we should have this Bill passed as soon as possible. I have been trying to get as much literature as I can on this matter and I do agree that we should have a workable Bill on the Statute Book.

I see that in this Bill the appointment of a Factory Inspector will be made by the Labour Commissioner; I agree that if you have any Act which deals with labouring people in the colony, that Act must necessarily be under the Department of Labour, but it does not necessarily mean that the Head of that Department should be actually responsible for the appointment of subordinates. That is a matter which can be settled when we go into Committee on the Bill. I heard a *sotto voce* remark "That is not so." I can only say that we have one man who is responsible for the Waterworks Department and I observe that if you want a surveyor in that Department the Head of the Department may make a recommendation, but the appointment of the officer rests with the Head of the Administration. I will bow to anybody who can prove the contrary to me.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The honourable member is referring to Clause 10 of the old Act, and that is not repealed in this Bill at all. That Clause deals with the appointment of Factory Inspectors.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am always willing to learn because an amended Bill such as this takes some time to read. I say that the honourable senior member for St. Peter, because of his occupation, would be able to enlighten me on the matter. Anyhow, that is only by the way; I shall deal with the matter in Committee. It is my considered opinion that, not only in the sugar industry but in other industries where boilers and machinery are used, which if not looked after properly can be very dangerous and injurious to people, we are much behind hand in the matter of legislation, and I do not think that there should be any delay in passing this Bill. I hope that it will not be another four years before the Factories Act is put into operation.

When the honourable junior member for St. George was speaking, he referred to the fact that a Factory Inspector has to be a competent man. I cannot imagine that the Governor would just appoint a clerk or somebody like that, to perform the duties of a Factory Inspector; it seems to me that people will have to be sent out for training in factory inspection. There are some things in which I consider that Factory Inspectors should be trained; I consider that a Factory Inspector should have some knowledge of machinery and the like; you cannot just take a man because he might be somebody's pet and appoint him as a Factory Inspector. No doubt Your Honour will agree with me and the honourable senior member for St. Peter will agree with me that you must have a man who has been trained in the matter of factory inspection so as to be able to deal with this subject. It has been remarked that you will have to pay such a man a lot of money; that might be so; but just to pick out somebody who does not know about factory inspection and appoint him to this post is definitely doing the wrong thing. I am at a loss to understand why the 1947 Act has not been proclaimed law, but it seems to me that the old Act did not meet with the approval of the Colonial Office and the then Labour Commissioner.

I will not delay this honourable Chamber any longer with my views on this matter; but I will say that whatever suggestions are made by the Opposition with regard to this Bill they must be taken in good faith because this Bill must cover all sorts of factories. Although the honourable senior member for St. Peter seemed to have offered a challenge at the outset, I still maintain that any legislation of this sort must, of necessity be put under the Department of Labour; but what we on this side of the Table do say is that you must convince us as to why this

Department, unlike any other Department, should have its Head responsible for making appointments. You should not allow the Head of this Department to make appointments when it is not so in the case of any other Department.

Messrs CRAWFORD, ALLDER, REECE and BETHELL entered the House and took their seats while Mr. MOTTLEY was speaking.

Dr. CUMMINS: The burden of the Opposition seems to be on two points. The first point is as to why the original Bill has not been proclaimed law and, secondly, why the Boards which were given certain powers under the original Bill, are now being abolished in this Amendment. I should like to explain that the 1947 Act was considered unworkable and that is why it was not proclaimed law, and then it could not be proclaimed law until Regulations were made. As I have said, the Act was considered unworkable and this Amendment is for the purpose of removing certain difficulties; when those difficulties have been removed then a Factory Inspector will be appointed. I may also point out that in other colonies with the exception of Jamaica and Trinidad, all factory inspection is carried out by the Labour Commissioner. As far as the Boards are concerned, the 1947 Act says: "The supervision of all factories and of all machinery in this island shall be exercised by the Board", and the difficulty is whether it was really intended that the Factory Board should supervise all the factories and the machinery. The Factory Appeal Board was established to hear appeals and to grant certificates of registration; that was considered unnecessary and cumbersome and it may also tend to discourage persons from erecting factories in the island. It was considered unwieldy for two Boards to control one Inspector and it was felt that that would lead to inefficient administration especially with regard to the registration of factories. There was an Inspector from the United Kingdom who went through the West Indies and conferred with the various Labour Commissioners in respect of factory legislation, and it was also considered by that Authority that our present Act was unworkable—hence this Amendment.

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. Cox, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was read and passed.

Clause 2 was read as follows:

2. Section 2 of the principal Act is hereby amended—

- (a) by repealing the definitions of "the Board" and "factory";
- (b) by substituting the words "the Labour Commissioner" for the words "the Board" occurring in the definition of "boiler certificate";
- (c) by substituting for the definition of "Inspector" the following definition—
"Inspector" means a factory inspector appointed for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act."

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I do not know if honourable members on this side realise that if we want to get in the word "Board" we will have to get it in here. In this Clause, if honourable members will look at it carefully, the definition of "the Board" is being repealed, and by doing so the Board is being taken

out altogether. I understand that some of us do not agree with the Board being taken out and then there is the idea that the procedure with an Appeal Board will be cumbersome. There is no doubt that the tendency is to get away with democracy and get in as much as you can of autocracy; that is definitely the trend. Here the proposal is to remove the Board which deals with the issue of certificates and so on, and put everything in the hands of one man; well, some people like that, but others do not like it. The feeling over here is that the Board should be left in, and therefore it will be our duty as far as we can, to vote against the cutting out of the Board. There is no doubt that the Labour Commissioner will be taking charge of certain parts of this Bill; the original Act was submitted to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, it was submitted to Jamaica and the then Labour Commissioner here agreed on the terms. Where you have a Board you will find that there will always be on that Board somebody who will always be able to see that his particular section of the Act is properly carried out; otherwise you will have the Labour Commissioner conducting the whole Act and he would agree with whatever the Inspector is telling him; on the other hand, he might want outside help. I am suggesting that we should have a smaller Board.

It is a pity that the 1947 Act was never brought into operation in order to see how it would work; now, in 1951, without our having any experience whatever as to the working of the Act, we are getting rid of the Board and trying something else. As the honourable senior member for St. Joseph usually says, "If you are changing an Act, the burden is on you to prove that it does not work." However, any Bill is better than no Bill; that there should be a Bill, nobody denies, but without any experience as to its working you are just turning down a Bill which has been agreed to, and substituting another one for it. It looks as if you are changing the Act on the "say so" of somebody; I beg to move that paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Clause be deleted. I am in agreement with paragraph (c); the appointment of the Factory Inspector can be made by means of Civil Establishment Order in the same way as other officers are appointed.

Mr. REECE: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to point out that this Bill is based on the United Kingdom Act of 1937. Before the last War the Home Office controlled factory legislation, but since then the Ministry of Labour controls such legislation. You have a Minister responsible but there are people under him. It is the Labour Department which is responsible for the carrying out of this Act; it would be unscientific to have a Board for this purpose. In Jamaica you have a Labour Officer who is Chief Inspector; in Trinidad the Labour Commissioner is responsible for the carrying out of the Act, but you also have a Factory Inspector who is an engineer, of course. One can quote many cases all over the West Indies where you have the Labour Department in control of factory legislation. We are not passing factory legislation in the sense that we are passing legislation merely to deal with a factory; we are passing this legislation for the protection of health. You cannot take a labour matter out of the Labour Department and set up a Board to deal with it.

