

H USE F KEYS.

DOUGLAS, TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1919.

Present: Messrs J. R. Kerruish (Acting-Speaker), W. Christian, W. H. Kitto, W. F. Cowell, E. Callister, F. S. Dalgleish, W. C. Southward, J. W. Walton, E. J. Curphey, R. S. Corlett, A. Christian, A. H. Teare, S. Walker Anderson, J. Qualtrough, A. Qualtrough, T. F. Quine, J. Garside, M. Carine, and J. Cunningham.

CABLE BREAK-DOWN.

Mr M. Carine: I beg to move:—

That, in view of the great inconvenience and serious loss consequent upon the absence of communication with the mainland caused by the breakdown of the submarine cable, his Excellency the Lieut.-Governor be urgently requested to make strong representations to the Imperial authorities as to the extreme desirability of immediate steps being taken to remedy the isolated condition of the Island by establishing an ample system of wireless telegraphy between the Island and the mainland pending the restoration of the submarine cable.

Continuing, the hon. member said: I am sure there is no necessity for me to apologise for bringing up this question. By many business men and others, this inconvenience has been felt to be very acute, and more especially in a number of cases where sickness and—in some cases—death has occurred; there is no chance of getting into communication with relatives. I am sure the House will agree with me that this is an important matter which should be taken in hand at once.

Mr Teare: I very cordially second the resolution which has been proposed by the hon. member for North Douglas, on the grounds of business urgency. I would like to point out that what we respectfully ask for this morning is already in operation so far as other countries are concerned. The Postmaster-General stated only last week that, on account of interruptions in the cable communication between this country and Holland, an auxiliary wireless service had been established by the English and Dutch Governments, pending the completion of cable repairs. Telegrams for transmission by wireless service are sent at the

same rate as messages sent by cable. I am sure the House wishes to urge upon the authorities the extreme desirability of having this matter adjusted at the earliest possible moment.

The Acting-Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak?

Mr Curphey: We all agree the thing is desirable.

Motion carried.

Mr Carine: There is just one point—whether this matter had not better be put in the hands of a small committee to wait upon his Excellency. If that is the view of the House, I move that a deputation of three members be appointed to wait upon his Excellency.

Mr Southward seconded the motion, and it was agreed to.

Messrs Carine, Teare, and Dalgleish were appointed the deputation, and later it was reported that his Excellency would receive them at one o'clock.

STEAM PACKET COMMUNICATION.

Mr Garside: I wish for the indulgence of the House for a motion which, I think, they will support under the circumstances:

That the House regrets the absence of the Speaker through illness, and sincerely trusts he will have a speedy recovery to full health; also, that this House wishes to convey to him its sincere appreciation of the patriotic stand he took in the recent agitation in regard to steamboat communication with the Island.

In continuation, the hon. member said: I am sure everyone in this House regrets the absence of the Speaker from amongst us this morning, and I feel sure also that we all feel his indisposition is owing to the stress and strain and anxiety through which he has gone during the last few weeks. (Hear, hear). I think we should recognise that it was a manful stand which he took in the face of much opposition, and it must have pulled him down considerably. I think we shall be expressing our own feelings, and the feelings of the people of this Island, by conveying a resolution of this

Cable Breakdown.—Steam Packet Communication.

description to him at the time of his illness. (Hear, hear). I beg to move that this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker.

Mr Southward: I have the greatest possible pleasure in seconding the motion proposed by the hon. member for North Douglas, and I fully endorse everything which has fallen from his lips.

Mr Teare: I should like, in a word, to endorse all that has been said by the hon. members for North Douglas and Ayre. It was a great tribute to the sagacity, the ability, and to the honour of the Speaker of this House, the manner in which he conducted the business on that momentous occasion, and what is more, he came out of the conflict with character unstained and honour maintained to the full.

Mr Corlett: I would like to support this in a few words, and to express my appreciation of the admirable way in which the Speaker supported carrying on the Isle of Man Steam Packet Company. A good many people who opposed him must have forgotten that the Isle of Man had given probably three-quarters of a million out of Manx moneys to provide magnificent piers and harbours for these vessels to use. I think those members of the Steam Packet Company who wanted to wind it up were acting to say the least, in a very shabby manner. (Hear, hear). The Isle of Man helped the Steam Packet Company by the splendid piers they made in the Isle of Man. In my time alone, I am sure three quarters of a million of money has been spent, and the people opposing the carrying on of this line were, at least, unpatriotic.

Mr Callister: I think we should also compliment the hon. member for Ramsey for standing the shock so well. After the energetic stand he took, he does not seem any way worse. (Laughter and applause.)

The motion was carried unanimously.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW GOVERNOR.

Mr Teare moved the following resolution:

That this House regrets the delay in the appointment of a new Governor, and respectfully urges on the Imperial Government for an early appointment, in view of the problems confronting the Island.

The hon. member said: It was never more essential than it is at present that there should be a very capable head of the Executive conducting affairs in this Island. At present there seems to be something like an interregnum going on. The financial estimates will shortly have to be presented to

Tynwald, and many other matters are awaiting attention, and in view of the problems of re-construction, it is most desirable we should have the Governor taking hold of the reins and preparing for the issues that await the Island. Therefore, I think we should send the strongest possible representation to the Imperial authorities asking for the appointment of a new Governor of this Island.

Mr J. Qualtrough: I beg leave to second that. The position we are in at present is very unsatisfactory. We hardly know whether the Governor is acting or whether he is not. The financial year is nearly at an end, and the Budget will have to be submitted to the proper authorities and passed, and it is, therefore, important that the financial business should be attended to. I consider, at any rate, it is important, in the interests of the Island that the appointment should be made forthwith. I think we are quite within our sphere, and within our rights, in asking that this appointment should be made without further delay.

Mr Southward: I support the motion moved by the hon. member for Ramsey. I should like to point out that, besides the difficulties with regard to finance, there are other matters which have come before us, which are held up owing to the delay, and the lack of a Head of the Government. I refer more particularly to the Reform programme. I suppose that, until we have a new Governor, that matter will not be taken in hand. We are attempting to make progress with regard to the Adult Suffrage Bill, and in many other ways, and it is necessary that the Reform movement should be carried out as far as possible in accordance with modern requirements.

Mr A. Qualtrough: I am in a sort of a quandary about this question. If you remember, his Excellency was absent from the Island for about 18 months. I wonder whether that will be considered when he is getting his pension. Will that be taken off him? Will that 18 months be deducted off the time he served here, when his pension is made up?

The Acting-Speaker: That is a question for the Imperial authorities.

Mr A. Qualtrough: But I think we ought to have a say in the matter.

The Acting-Speaker: It does not arise out of this present motion.

Mr Corlett: I do not rise to oppose this motion, but we ought to remember, I think, at the present moment, the English Govern-

ment have great business on hand—the Peace Conference and business of first-class importance. They are fully occupied, and more than occupied. Then they have these threatened strikes of railwaymen and coal miners to deal with. The Government have hardly ever in our time had so many grave matters claiming their attention, and I am not sure that we are wise to hurry this up for a week or two. Let this Peace Conference come to some result, and this other thing which is to be decided on 20th March, and then afterwards it may be advisable, perhaps to bring this motion forward. But it is extraordinary, the difficulties the English Government have at present without attending to our needs. We are a mere nothing compared with what the English Government has to do. I do not suppose there has ever been such a press of business as there is at the present moment.

Mr A. Qualtrough: Why don't they give us Home Rule then?

The motion was put and carried.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

Mr J. Qualtrough: I move the third reading of the Workmen's Compensation Bill.

Mr Southward: Before the hon. member speaks on the third reading, I would move that the Standing Orders be suspended in order to consider a clause—paragraph (c) of sub-section 2 of clause 3. There seems to be a misunderstanding as to the passing of this sub-section. Several members are under the impression that it was held over for further consideration, and in order to give an opportunity to look into the matter, I move that the Standing Orders of the House be suspended.