As honourable members will see, this Bill gives a new definition of the expression "factory." I should like to say that the Labour Commissioner has no authority to appoint Civil Servants; honourable members should be aware of that. It is the Governor who has to appoint the Factory Inspector. I want to say that we cannot make a change now and go

back to the establishment of a Board because you will find that all these matters come under the Labour Department. Barbados has been very far behind the times in the matter of the implementation of Labour legislation in so far as the International Labour Organization is concerned; the whole ambit of the service of inspection comes under the Labour Department.

The honourable senior member for St. James says that the proposal in this Bill seems to be dictatorship, but it should not be regarded as any dictatorship. In the United Kingdom Act of 1937 the control of factory legislation was transferred from the Home Office to the Ministry of Labour, and there are lots of things which the Ministry of Labour looks after today but which come within the ambit of the Home Office. It is nothing new to have factory legislation put under the control of the Labour Department.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: When you talk about the Ministry of Labour in a big country you talk about a Department about one-half the size of the Civil Service of Barbados. If you allocate duties to a Minister of Labour, there are so many people who can be put in the Department to look after a matter, people upon whom you can call to give advice. You will find that much of this Act undoubtedly calls for skill and knowledge of persons concerned with a factory, and it is a pity that you cannot have a smaller Board to carry out the Act. The matter calls for the display of skill and knowledge of people in engineering to prevent wrong from being done just as you should have the Labour Commissioner to see about such parts of the Act which pertain to his duties. In a big country you will not have the difficulty which you would have here because, although you have the Ministry of Labour, the Factory Inspector holds such a big job that what he says about the safety of machinery goes. In this case, in a little place like Barbados, where you have two or three persons and they change from place to place, you run the risk of having an Inspector being supervised by a Labour Commissioner. That is one of the reasons why we have always had Boards existing in Barbados; although they may be cumbersome they give satisfaction to all concerned. In the 1947 Factories Act the Board consisted of the Chief Medical Officer, the Colonial Engineer, the Labour Commissioner, the Government Electrical Inspector and not more than two other persons appointed by the Governor; if it is felt that the two other persons to be appointed by the Governor should not be there, then we can take them out. I still feel that we ought to be able to get rid of any cumbersomeness in the Act and still have a Board where you would have three or four Departments dealing with the Act rather than only one Department dealing with it. When you have one man in power you can see the beginning of trouble before it comes. On the question of appeal, perhaps honourable members would prefer to go to the Court because we know that justice exists there, and the Court might be substituted for the Appeal Board. However, I thank the honourable senior member for St. Peter for his explanation.

Mr. REECE: I am always sceptical about appeals from a Board to a Court. The Court will say: "I do not know anything about it; I must be guided by the expert." The Court will take the easiest way out in the matter of appeals from an expert; the Court will say: "The expert has said this or that and therefore I feel I am bound by the opinion which he expresses," and for that reason the original order of the Board or the Department will stand. I find myself differing from the Deputy Leader of my Party. I have absolutely no confidence in the decision or justice of a Court when you

come to dealing with matters of which the Court does not know anything.

In this proposed Bill you have something added to the definition of "factory" and I would like to remind honourable members that it is not only a question of dealing with big factories which manufacture sugar, but with other factories which manufacture other things. You will find that a very wide range of things are affected by the improper working of this Act. Speaking for myself, I am not against the principle underlying this Bill, however, I counsel honourable members to realise that we cannot agree with everything that is done at Labour Conferences all over the world. That is an impossibility. There are countries in which big industries are carried on and it is but right that the workers in those industries should be given ample protection. When you come to a small place like Barbados you have to look at conditions as they obtain; and while we must see that the workers in an industry no matter how small are protected, we have got to adjust any legislation to suit the conditions obtaining in a small country. I think it would be much better if we stuck to the Board; I know that much objection has been raised against the working of a Board, but despite the criticism which has been made, there can be no gainsaying the fact that the Boards have been capable of adjusting themselves to local conditions.

There is one thing in which I do not entirely agree with the honourable senior member for St. Peter; the honourable member has said that this Bill was put forward for the welfare and protection of workers. I agree with that up to a point. This Bill is also for the protection of those who own and operate factories; if the worker is protected, it follows that the people who are operating the factories will also receive the benefit and protection in the operation of the factories. This Bill is for the good and welfare of the workers, but the good and welfare of the workers are so wrapped up with the benefit and protection of those who operate the factories that it is difficult to differentiate between the welfare of the one and that of the other in this matter. In all cases where industries are carried on by factories no matter how small, they come within the ambit of this Bill; and it is right that the workers in these factories should be protected. Where you have a highly skilled Inspector who must, by reason of knowledge and experience, report adversely against small factories and industries, I say it is very likely that many workers will find themselves unemployed and it is right that there should be some method of adjustment. With conditions as they exist in Barbados today, we cannot expect 100% perfection in the running of a sugar factory. I agree that every safeguard should be given to workers in factories; but in a small shoe-making factory, for instance, it is impossible to get ideal conditions existing, and therefore I think it would be much better for a Board to look into the affairs of these factories because the Board will be able to get information and be in touch with conditions, which an expert, although he might possess all the technical knowledge, may not be able to get and he might introduce changes which might not be workable under the conditions existing in some of the small factories and industries in this island. We have not got many industries, but we have some industries. When it comes to the sugar industry, I agree that factories should be modern and every protection should be given to the workers therein. There should not be any need for the use of the Workmen's Compensation Act, because the protection should be so great that there will not be any accidents taking place. I am wondering whether we could make a line of demarcation and say that industries of a certain magnitude should be expected to come within

the regulations and that necessary adjustments should be made in the case of certain other industries.

Mr. DOWDING: It is with a great deal of trepidation that I approach the idea of completely removing the Board from this Bill. The honourable senior member for St. Peter has thrown a great deal of light on matters which were, no doubt, in my mind, but I still have not heard from the honourable introducer any cogent reasons, apart from the statement that the 1947 Act is unworkable, as to why the Board should be removed. I am not at all satisfied that justice will be done in every case whether it be the labour side, the engineering side, the sanitation side or the factory owner side of the matter, by placing full responsibility on the Labour Commissioner. The Board, as it was constituted in the past, was able to represent labour, engineering—steam and electrical—and it was able to represent sanitation. Now, Sir, why should a Board consisting of five persons be more unwieldy than the redtape of the Departments which have been set up in this little island today? There are Departments which are controlled by men who are, very often, unsuitable and unqualified to control them. This House, on numerous occasions, has found it necessary to censure the Head of the Department of Highways and Transport; however, here we have a Bill which has been held up primarily because of a Labour Commissioner; that is why it was not put on the Statute Book of this island. We have a Bill which was passed by the two Houses of the Legislature since 1947 but it has not been proclaimed law; no opportunity has been given to it in order to see whether it is workable or not. Unless I have much greater light thrown on the unworkability of this Board, I will not be able to understand why the Board should be unworkable. I can understand a Board unworkable if one man wants to have all the power.