Mr A. Qualtrough: I beg to second the third reading of the Bill.

Mr Walton: I second the suspension of the Standing Orders.

Mr J. Qualtrough: I think in the interests of what the hon. member has in view, he had better announce to the House what he intends, because the proposal of suspending the Standing Orders without knowing what we intend doing may cause members to hesitate. We want to know what the hon. member intends to read into the section, so that the House may know about the necessity or otherwise of taking a course which is taken very infrequently by this House.

Mr Southward: I think that what is in the minds of some members of the House is

very evident. The question that was under consideration, in the committee stage, was that the whole position of this section seems to be illogical. The sub-section provides that if a workman is injured through his own wilful misconduct, unless that injury results in death or serious and permanent disablement, he gets no compensation. If he is injured for perhaps a week or two, he gets no compensation at all. That is really the position. Why should it operate in one case and not in the other case?

Mr Garside: Having had charge of the clause when the second reading was under consideration, I may say at once that personally I have no objection to the matter being reconsidered, because in a Bill of such importance I think everybody should have a fair chance of stating a case; but I do think, with the hon. member for Rushen, that it is very unconstitutional to pick the Bill up again and to go back on what we have already discussed and passed. We have done it deliberately, it was not done hurriedly. I will support them, though I do not think it is the right thing, for the sake of giving fair play. I would point out that this Bill has been in the hands of every member since last October. Every member of this House has had an ample opportunity to know everything there is in the Bill, and when the discussion took place on the clauses, everything could have been brought forward. At the same time, I might say that this clause has been in operation in England, where there is an industrial development immeasurably greater than there is or ever can be in the Isle of Man. These cases have been coming before the County Courts since 1906, and, had there been any injustice either in law or equity arising out of this clause, it would certainly have been brought out.

Mr Quine: I rise to support the suspension of the Standing Orders. It is a perfectly proper proceeding. It would have been quite out of order if we had proceeded to discuss this, and alter the clause on the third reading. I am, myself, under the impression that it was passed, and fully passed, at the last sitting, but seeing that other members are under a different impression, I think we should suspend the standing orders. Mr

Garside appears to argue that we should follow England whether right or wrong. I do not think for a moment that we should. Secondly, he says that the judge has discretion. Now, can the judge's discretion alter the law? The judge will say, "I am here to administer the law." They will have no discretion at all. Whether they agree with it or not, they will administer the Act. If they find this man is injured for a short time, and there is evidence that there was wilful misconduct and neglect, the judge will say, "much as I pity the wife and family, although I have full sympathy for them, I can give no damages." He has his judgment of the weight of evidence, but if the weight of evidence shows wilful misconduct, he has no discretion, but must abide by the law.

Mr Corlett: I beg to support the suspension of the Standing Orders. I quite agree with almost every clause of this Workmen's Compensation Act, and have practised it all my life, but one clause I thing is grossly unfair. Mr Southward and Mr Walton have both said that they thought this clause was held over. I do not know whether it was held over or not, but I would influence members to reconsider it. If the third reading comes on now, without this clause being reconsidered, I shall have to oppose the third reading and say why I do it; whereas, if this clause is altered, I shall be glad to support the third reading.

Mr Curphey: My colleague wishes, if I understand him rightly, that all cases of injury brought about by the man's own misconduct should be paid for, whether they are for a long period or a short.

Mr Walton: No.

The Acting-Speaker: The motion before the House is, whether the Standing Orders be suspended.

Mr A. Qualtrough: So far as I can understand this motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders, I think it is trying to wreck the Bill they are. Nothing is said of what they are going to put in place of this clause, if a man gets disabled. It all sounds very tainted, and I shall vote against the suspension of the Standing Orders. If their ideas are honest and equitable, why don't they draft their amendment, and say what they are going to do with this clause? If they were honest over it; but they are not.

Mr Tenre: The question is whether or not this clause is to be reconsidered, and

whether members have made out a case for going back upon the declared decision of the House. There is no doubt in my mind that the clause was passed, and this is confirmed by the recollection of the majority of the House, because the hon. member for Glanfaba made a strong and determined attack on the clause, and, if I remember rightly, a division was taken. On the other hand, if there is a strong feeling that the clause should be reconsidered, one naturally desires to give consideration to that desire. At the same time, I feel, as the hon. member for Rusnen has said, that it would be better to have a stand-up fight on the whole Bill, because, if this clause goes down, a very serious situation will have arisen, and it would be better to debate the question on the Bill, centreing round this crucial clause. ("No.")

Mr Anderson: I should like to ask if a division was taken on this clause? ("No.") If it was, I think it is quite out of order to reconsider it.

Mr Garside: I have my own notes here, made at the time when the hon. member for Glanfaba was attacking the clause, and I have here before me what I was going to say in reply. I gave my reply, and my impression is that the clause was passed.

Mr Callister: I don't wish to prolong this argument, because I take it that the question is whether the matter should be reconsidered. I should like to say, in contradiction of the remarks of the hon. member for Rusnen, Mr A. Qualtrough, that I am perfectly honest in my opposition to the clause. I don't think it is right for any hon. member to make accusations of this sort. I do hope that hon. members will give each other credit for being honest, and being prepared to do what is right. I should like to see this matter dealt with fairly and squarely, and to see how we can get over the difficulty. If members will give us a fair chance, and have the clause reconsidered, or examined by a committee during the coming week, a compromise may be reached, so that the clause will read sensibly and reasonably, in this fashion: if a workman is injured—

Mr Garside: On a point of order, we are getting away from the point completely. If the hon. member has any amendment to make, well, after the Standing Orders are suspended, then it will devolve upon

him to move it, and it can be debated. Everything that he says now is going to be said over again.

Mr. Cowell: I am in favour of the Standing Orders being suspended. I don't agree with the hon. member for Ramsey, when he says that it is better to debate the whole Bill on this clause. I am afraid that, unless the Standing Orders are suspended, and this clause is reconsidered, the probability is that the Bill will be thrown out, and I am certain that we should be sorry to see it wrecked. While there seems to be a difference of opinion as to the attitude which the House took up on the last occasion, it seemed to me that the hon. member for Glanfabla was a bit Irish when he said that if a man was killed you gave him nothing. But we can re-open the debate after the motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders has been finished with.

The necessary 16 members rose up in support of the motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders, and it was carried.

Mr. Garside: Under the suspension of the Standing Orders which has just been passed, I beg to move once more the following paragraph of clause 3, sub-section 2:—

If it is proved that the injury to a workman is attributable to the serious and wilful misconduct of that workman, any compensation claimed in respect of that injury shall, unless the injury results in death or serious and permanent disablement, be disallowed.

Continuing, the hon. member said: I don't know that I need say very much on the clause. It explains itself very fully, and, as I said a few minutes ago, every member has had an opportunity of perusing this Bill since last October. What objection members have to it, beyond what was said on the second reading, I don't know. The clause was passed; no amendment was forthcoming. I should think that if members have any tangible objection, they will either vote direct against it, and show a clean division, or else bring some amendment which will, as was said this morning, place a more sensible reading on the section. Well, if a more sensible reading was required, I think we have had a chance to put it in. Not having had a more sensible reading given to us, I have practically nothing to reply to it present. I shall have to wait