The removal of this Board creates circumstances in which factory owners may be called upon to carry out the wishes of some unscrupulous appointee; it is a fact that appointees to-day even in our Education Department can be found not even to have anything more than the paper—I doubt if they have the paper—purporting to be a certificate. That is the situation in our Education Department. I do not see why the Labour Department should be in complete control under this Bill and that no Board should be appointed; I am yet to be convinced that that should be so. In my opinion, for the smooth running of this Bill, I cannot see anything better than having a Board comprised of persons directly concerned with the many matters covered by the Bill; I do not see that the Board should be removed and all the power placed in the hands of the Labour Commissioner who may delegate his authority to an Inspector. The Labour Commissioner may not have any knowledge of sanitation—some of these officers do not have any knowledge of labour—or engineering and he can delegate full power to any Inspector! I envisage that there will be more than one Inspector appointed. I am very grateful to learn that the appointment will now be made by the Governor, but although that is so, it is obvious that in this Bill the Governor has no one from whom he can get advice on matters which materially affect the working of the Bill. In other words, the Governor will have to take recommendations from the Labour Commissioner because I see that, in this Bill, the Labour Commissioner will be responsible for requiring any applicant to furnish particulars of his engineering qualifications and to pass such test or examination, if any, as he may consider necessary. Just fancy a Labour Commissioner setting an examination paper on the fencing of machinery! I repeat that the Governor must, of necessity, take the recommendations of the Labour Com-

missioner in matters of this sort, because the whole responsibility for the running of the Department is that of the Labour Commissioner. It is ludicrous to suggest that the Labour Commissioner should be called upon to set such test or examination as he thinks necessary. On the other hand, if, as in the 1947 Act, you had a Board consisting of qualified persons being called upon to make recommendations for appointments, the picture would be completely different; you would have persons who had passed examinations in the various matters in this Bill. As the position is here, everything is placed completely in the hands of the Labour Commissioner.

This island is suffering now from the fact that even this House of Assembly has been unable to do anything in a Department where there is the obvious necessity for some action to be taken. This island is a very small island and it cannot be compared with large countries where there are big organizations for the purpose of ensuring that an Act like this is correctly enforced. I say that in these days I do not think that one man should have all the power in this Bill; in these days we have had unscrupulous men amongst us even in our Education Department—so unscrupulous that they go so far as to claim the possession of qualifications when they had none. Let us just envisage this Board being abolished and a gentleman purporting to have the necessary qualifications, but in truth and in fact having none, being placed in the position of being allowed to stop any one factory in this island from operating for practically any period of time! I repeat that I shall do my utmost in every way in seeing that legislation is put on the Statute Book of this island, which will benefit the workers in any industry; but on the other hand, I do not intend to see any legislation put on the Statute Book of this island, which may, in the hands of some unscrupulous person, prevent the same workers from obtaining work.

Mr. BRANCKER came into the Committee and took his seat while Mr. DOWDING was speaking.

The question that paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Clause be deleted was put and resolved in the negative, a division being taken as follows:—

Ayes: MESSRS. MOTTLEY, DOWDING, REECE, HAYNES, E. K. WALCOTT, GODDARD, BETHELL and GILL—8.

Noes: Mr. SPEAKER, MESSRS. COX, ALLDER, MILLER, MAPP, BRYAN, F. L. WALCOTT, DR. CUMMINS, MESSRS. ADAMS, LEWIS, GARNER and BRANCKER—12.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported progress with leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

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

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On the re-assembling of honourable members

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker—I ask leave to lay the Reply to Question No. 92 standing in the name of the Hon'ble Senior Member for St. George—(Mr. Miller).

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in Committee on the Bill to amend the Factories Act, 1947.

His Honour left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH in the Chair. Clause 3 was read and passed.

Clause 4 was read as follows:—

4. Sections three, four and five of the principal Act and the headings thereto are hereby repealed and the following new sections substituted therefor:—

“3. (1) The inspection of all factories and of all machinery in this Island shall be supervised by the Labour Commissioner.

(2) The Labour Commissioner may delegate the exercise of all or any of his powers and duties under this Act to any Inspector.”

“4. (1) The owner, manager, or person having control of a factory shall serve on the Labour Commissioner and on the Commissioners of Health for the parish in which a factory is situated a written notice stating the name of the occupier or the title of the firm, the postal address of the factory, the nature of the work, whether machinery is used and, if so, its nature, and such other particulars as may be prescribed—

(a) not later than fourteen days after the coming into operation of this Act, in the case of an existing factory; and,

(b) not later than twenty-eight days after he begins to occupy or to use any premises as a factory, and if he fails to do so, he shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a fine of one hundred dollars or five dollars for each day since the expiration of the fourteen days and twenty-eight days, respectively, whichever is the greater.

(2) Within twenty-eight days of the date upon which machinery is, after the commencement of this Act, first used in any factory the occupier shall serve on the inspector and on the Commissioners of Health for the parish in which such factory is situated, a written notice stating the type of machinery which is being used.”

“5. (1) The provisions of this Act shall apply to any premises in which persons are regularly employed in or in connection with the processes or operations of generating, transforming or converting, or switching, controlling, or otherwise regulating, electrical energy for supply by way of trade, or for supply for the purposes of any transport undertaking or other industrial or commercial undertaking or of any public building or public institution, or for supply to streets or other public places, as if the premises were a factory and the employer of any person employed in the premises in or in connection with any such process or operation were the occupier of a factory.

(2) The provisions of this Act shall also apply to any other premises in which any such processes or operations as aforesaid are carried on or performed for such supply as aforesaid, being premises large enough to admit the entrance of a person after the machinery or plant herein is in position, as if the premises were a factory and the employer of any person employed in the premises in or in connection with any such process or operation were the occupier of a factory.

(3) No such premises as aforesaid shall be excluded from the provisions of this section by reason of the processes or operations being carried on, or the machinery or plant being situated, entirely or partially in the open air.

(4) Subsections (1) and (2) of this section shall not, except in so far as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may by order direct, apply to any premises where the aforesaid processes or operations are only carried on or performed for the immediate purpose of working an electric motor or working any apparatus

which consumes electrical energy for lighting, heating, transmitting or receiving messages or communications, or other purposes.

(5) For the purposes of the definition of the expression "factory," electrical energy shall not be deemed to be an article, but save as aforesaid nothing in this section shall affect the application of this Act to factories within the meaning of that definition."

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I would like the honourable member in charge of this Bill to tell me where they have got the words from which appear in sub-clauses 3 (1) and (2) of this clause. I would like to know if they have improvised those words, or if there is an Act in Jamaica or Trinidad from which they have taken them, and if they know how they work. If we say that the Labour Commissioner is to do certain things under the Act and then we say that he can delegate those duties to whom he likes we are giving him a free hand. We do not know how incompetent a person may be appointed to this office. You are trying to run it as it is run in a big country; but in such countries you cannot get a Labour Commissioner questioning the work of a certified engineer. You can only have a minister in this House or the equivalent in the Executive Committee questioning the work of a certified engineer in a department, and it would invariably work out that the engineer in the department who is looking after a particular job would know that you would take his word. The Labour Commissioner may even call upon anyone to do certain things. Presumably he will perform his duties well, but you will always have to be sure that he delegates his powers to a responsible person, or you will be working in a more haphazard manner than before. If you look at the definition of "factory" which you have passed, you will see that even one of those machines which roll out the weekly editions of the Yellow Press will be subject to the necessary orders being made. That is why I have said what I have said. If we are making him responsible let us make him responsible under the Act. But if his duties are going to be delegated, let us at least see that he does not delegate them to any inspector. Let us have some responsible authority.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: There will have to be a whole Inspectorate Service to deal with this factory inspection. The honourable member must be aware that the Government is going to appoint a Factory Inspector; but as far as seeing that these factories are properly inspected is concerned, you will find that there will have to be more than one inspector. You will find that the Labour Commissioner may have to delegate his authority to some inspectors. The Labour Commissioner will rely on them just as the Chief Sanitary Inspector of a parish relies on his inspectors. As honourable members will be aware, there will be different types of factories to be inspected. You may have a small factory with no boilers; just a small engine. Such a factory would not need the same type of inspector as a sugar factory would need. Therefore the Labour Commissioner will have an Inspectorate Staff to carry out the various duties. These bits of legislation have been passed already in some of the other colonies. Take the Leeward islands. They are not large enough to employ a qualified engineer or factory inspector all the year round; so they use a man from Jamaica. To return to Barbados, I will repeat that when you say that the Labour Commissioner will delegate his powers etc. you mean that he will delegate them to his Inspectorate. You cannot tell now how many inspectors you will need. But everytime

that one is going to be appointed the matter will have to come before the House, and the House will have to approve the salary and see what type of man is being appointed. Although the Labour Commissioner has duties under the Act it does not follow that he knows everything about factory inspection.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: We are giving the Labour Commissioner certain powers under this Act and as far as we are concerned that is the end of the matter with us. We are doing it with our eyes wide open. The people in the Executive will never know some of the things that will be happening as far as factory inspection is concerned. You are making the Labour Commissioner all powerful as far as this is concerned. When you give power to an Executive Committee that is a different matter because they are always with us. There are things to be dealt with under this Act of which the Labour Commissioner would know nothing. The employment of women and young people is a different matter. That is the Labour Commissioner's job. Boiler certificates will be a matter for a Factory Inspector. I am sure that after this Bill is passed and you try to make it work, you will find that you have made a mistake and then you will have to amend it. My point is that you are saying on the one hand that the Labour Commissioner is the man who has to supervise everything, and then you say "never mind what we said, he can delegate all his powers to someone else." How ludicrous! What is the use of saying that the words are the same as those in the British Guiana Act? Heaven help us when we have to go to the "Land of Mud" to learn to draft Acts.

A MEMBER: Four hundred for one!

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Yes, 400 for 1. That is because we were conceited enough to send down a second eleven team. Conceit will always work that way. The conceit of the persons who advised the Government to send down this Bill is the same thing.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Whether it is a big country or a small country; whether it is Trinidad, Jamaica or Barbados does not change the principle of the thing. In the U.K. it is the Chief Inspector in the Ministry of Labour who is responsible for the supervision of factories. The principle of this Bill is safety in factories. Obviously it can only come under the Labour Department. Therefore, as night follows day it follows that the person who is Head of that Department will have to be responsible for the working of the Bill. You could not operate this Act and have two or three departments dealing with labour matters. When you are dealing with the health and protection of workers you must go to the Labour Department. In the Labour Department Act the Labour Commissioner is the person who has to advise the Governor-in-Executive on all matters pertaining to Labour. The hon'ble member knows that the Labour Commissioner has no authority to appoint any inspectors. The Labour Commissioner is under the control of the Colonial Secretary and the Governor. We are only passing an Act saying that the Labour Commissioner may delegate his powers to any inspector. When the hon'ble member says that you will be making a mistake to put this power in the hands of the Labour Commissioner that is not so. The hon'ble member must be aware that it is in keeping with the modern tendency that Labour Commissioners should have a broad knowledge of all labour matters. They may not be experts in engineering, but there are other aspects of inspection which they may be able to carry out. If the Labour Commissioner wants to take advice on any matter of inspection he is free to do so. Or he may call upon people to carry out an inspection for

his department. The Department of Health can be asked to carry out supervision of a factory where health matters are concerned.

Mr. DOWDING: Sir,— This is a small country. I wonder if the hon'ble senior member for St. Peter can tell us how many inspectors are liable to be appointed. This Bill says that the Labour Commissioner may delegate his powers to any inspector. One would take it that there will be some sort of Chief Inspector appointed with qualifications for the general performance of the duties to be carried out under this Act. One would then take it that there would be further minor inspectors, who would attend to the minor aspects of this Act. This section gives the Labour Commissioner power to delegate his authority "to any inspector". I take it that you mean "any other inspector". Remember it says "under this Act". Now under this Act the Labour Commissioner is responsible for many things, such as the granting of boiler certificates. So when the Labour Commissioner delegates such powers to "an Inspector," I take it that that Inspector would be able to grant a boiler certificate. If the powers of the Labour Commissioner are going to be delegated to someone whom we are going to import I would like that person to be someone from the Caribbean area. But I think that to say just "any inspector" is going a bit too far. Another point that I want to make is this: Under the old Act, Section 5 which is now to be deleted calls for the registration of factories, and a further section called for application under that section to be made to the Board, and the Board would then cause the premises to be inspected, and would only grant the application for registration if they were satisfied that the place was suitably protected. I hope that the hon'ble senior member for St. Peter will be able to tell us what provision is made in this Act for similar procedure. Today there is a certificate issued for every weigh bridge in the island. You cannot operate one without that certificate stating that the bridge is in order. Then during the crop season various checks are made. I see no similar provision in this Bill. There is nothing in this Act similar to the "certificate of clearance" that you had to get before you could operate your factory. This is important to both sides. In the first place with that certificate in possession you could post some notice on the doors of the factory so that the workers would know that the factory has been inspected and that it is a safe place in which to work, and in the second place the owners would be in the position of having some evidence to show that their factory has been inspected and that the necessary safeguards have been adopted. Then the Inspector could visit at any time and see whether those safeguards are still in operation or not. This Bill calls for a certificate for a boiler; but from my experience in this island I will say that boilers are safer for a period of years than many other pieces of machinery. You call for a boiler certificate, but you do not call for a certificate for the other units of machinery in the factory. There are myriads of engines and electrical appliances with very high voltage. But boilers so far as I know have caused very little damage in this island, and in my time I have not known of any loss of limb or any other injury caused by boilers. A boiler is a stationary thing. It has no moving parts. One of the most dangerous pieces of machinery, and one for which a certificate was called for under the old Act is the centrifugal. I can remember such a machine causing damage. It is much more dangerous than any boiler. There is no getting away from the fact that if a boiler exploded the loss of life would be greater.

But, in my opinion, a certificate is much more necessary for other pieces of machinery which, because of their moving parts, have far greater opportunity to cause damage to workers.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I wonder if the last honourable member has read the Bill. Here he is saying that you do not have to produce any certificate under this Bill and therefore you will be worse off than under the old Act when Section 19 of this Bill specifically talks about forging and counterfeiting of certificates etc. I do not want to anticipate things before we get to them, but as far as his remarks about inspection are concerned, inspection will have to be carried out. I wish he would read Section 19. It is clear to me from this section that certificates will be issued. It is not the intention of the Act to close down factories. If you worked these things rigidly you might have to close down many factories. But there is no use passing legislation of that kind unless conditions in factories become too dangerous for people to work under them. I do not think that the section which the honourable member is speaking about comes into operation there. If he gives me more time I will go through it and see if there is the point which he speaks about in connection with the old Act.

Mr. DOWDING: The point that I am making is this: Section 19 of the new Bill does not deal with the certificate granted for the factory to go into operation. As far as this new Bill is concerned, the only certificate it speaks about is the boiler certificate. Under the old Act, Section 5 which it is the intention of this Bill to repeal says that no factory shall be operated unless it is duly registered under the authority of a certificate of registration in pursuance of the provisions of this Act. Section 7 says, "Every application for registration shall be made in writing to the Board by, or on behalf, of the owner, and shall be in the prescribed form". Section 8 says, "Upon receipt of an application under Section 7 of this Act the Board shall immediately cause the factory to which the application relates to be inspected." All those quotations show that factories have to be registered, and they can only be registered after they have been passed by inspection. Therefore that registration gives the authority for saying that that factory has been inspected and is safe. The only part of this Bill that I see deals with the registration of factories is the amendment to Section 6 of the old Act. But that only deals with the Register of Factories in the island. It is not the registration by virtue of which you say that the factory is inspected and is safe. I would be only too grateful to the honourable member if he could show me where a certificate is to be produced in this Bill. I hope that something providing a certificate of operation will be put into this Bill if it is not in already.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Chairman,— I see the force of the argument of the honourable member. The certificate to which he has referred will ease the minds both of the factory owners and the workers. While I see the force of that argument I also see that the mere fact that no certificate is given that the factory is in good working order and that the machinery is safe leaves it open to the Department to come in and inspect, even if they have inspected the day before. Therefore, from the Department's angle it is better not to give a certificate at all. If you give a certificate it is reasonable to expect that it will be valid for a period of time; but if no certificate is given the Department will be able to come in and check within a short time and see if everything is working right and will be in a position to prosecute the factory if anything is wrong. While that is so, I think there is much weight in what the hon'ble