for any arguments that come. But I would impress upon the House the seriousness of the position we are in. We have been without Workmen's Compensation, in comparison with England, for a considerable number of years. Complaints have been made on many occasions by those concerned, that they were placed in an unfair position. As I said when the second reading was under discussion, it seemed to me very possible that in the Isle of Man the need was not so pressing, but under modern conditions it has become more and more pressing as we are coming more into line with the English company law, and during the last few years the demand for the Bill has become more insistent. It all hinges pretty well upon this clause, and I would warn members against wrecking this Bill. It has been denied that there is any intention of wrecking the Bill, and yet this morning it has been stated that if this clause is not struck out, there is great danger that the third reading will be defeated. I should not like to think it was so. I think it would be a very serious matter. The consequences, not alone in the town, but in the country, would be more serious than the House is disposed to think. As I mentioned a few moments ago, this Bill has been in existence in England for nearly 20 years, and this very clause has been in existence for 13 years. Had there been any injustice, I am certain that an agitation would have been raised, strong enough to have caused the law to be amended, and a "more sensible reading" found before now. This has not been done, and, consequently, it seems to me, it must have worked out equitably. The hon. member for Glanfabla said that if a man purposely hurt his finger, put his finger into a machine, and got himself badly mauled, he would get nothing; but if the accident resulted in his death, he would get something; and, the hon. member said, it should be the same in one case as in the other. But I failed to find out from his remarks what he wants to be done in the one case and in the other. (Hear, hear.) Does he want the man to have compensation in both cases, or in neither? It is not for me to decide for him. But I would ask, in the interests of all classes in the Island, that the House should pass this clause as it is. I feel sure that in working the clause will result in no injustice. It has been said

that the judges will not have discretion, that they will have to carry out the law rigidly. I don't know how rigidly it has been carried out; I only know that in my own reading of the administration of the Act in England, very great discretionary power does lie with the judges, and that as a rule they do not fear to use that discretion, and to decide whether compensation shall be paid or not. This is a clause upon which they have to act very often, for charges of misconduct are made many a time, and, besides deciding whether compensation shall be given or not, they have to decide whether it shall be the full amount or a lesser amount. I recommend the House to pass the clause.

Mr A. Qualtrough: I second that. I expect that we shall see the amendment brought forward just now, and then we shall see hypocrisy in all its nakedness ("Oh!" and laughter.) If you will remember, sir, in reading Scripture, we are told about Judas Iscariot kissing Christ in order to betray him. We shall see just that going on in a few minutes (laughter.)

Mr Teare: I support the motion of the hon. member for North Douglas. After the very able manner in which my hon. friend has handled this clause, it seems unfortunate that we have to go back upon the subject. What does this clause really mean? The presumption in law, so far as my reading of the English Act, and the explanations given of that Act go, is this: A man does not indulge in wilful misconduct to such an extent as to involve his death. A man doesn't do it; he is not such a fool. The law does not suppose that he would do such a thing; it would amount to suicide. But if, as the price of his folly—his getting drunk, for example—his death follows, then the law says that those who are dependent upon him shall be compensated.

Mr Quine: By whom?

Mr Teare: By his employers. ("Ah!") But suppose a man, by his death, sustains a slight injury which renders him temporarily disabled, then he must pay; the price of his folly is that he does not enjoy the benefits of compensation.

Mr Quine: Nor his wife and family.

Mr Teare: They have to suffer along with him. But the law does not go so far as to say that the price of his folly

must be perpetual, as in the case of his death. It presumes that a man is not such a fool as to get so incapable as to court his own destruction. I believe that is the essence of the law. As the hon. member for North Douglas has said, the law has been administered with remarkable and creditable discretion by judges in England and Scotland, and there has been no serious outcry against it. Had it worked harshly to the employer, we may be perfectly sure that long ago there would have been an amendment. In the days before Labour was organised and as influential as at present, and during ten or twelve years' experience of the clause, there has not been any serious opposition. Of course the whole argument is this: If a man is properly covered by the system of insurance, the whole grievance falls to the ground. But I admit candidly that we should have some system of State insurance whereby an employer is amply secured against what does seem to be illogical and unfair. It does on the face of it seem to be a piece of injustice. But we cannot get perfect equity and justice in this world. I suppose no law in existence ensures that every man shall be treated with perfect justice. This is an effort to provide practicable justice, and I have had under serious consideration the advisability of trying to bring into the Legislature, when this Bill is passed, a Bill providing for insurance under this Bill. A former member for Rushen, Mr J. D. Cheneas, some five or six years ago made a similar suggestion, that all employers should be compelled to insure with the State, and if that provision had been enacted in this Island, this Bill would to a considerable extent have been superfluous. But I give it as a personal undertaking, for whatever it is worth, that I shall bend my energies, along with other members, and with the law officers of the Manx Government, in the direction of devising some such Bill as would provide for a system of insurance under this Act, compelling all employers to insure with the State, which would protect them amply against the risk occasioned by this clause. But I do endorse very sincerely the warning issued by the hon. member for North Douglas. I was travelling this morning with a director of the Steam Packet Co., and he informed me that some months ago, the Company was