junior member for St. George has said, and I think that some provision for such a certificate should be put in the Bill. It does not mean that because such a certificate is granted it must be valid until the end of the crop season. Even although the certificate is in force the Department will yet have the right to come in and inspect and see that any defect is put right. I would be glad if the hon'ble senior member for St. Peter could throw some light on the point raised by the honourable junior member for St. George.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Under the old Act the Board gives a certificate. The Jamaica Act says that every existing factory must make an application for registration etc. Here you register your factory with the Labour Commissioner. What is the point in giving a certificate? A certificate for a factory is not something like a rum license that you post up. The factory is there. If the Labour Commissioner is not satisfied with the factory the regulations are there which state what the factory must have. If the law the law. You do not have to satisfy anyone before you begin operating. I do not see that not having a the law. You do not have to satisfy anyone before you begin operating. I do not see that not having a certificate makes the factory owner any worse off than before. If you register you have the protection of the law. The honourable member on my right says that you will give the factory owner a receipt if the law calls for it. That will be normal departmental procedure. I do not see that having a certificate with the crown on it means anything.

Mr. L. E. R. GILL: Mr. Chairman—If you have to be registered under the Act, and you are not given a certificate, what will you have to show as evidence that you have been registered? I think there should be some certificate from the Labour Commissioner as evidence that you have complied with the law and have been registered.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman— I have been trying to keep quiet all day. What I would like to ask the last honourable member is why would a factory owner need a certificate to show the Labour Commissioner as evidence that his factory has been registered when the Labour Commissioner is the person with whom the factory has to be registered. Surely the Labour Commissioner would see and know when a factory is registered. I do not mind staying here all night and doing some work, but not listening to foolishness. The law says that Johnson & Redman like every other place of business must be registered. Does that mean that Johnson & Redman, every time that a person comes to buy bread, will have to produce a certificate to show that they are registered?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Regulations state that a fee is to be paid for registration. When a factory owner registers the factory he will pay a fee. If you pay a fee will you not get a receipt for it. And will not that receipt be ample evidence to show that your factory is registered?

Mr. GILL: If the honourable senior member for St. Joseph had listened to me he would not have accused me of saying that a factory owner should have a certificate so that people could see it. I am talking about the issuing of a certificate for the protection of the factory owner. In the Business Names Act which Johnson & Redman would come under you do get a certificate.

Mr. ADAMS: I suppose that every labourer before he accepts a job with the factory will demand to see a certificate that the factory has been registered. How can anyone prosecute you for not being registered without going to see whether you are registered or not? That is commonsense. I was having a good sleep when the honourable junior member for St. Andrew woke me up, and I am going

back to sleep as soon as the honourable junior member for St. George starts to speak again. With regard to the argument raised by the honourable senior member for St. James about the Labour Commissioner delegating his powers I thought that even the honourable junior member for St. George would have been able to tell him that he was stultifying his own argument. You agree that the Labour Commissioner knows nothing about machinery. For that reason you say let him delegate his authority to someone who knows about it. If the Act is under the control of the Labour Department whom else can you put in charge but the Labour Commissioner? Mr. Thorne was Chairman of the Sanitary Commissioners of St. Michael. He was a layman; but as Chairman he was in charge of the sanitation of the parish; but you had to give him servants who knew something about sanitation. In England you may have a layman at the head of the Ministry of Health. They get away from the danger of putting doctors as Ministers of Health. But he has to see after the health of Great Britain through doctors. How else can it be done? We are trying to get away from the idea that everything must be run by a Board. If you are working towards Ministerial Status the more you get away from Boards as executive powers the better. The Labour Commissioner is the Head of the Labour Department. Inasmuch as he may not be an expert on machinery, obviously he must have a right to call on someone who is an expert and tell him to go and see that so and so is properly done. I have touched on this point because I fear it may be raised again.

Mr. DOWDING: The honourable member's fear is correct. It is fortunate that he started out by saying that he was asleep. I do not know if he was prompted by someone because I said that I suspected that there would be more than one inspector needed. I was suggesting that there should be one, and that he should be the one and only person to whom the powers of the Labour Commissioner should be delegated. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are getting away from Boards quickly, and the money is getting out of the Treasury quickly. These Boards did good work, and they were representative of both sides. Today you get the imported official. I will not say anything more; my views on that are well known. Now to get back to the high level of debate that we had when the honourable senior member for St. Peter was discussing the question of the registration certificate. This Bill, Sir, only calls for the registration of factories. It does not call for a certificate showing that the factory has been inspected. Another point is this: This gentleman or these gentlemen are going to walk into factories from day to day, week to week and year to year giving instructions about what is to be done and how it is to be done. What record is there going to be that these instructions have been given? What check will the Labour Commissioner have over his inspectors? I repeat, Sir, that under the old Act a good system was operated which was to the benefit of both sides. What authority will the factory owner have under this new Bill to say that the factory has been inspected and the following recommendations for alterations etc. carried out? If there is no necessity for a certificate in this case, what necessity is there for a certificate when a peasant brings his canes to the weigh bridge? The peasant is safeguarded by the knowledge of that certificate, and the owner is safeguarded by the knowledge that that bridge has been passed as perfect. I am not saying for one minute that there should be any length of time for which this factory certificate should be valid. I am

saying that there should be proof that the factory has been inspected and is safe, and a clause could be put in this Bill to make the factory liable to further inspection during the crop in the same manner as the weigh bridge is liable to further inspection.

Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman—I would like to make a contribution to this debate as a layman. As far as the Labour Commissioner is concerned, we may have one who has been promoted from the point of Labour Inspector. We admit that the Labour Commissioner should know something about machinery, because he has to see that it is made safe for workmen to work around it. I cannot imagine a man qualifying for that post without having some knowledge of machinery; nor can I imagine that in these days people would be allowed to go to the extent of making machinery without having proper safeguards for it. This machinery is made in countries where people have the same type of inspection, and where social legislation is far ahead of that of Barbados. When it comes to the registration of a factory, we have heard that when you register a factory you pay a fee and get a receipt for it. I think that the honourable junior member for St. George is labouring under a misapprehension. If I understand this Act correctly, it is the Labour Department who is responsible for seeing that the machinery is safe for the people who have to work around it. They will tell the factory owner if anything is wrong. They will not tell him by word of mouth. He will receive a letter from the department saying "you are asked to do so and so." If anyone is killed in a factory at any time, all the owner has to say is that he has registered the factory, and that no one sent around a skilled man to inspect. If the Government had carried out its duties that would never have happened. If you had a certificate in April and something happens in May the factory owner can say that he is not to be blamed because he had a clear "bill of health." As the honourable junior member for Christ Church said that does not amount to a row of pins because the inspection will be of a periodical nature. I do not see the sense of demanding this certificate because the onus will be on the Government to see that the machinery is safe. That is why we have Labour Inspectors; to see shops close in time; to see that shops have proper sanitary arrangements. The onus is on the Labour Department to see that all that is done. While I agree that a factory owner should be able to say, "my factory is in good working order, here is a certificate to that effect," still he cannot be blamed if he is allowed to operate the factory for a month with something that can kill someone, and the Labour Commissioner does not know anything about it. In the vast majority of cases you will find that this machinery will come here with the necessary protection because it is made in places where social legislation is far ahead of ours. We pass this piece of legislation today, and someone at the I.L.O. brings down another piece tomorrow. I would counsel the honourable member not to appear to be against this Legislation. It is all in his favour. As far as I can see the Labour Department is made responsible. The factory owner has to register his factory, and then it is the business of the Labour Department to see that the factory is safe.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman—I think that where this Bill is concerned we have reached a stage where debate is unnecessary. We have heard a lot of stupid talk about the Labour Commissioner. It is unlikely; indeed it is impossible to find any one person, even any one engineer with such a wide knowledge of engineering as this legislation will call

for. Under this legislation will come all forms of manufacturing. In addition the person in charge will have to have a perfect knowledge of sanitation; a knowledge of the manufacture of soda water, biscuits, butter etc. So it is stupid to talk the whole day about the Labour Commissioner being incapable of doing this or that when you know that you cannot find any one man who knows about all these things. Talking about the necessity for a certificate to prove that the scale is correct is stupidity. You will get a certificate to that effect to-day, and two days after an inspector from the same department will come around and discover that it is weighing wrong and that the peasant is losing a ton. We have been on this Bill all day and there is so much work to be done. I own part of a little factory myself. It is not a question of insurance. If you lose a good man on whom you can rely you do not want to feel satisfied that the insurance company will pay the damage; you want to know that the man is there to keep your machinery going. We have spent two days trying to find something to destroy this Bill. There are other things on the Order Paper. Why fight over this? You are just deliberately trying to kill the Bill. Be man enough to get up and say that you do not want the Bill.

The question that Clause 4 stand part was put and carried *nem. con.*

Clauses 5 to 20 were read and passed.

On separate motions of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. COX the CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported the passing of the Bill in committee.

On separate motions of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT the Bill was read a third time and passed, and the title was read and agreed to.

ADDRESS RE WEST INDIAN STUDENT CENTRE

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—I am asking leave to take as the next Order consideration of an Address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to His Excellency's Message 28 of 1951 relative to the proposal to establish a Club and Centre for West Indian Students in London. My reason for asking that it be dealt with now is that the Colonial Office is waiting on us for an answer. We are the only colony that has not yet replied.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—Honourable members will remember that we have put in the Estimates a sum of money to provide social amenities for Barbadian students in London. There is the West Indian Students' Union in England representing 1,200 West Indian Students of which about 600 are in London. Of these about 78 to 100 are Barbadians. The West Indian Students' Union has sent around a Memorandum to the Colonies in which they set out proposals that they would like to set up some centre where they may gather together for social relaxation. Other colonial students have such centres, and the West Indian Students' Union has pointed out that West Indian students would like one too. The Colonial Office is anxious that the West Indian colonies should help. I understand, as I have said, that we are the only colony that has not replied, and I am asking honourable members to approve a reply to the effect that we agree in principle with the proposal. In His Excellency's Message it was pointed out that if we gave money on a population basis rather than on a student basis it would be somewhat less; but I am suggesting that we give it on the student basis. There are 78 Barbadian students, and if we give money on the student basis, human nature

being what it is, the chances of Barbadians participating more fully in the life at the centre would be improved. I have very much pleasure in moving that the following Address do now pass:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 28/1951, and to inform Your Excellency that the House agrees in principle with the proposal to establish a Club and Centre in London for West Indian Students and would be prepared to approve a contribution towards the capital and annually recurrent costs on a "student" basis.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker—I would like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to tell me roughly what the capital and recurrent costs of this proposal would be.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker—From my experience of London I know that there are many places of this type where you can go for a small subscription, and get any sort of amusement and relaxation. There are various clubs which open their doors to undergraduates. What I would like to see is a place where West Indian students can enjoy at least 28 days a year during their holidays when it is difficult to get accommodation. This Address should be amended to that form. I too would like to know what will be the capital and recurrent costs.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker—It is true that something is better than nothing. I agree with the honourable junior member for St. Andrew that it would be better if we could provide a sort of residential club for these students. The time comes, Mr. Speaker, when you must call a spade a spade. Although there are some who say I am anti-British, I am still going to say this: It is regrettable that in this 20th Century such an Address has got to be considered by this House. It is regrettable that after this Second World War this Address should be sent to this House. Do you know what is at the bottom of this? It is the racial prejudice in England; the racial prejudice that exists in the heart of London, and which makes English people refuse to take negro students—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the honourable member to address the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry, Sir; that you could not hear me.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member was not speaking to me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This Address has been brought here because in this 20th Century people still exist in England who refuse to take in coloured West Indians.

A VOICE: That is not true.

Mr. MOTTLEY: A voice says that is not true. I wonder if he would have said that ten years ago. Everyone knows that coloured students have a hard time in England. I do not mean students like the son of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew. I am a member of this party. I know that a lot of people do not like what I am saying; but it is true. I have the same ambition as anyone else to send my children to England; but someone has got to say what I am saying. This is not an accusation against the British Government or any particular organisation. What I am saying is that when a little over ten years ago war broke out and people from the West Indies enlisted, there was not this sort of treatment. Rooms were offered and all that

sort of thing. But to-day you find coloured students in England not being able to find places at which to stay. It is better to be in America where you know where you stand; then students would not leave this country on false pretences. Time was when students came back from England to this country in the days when I went to America, and every student to whom you talked used to tell you that there was no segregation. I used to believe a lot of it too; but I have seen more light than that. I am going to vote for this Address. But I want my views recorded. This is something that has come about because of the difficulty that West Indian students are meeting with in finding places to live. It is nothing more than the British Government could do to provide this place. It is not surprising to hear some honourable members talk differently because by virtue of their official position they have been to England and have had certain privileges meted out to them. But I am not impressed by the way you treat a man because of his official position, or because of his influence or affluence. Who can honestly say that what I am saying is not true? The honourable member for St. Andrew has a son in England at Cambridge. You have not heard that he cannot get digs or a social club to which to go. A person will leave here and go to England and because of his position or affluence will be treated in a decent way. But do not say that because that is so we are to blind our eyes to the fact that a man from the bottom of St. Andrew or St. Peter will not get the same treatment. I will repeat that it is nothing more than the British Government could do to provide this centre that we are being asked to provide. When these things occur I must agree with the honourable senior member for St. Philip that we have no Mother Country. Ten years ago when the honourable junior member for St. George joined up in His Majesty's Army he did not have two men looking like himself with him; and there was no ostracism then. Now we have 600 West Indian students in London and because the majority of them are not of pure European descent, that and that alone is the reason why we have this Address to-day. I feel very strong on this, Sir. In this 20th Century, after hundreds and hundreds of West Indians gave their lives for the Mother Country, you are told if you want a club and centre for West Indian students in England the colonial governments must provide it. Even though I will vote for this Address to-day, those are my views, and I do not care that some people will say I am anti-British. We have mothers, and if they attempt to do something wrong we have to tell them so. This Address deserves having a row made over it. Those who do not want to make a row are spineless, or do not own their children.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member making a personal reference to other honourable members?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am making absolutely no personal reference to any honourable member, including yourself, Sir. We are not all people of affluence. It is not my fault that my son does not look like the honourable member for St. Andrew's son. I support the Address, but I feel very strong on it.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker—I think it is regrettable that the Colonial Office should have sent and asked us to support such a scheme. I think that the British Government owes so much to these West Indian islands that this is nothing more than they could do for the few West Indian students in England. We have given so much to their industrial expansion—even today they are making money out of our sugar—it is extremely