threatened with a very serious strike upon their steamers, unless Workmen's Compensation was made applicable to the Island at once. (Mr A. Qualtrough: Good luck to them.) And the Company, in order to keep their service going, had to say to their men, 'We are putting you now under the operation of the Bill.' Those employees are under the operations of the Act now, and if an accident happens, they claim under the English Act for compensation. And I honestly think that before rejecting this clause or this Bill, we must pause very seriously indeed, or the consequences may be extremely grave. The labour element in the Isle of Man is rightly assuming its proper place, and I think it is one of the features of Manx life which the Island may congratulate itself upon, that Labour is coming into its own, and that the next General Election in the Isle of Man will give some indication of its power, and I feel perfectly sure that we shall have to reckon with grave labour troubles if we reject this principle of elementary justice of which the British nation has had experience for twelve years, with perfect satisfaction. I hope the House will pause before it rejects this Bill, or rejects this clause, which is an integral and essential part of the Bill, and which has proved to work satisfactorily to masters and men; otherwise there would have been most vigorous protest, and probably an amendment of the law.

Mr J. Qualtrough: As the House has taken the unusual course of suspending the Standing Orders in order to deal with a subject which, I understood, had been disposed of by the House, I take this opportunity of saying a word or two on the question. We have not yet had, from the persons who allege the unworkableness of this provision, anything in substitution. I should like to know what the amendment is to be. But in advocacy of the clause itself, I want, as on a previous occasion, to persuade the House to remain in keeping with the English law. Whatever is law on the mainland, in regard to Workmen's Compensation, it would be wisdom on our part to make the law here. If we delete or alter this clause, there will be a different premium chargeable to Manx employers and to English employers. Employers in the Isle of Man will be penalised, because they will be liable to pay

compensation for all sorts of misconduct. I believe that this Act in England has worked well, and I hope that no attempt will be made to alter it. I believe, after what has been said by the hon. member for Ramsey, that this provision is a penalty for misconduct. The workman knows that there is a provision in the Act that if he does not faithfully perform the duties of a workman to his master, then, if anything happens to him by misconduct, he suffers—unless it amounts to death or permanent disablement. Does anyone in this House attempt to justify misconduct? Is that the intention of the member who proposes to alter this clause? A workman should be obedient, should be sober, should do as he is bid; if he is to benefit by the provisions of this Act, he should be subservient to his employer in every way. A workman may put himself into a place where he is not allowed; very well, he gets no compensation if he sustains injury—

Mr Quine: Serious injury?

Mr J. Qualtrough: If he places himself where he receives minor injury, contrary to the orders of his master, he suffers. It simply means that men must be obedient to their masters, to enjoy the benefits of the Act. If it happens that the man is permanently injured or killed, of course he has been insured, and the insurance company will have to pay. The judgments that have been given under the English Act will be copied under the Manx Act. Would we have it otherwise? If we altered this clause, our judge would have no precedents to follow; but this clause has been for a number of years on the English Statute Book, and there will be cases which the judges could cite to guide them in their decisions. I hope that if the House accepts this Bill, we shall accept it, and accept it as it is in England. If you do otherwise, you will penalise the employer, and compel him to pay double the premiums which are paid in England.