mean of them to send and ask us to support this proposal. This shows that the Englishman has always been a mean fellow, and will always be one. I am anti-British because they have robbed my people all the years, and are still sucking their blood now. I make no apology about saying that. Race prejudice? The British are sunk in it. The resources of the Mother Country are almost unlimited. They make money out of every country; but they do not prosper because they are not going right. Justice is overtaking the British people. I do not want to let down our students. I have read about Hans Crescent. What are we doing? Are we not men? We see every other people taking their destiny in their own hands. Partnership with the British people will never work. Only yesterday we were their slaves. Do you think they really want to take us as their brothers? A few people go to the universities and may be treated well. But one swallow does not make a summer. One man gets patted on the back and the others catch hell. Do you know when we will be doing something? When we get ships plying between the West Indies and Mother Africa. When we have removed the iron curtain that Britain has erected between the West Indies and Africa. When do you see West Indians go to Africa today? Never; except in case like Mr. King and when you talk back you are killed and £10 will pay for your body and soul. England is spending hundreds of thousands of pounds on military schemes; she has nothing to spend on these colonies. They cannot spend anything on providing a place for a few West Indian students who are the victims of the racial prejudice that exists. Except for British Diplomacy there is as much discrimination in the heart of London and England as there is in South Africa. It is not in the laws; but the spirit is there. When Englishmen come down here they get the best food and the best accommodation and the best of everything. When our people go there, they have a hard, hard, life. The honourable senior member for the City has compared the British system with the American system. Frankly speaking, I am an African first, and next to that I like the American system. I like what the Yankee tells you. He tells you to draw your own line, and you have a chance to develop to the highest in your group. The Englishman gives you a pat on the shoulder and a diplomatic smile; but just the same he has drawn a line which you must not pass. I am going to support this Address because I feel that the West Indian students feel that this centre is an urgent need and they have appealed to us through the Colonial Office. I feel, Sir that we should send back a strongly worded message to the Colonial Office telling them how much we regret this cheap, mean act, and this lack of hospitality to the students in England. I feel that our boys are more or less lonely, and so I will vote for this Address; but I do so with scorn for the British people. They are spending millions of dollars on Germans, and Austrians and Italians who yesterday were their mortal foes; and they can do nothing for these West Indian students; these students from colonies that helped them to make the millions that kept their war machine going. I have no faith or belief in the British Government. I believe that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph could run this country from Government House, and also Bustamante or Manley in Jamaica and some of the people in Trinidad. They could do it better than some of these fifth rate people the British Government sends down here. We must get together and contribute something to civilisation. There are too many of us not to contribute something to civilisation; and there are

millions in Africa just waiting. They have the same ambitions and desires as we, but iniquitous laws prevent them from climbing. We must have educated people. These students in the U.K. are our ambassadors; they are the coming leaders of the United Socialist States of Africa. I envisage that. Just as there is the U.S.A. today, so there will be the U.S.S.A. I do not care how many guns they have got; they cannot stop us. I will repeat, the British owe us a lot. Even if they do not get anything out of us now; according to what I have read they have got a good deal out of us in the past.

Mr. H. A. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker—This Message and Address reminds me of something which was the most bitter episode of my life: that is the reception by the British Government of the West Indian Regiment made up of men from these islands who felt it was their duty to take part in the last war. When we arrived, as volunteers with all good intentions, we were met with such excuses as, "you are too small a unit; you will not be able to stand the cold; you do not eat the same food." That, Sir, was an action sponsored by the British Government. This proposal contained in the Message also purports to be sponsored by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Now, Sir, if we agree to the principle behind this, it is tantamount to agreeing to the principle of the segregation of West Indian students in England. Is it necessary for West Indians to have their own constituted club and centre in London? Do we hear of the necessity of such things for American, New Zealand, Australian and Canadian students? It is for me a bitter pill to swallow to agree to anything which tends to segregate West Indians in England. This Government, and many other governments before it, have tried and will try and will never succeed in getting the Colonial Office to sponsor the emigration of our workers to England. We read in the Press day after day how many thousands of workers are required for this and that industry in England. But the Secretary of State for the Colonies will never sponsor any Address forwarded by this House on the matter. I definitely do not like passing this Address, Sir, but since it comes from the West Indies Students' Union I take it that they have discussed it thoroughly among themselves and have no alternative course. West Indians are now—if I use the words "being refused" it may seem too strong—West Indians are now finding it very difficult, particularly those of colour, to obtain entry into English Universities, and it will be a long time before the University of the West Indies can give an Honours Degree comparable to that of an English University. So we will have to agree to pass this Address so as to assist the few students we now have in England. But I hope that the sentiments of members of this House will be forwarded in some manner to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The mere idea of this parsimonious amount being called for must point to but one thing. As I said it is tantamount to the segregation of West Indian students in England. After my bitter experience during the war I will always hold it against the Mother Country, that instead of facing the facts she continues to adopt methods such as these; methods such as the British Council and other bodies so as to make believe that she is willing to accept West Indians in England.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—It seems that in this debate certain honourable members have overlooked the first paragraph of the Message where it states that this is an application by the W.I.S.U., for financial support. It is not the Secretary of State, nor is it the U.K. Government, nor is it any English source from which this appeal for assistance

comes. It is simply that the Secretary of State has sponsored the appeal by the W.I.S.U., I am in entire agreement with the view that it indicates that a deplorable state of affairs exists in the U.K. It is plain that today West Indian students are finding it difficult to gain admission to clubs and social centres, and it has therefore become necessary for them through the W.I.S.U., to form their own club and centre. Because of the expenditure involved, it has become necessary for them to ask for financial support from the governments of the West Indian colonies in order to found and maintain this club. One would have expected that the U.K. Government would at least have out of consideration for what we have done during World War II and on other occasions said they would put the matter before the English Parliament. That having not been done, it is necessary for us to respond to the call of our West Indian students. That is why I do not agree with the suggestion that we should not pass this Address. The appeal comes from our fellow countrymen. How can we dream of not answering the call? Can we let them down? We should pass the Address and let the West Indian students in England know that we are prepared to stand by them in the true spirit of loyalty and co-operation. The amount of money will be in the region of \$5,500 capital, while maintenance will come to \$1,100 per year. I am afraid that we will have to be satisfied to pull our pockets. The U.K. Government is not prepared to shoulder the responsibility. We must pass this Address.

MR. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—I think that the most sensible point made in this debate was made by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy. This is particularly an application from the W.I.S.U., and not from the Secretary of State for the Colonies. West Indian students are finding it difficult where accommodation is concerned. They come up against landlords and landladies, and the latter especially are often very vicious in their attitude towards students. There is a big colour bar. Their difficulties are very great. When the Press Delegation visited England the students asked if their proposals for this club and centre would be backed by the West Indian Press, and if we would press on the West Indian governments that this club and centre would be a good thing. It was very obvious that their greatest difficulty was this matter of accommodation. The recent trouble over Hans Crescent arose because the students when they were forced out of Hans Crescent came up against the colour bar in its greatest proportions. That was what forced the Hans Crescent issue. The sit down strike in the hostel forced the situation which arose. The W.I.S.U., took vigorous action and criticised the British Council in the matter. That was what forced the Secretary of State for the Colonies to intervene in the affair. From conversations which I had with students it would appear that in establishing this club they would like it to be particularly West Indian in nature, and supported by West Indian students, and not one which could in any way be dictated to, or have its affairs interfered with by the British Government. That is why the students do not want the British Government to contribute. Some honourable members talk as if they know everything about everything. If they do not listen they will not learn. The W.I.S.U. wants to be independent. They want to be able to criticise the Colonial Office at any time. They want to be able to bring to bear a great body of public opinion against the British Government and the Colonial Office as far as the colour bar is concerned. It is in that respect that this Union can do a lot to help the students in England wherever