Mr Corbett: I oppose this clause, or part of it. As I said just now, I am quite in favour of all the clauses of the Bill, but there is one clause in it which will cause me to vote against the Bill on the third reading. I would first of all like to look at the matter from an agricultural point of view, and from a warehouse point of view, both of which points of view I am myself conversant with. I

have heard a member say, "If this is the law in England, we must have it here." Well, there are many laws in England that there is no occasion for here. Another member says it would be a great mistake to enter it. I don't think we should pass the Bill if it is clear to us that there is a bad clause in it. Looking at the matter from a warehouse point of view, let me give you a couple of illustrations that happened in my time. This was a long time before Workmen's Compensation was even the law in England. One of my young men fell off the floor of the warehouse, and got hurt, and was laid up for six months. I paid him wages all the time. I had no occasion to do so, but I did it. That shows that I like to treat my workmen well. But in this same warehouse, one day I was on the top floor, and a man came behind me, and fell down right at my heels, dead drunk, and if I had not gripped him he would have fallen four flights, and been killed on the spot. Under this Bill I would have had to pay that man's family compensation amounting to £200. I don't think that that is a just law. I don't object to being made liable ordinarily; but this is the injustice, that I am liable when the man sustains injury entirely through his own fault. You may say, "You should not employ a man who is drunk." But in a warehouse, you employ a man for perhaps only one day in the year. If you have to pay compensation in a case of that sort, I think it is unjust. Let us look at the matter now from an agricultural point of view. There are a good many small farmers in the Island, who don't employ labourers at all, but do the work themselves, they and their sons. A day's threshing may come on, and they may have to employ men for that. Suppose a man is employed only for one day, and he gets killed with the threshing machine, it is hard upon that small farmer that he should be made liable to pay £200 to the family of the dead man. If the man was killed through his own fault, it is not only hard, but very wrong. There are many farmers in the Island who employ only one man. Often enough the man and the employer sit at the same table. Under present rates of wages, the man gets £91 per year, 35s per week, and many a time he makes as much income as his employer—sometimes more. You may think this a strange thing to say. But I was speaking one day to a man who had commenced farming on his own

account a couple of years before, and he said he made more for himself in the days when he was working for a farmer. He spent twenty years as a labourer, and yet, when he became his own employer, he was no better off. "Very well," I asked him, "why do you farm for yourself?" He replied, "I am hoping to get a little more stock, and to be able to improve my position." But if a man of that sort had a labourer in for one day's threshing, and an accident happened to the workman, you would make the man liable for compensation, and he might be ruined. We should remember that when we become members of the House of Keys, we are supposed to do justice, and indeed we are sworn to do it. I don't see any justice in a law like this. It is said that you can get over the difficulty by insuring. Well, you can insure, but the insurance premium is a large sum. Although agriculture has been prosperous for four years, I was reading in the London "Times" the other day that after the Battle of Waterloo, there was a terrible time for agriculture in England. The writer gave figures, and really the figures were very startling. And I believe we are going to have a bad time in farming in the near future. Mr Lloyd George told us that we were going to have a new heaven and a new earth, but when he was reminded of that statement he said, "Yes, but I didn't promise a new heaven and a new earth by March 15th." (Laughter.) And he is the strongest man in England, no doubt. But I don't think he is strong enough to induce the workmen of England to accept a tax upon corn, so as to give the farmers a chance of growing it. He means to do that, but he cannot do it. The consumers are paying a considerable amount of Protection now—(Mr A. Quiltrough: "Profiteering")—but do you think that that will be allowed to go on? I don't. Farmers will be left in the lurch, and will have to fend for themselves. I am quite convinced that there is a bad time coming. We should consider these things, and not make a law that will further harass the small farmer. If this clause is carried, I shall vote against the third reading, and do it with a clear conscience. Of course, I know that if a member of the House of Keys goes before the public, after having voted against Compensation, he is in a "precarious position," to use a phrase which is a common one with a friend of mine at chess.