the colour bar rears its head. They can send letters to the Press and bring pressure to bear on Parliament. They can get a great body of public opinion against any agency that practises the colour bar. I think that it would be better if instead of getting a non-residential centre they could get a residential one. But in matters of this sort the last thing they want is any assistance from the British Government. At the same time what has been said about the colour bar is true. But the heat that the honourable junior member for St. George has generated is purely synthetic. There is more segregation and less antipathy to it here than in England. Of course the difference here is that it comes from the minority. As regards the question of employment of West Indians in the U.K., it is true that the Colonial Office seems to be opposed to encouraging a colour bar problem by the immigration of coloured West Indians. On the other hand can we honestly say that we are facing up to that matter? I have heard talk that the Secretary of State for the Colonies should see that a law was passed making it illegal for the colour bar to operate in England. I think we should start locally. Just to get here and make a political speech does not impress me. I think that the House will be well advised to pass this Address. I do not know if the Leader of the House spoke on Para. 3. I was not in my place when he was speaking. I see here that it is suggested that we should contribute on a population basis. I do not know what the opinion of the House will be. But it strikes me that although at present the student basis may be more expensive, I do not see that it will remain at a fixed figure. The number of Barbadian students in England may decrease or increase at some future date. I am glad to see that the House will accept it.

Mr. ADAMS: I personally regret that honourable members in speaking of this matter have gone off the rails. Perhaps it is my fault in that I did not give a full explanation. The question of coloured students not getting accommodation and the question of this club are entirely different matters. I must correct the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the honourable senior member for the City and the honourable junior member for St. George as regards the question of colour prejudice and the alleged niggardliness of the British Government. I believe that racial prejudice started in the Middle Ages; but there is no white race that is free from racial prejudice. Englishmen in our midst have less of it than the local whites; there is more of it here than in England. The French, perhaps, have less of it than any other European race, even though some Frenchmen are not free from it. Do not try to let us throw bricks. Some members say they have a preference for the American system. I do not agree with them. It is true that there are some Americans who are doing their utmost to break down racial prejudice in that country. But there is no more use making use of them to throw bricks at the Englishmen than it is to make use of the occasion when an American employer treats his workers badly to curse all Americans. It is true that coloured students in England suffer from the the colour question in England; on the other hand there is a situation in London today that was inconceivable in my day. I was in England for more than five years, and in all that period, except for one Trinidadian family, I saw one coloured woman. In London today there is a famous resort called "Little Harlem" where they do not sell rum but where you can see hundreds of Africans and West Indians dancing away to their hearts' content night after night. That did not happen in my time. If you went to the "Little Harlem"

you would come back and say that every white woman would dance with a coloured man; on the other hand if you came back after a landlady had slammed a door in your face you would say that all white women hate coloured men. I do not think we should generalise and say that the English are worse than any other people. It is not true to say that where helping students is concerned, the British Government has been parsimonious. We have already put on the Estimates \$5,000 for the International Students' Union. The Lord Mayor started a fund as a mark of their gratitude to colonials who fought in World War II. That fund will provide hostels etc., for colonials from all over the Empire and the British Government is prepared to contribute £750,000. So it is not really fair to say that the British Government is being stingy, and it is not fair to link that accusation with the project which we are considering today. Hans Crescent was bought by the British Government for the Colonial Office and it is amazing how much good work the British Government does for students and people who go there privately. A couple nights ago as I was going through these files I saw a Report of the social welfare side of the British Council in which they visited three thousand landladies and discovered of that number how many were willing to take coloured students. They have lists of people who are not opposed to taking coloured students, and those lists are furnished to students. The West Indian Students' Union was formed in December 1945 by a group of enthusiastic students who felt that there was need for this organisation particularly in view of the changing ideas of West Indians. It is an attempt to bring West Indian students together and create a West Indian spirit among them, so that they might hasten the day of Federation. That is stated in a Memorandum prepared by the Executive Committee of the W.I.S.U. The Memorandum also states that the West Indians are the only large group of colonial students without a club or student centre of any type. The Secretary of State for the Colonies has encouraged the idea and has asked the West Indian Governments to regard the figure of £10,000 or £15,000 as the capital cost. I entirely agree with what the honourable junior member for St. Thomas said, that when it comes to racial prejudice we have not got cause to look any further than home. When Learie Constantine was refused rooms in a hotel in England questions were asked in the House of Commons, the Secretary of State intervened in the matter and some scathing remarks were made. Can you imagine that happening if anyone was turned back from the Marine Hotel in Barbados? A greater social consciousness of racial discrimination exists among the English people than one is inclined to believe from only having heard of the bad side of it. I do ask honourable members to bear in mind that this is a request of the students themselves for the specific purpose of creating a union, creating a West Indian spirit among the students who come from these scattered islands. I apologise for having spoken at this length again.

Mr. MILLER : I would be very angry with myself if I allowed this debate to be closed without saying something in connection with this matter. I am 100% in agreement with the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, although I have feelings of my own. Although it might appear as if this money would be going down the drain and there would be some justification for discontinuing this expenditure, yet it is in our interest that this money should be spent. This question of race prejudice has been with us for centuries; I will say that almost every city in the world can point to slave labour and it is most

important that we happen to be within an Empire of our own. However, we will continue to suffer in these circumstances until people who are conscientious show that we have a claim to some place under the sun and the right to a flag. What I feel is that we will have to spend this money; there are some 45,000 West Indians in America who will probably tell you that they are not in a hurry to come back to Barbados.

Mr. MOTTLEY : On a point of order. The honourable member says that there are 45,000 West Indians in the United States of America. That is wrong.

Mr. MILLER : I have seen the figures; however, that is a technicality. What I am saying is that if for all your life you have been told that you are of a decent type, how are you going to ridicule people who happen to be unfortunate? For all the centuries we have had a flag of our own.

Mr. SPEAKER : The honourable member is straying very far away from the subject of this Address.

Mr. MILLER : The primary discussion was based on whether or not we should spend this money on students in England because of this question of prejudice. An honourable member said what he said and apologised and I should say what I am saying and apologize in the end. I can do the same thing as that hon. member. I feel that God created us and we should be given a chance. In every phase of life—

Mr. SPEAKER : Is the honourable member still within the confines of this Address? The honourable member should not take advantage of the latitude I have given; he has gone outside the compass of this Address.

Mr. MILLER : People have been injured rather than enjoy the form of prejudice of which the honourable senior member for St. Philip has spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER : The honourable member is breaking the Rules of the House; he is not keeping to the subject of this Address.

Mr. ADAMS : I beg to move that the question be now put.

Mr. GILL : I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER : The question is that this Address do now pass. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye"; those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. I ask the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to present this Address.

Mr. ADAMS : As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. MILLER : With unswerving respect to the Chair, may I speak?

Mr. SPEAKER : The honourable member cannot speak unless he is making a motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MILLER : I reserve the right to speak; on a popular vote I was given the right to speak. The honourable senior member for St. Philip spoke at length on this Address.

Mr. SPEAKER : I repeat that the honourable member cannot speak unless he is making a motion for the adjournment of the House. There is nothing before the House now and therefore the honourable member cannot speak unless he is speaking on a motion for the adjournment.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Mr. ADAMS : I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, the 2nd October, 1951, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Dr. CUMMINS : I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week, the 2nd October, 1951, at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.