(Laughter.) But you must not pass a Bill that is wrong in order to save yourself from a precarious position. The hon. member for North Douglas, Mr Garside, and the hon. member for Ramsey, say there have been no complaints against this clause in the English Act: but my recollection is quite different. I remember several lawsuits over this matter. One was the case of a colliery, where there was a regulation that men were not allowed to be in a certain truck. Some of them went into it, and were killed. There was a lawsuit, and it was held that the employers were liable. That controverts the statements of the hon. members for Ramsey and North Douglas. I remember two or three other startling cases, where the judgments all went against the employers, and they had to pay.

The Acting-Speaker: The hon. member will excuse me, but this is the hour appointed for the interview with his Excellency on the question of wireless communication. The hon. member may resume after lunch.

The House adjourned to 2-30 p.m.

TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION.

The House resumed after lunch.

The Acting-Speaker: Perhaps the deputy who interviewed the Governor will report?

Mr Carine: When we met his Excellency on this matter he pointed out that he had already taken steps on lines similar to those we suggest, to get into telegraphic communication with the mainland, and he hoped that something will result. The resolution passed by this House was submitted to him, and he will send it on to the proper authorities, so as to strengthen his hands. Nothing further can be done in the matter at present. His Excellency is doing all in his power to get wireless used in the cases we spoke of.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

The debate on Workmen's Compensation was resumed.

Mr Corlett: It is a good idea to be speaking when the House adjourns, as, after the adjournment, you feel refreshed. When we adjourned I was referring to something which appeared in the "London Times" as to the position of the farmers. It was "The Times" of March 10th, and it says that between 1815 and 1820—Waterloo was 1815—52 farmers, farming 24,000 acres

in Dorset, failed. That was after the Napoleonic wars, and that was only in one county. I quite think that we are going to have a bad time in agriculture, and I think, therefore, that we ought to be cautious before making farmers pay more than they ought to pay. One of the hon. members told me in the smokeroom just now that the only way to do was to pass the Bill. But is that so? There are always more ways of doing a thing than one, and I will venture to suggest to the House another way of dealing with this, which, if it is adopted, will induce me to support the third reading of the Bill. The idea is not my own, and was suggested when I was fighting for my seat, I think, for Michael, when it was proposed that we should have National Insurance for the Manx Government. This Bill is going to cost us a very considerable sum of money in insurance, but if the Isle of Man had an insurance scheme the large amount that would have to be paid in insurance would remain in the Isle of Man, and go to the Manx revenue. In that way we could insure in the Isle of Man under the Workmen's Compensation Act. I, for one, would be very pleased indeed to pay insurance in that way. Under this clause the employer might be compelled to pay £200 compensation where the employer is not at all to blame, and the employer might be a poor man, poorer than the man to whom he has to pay the £200. It has been suggested that, unless we pass this Bill we will be in a precarious position, but I ask you to remember that you will not be in such a bad position as we were over the Income Tax Bill, when the Governor told us that we had two hours in which to pass the Bill, or else it would be passed over our heads. That took place in this building, though not in this room. We are not in half such a precarious position as we were then.

Mr A. Qualtrough: Question.

Mr Callister: I rise to propose an amendment to this clause:—

If it is proved that the injury to a workman is attributable to the serious and wilful misconduct of that workman, any compensation claimed in respect of that injury shall be repaid to the employer out of the general revenue of this Island.

Mr Quine: Had not you better say "claimed and allowed"? He may claim, and not get it.

Mr Callister: I think it has already been granted that this is an unreasonable thing to expect of any employer. The man in

the street has as much right to bear the cost of injury to a man caused by his own wilful neglect as the employer. My sympathy is all with the working-man. I hold with this Bill, and I will do all I can to support it, but I want to act fair and square between all parties. I don't want to penalise the poor man. Members know quite well what are the conditions in the Isle of Man. Take, for instance, the sheading I represent; there are a lot of small farmers, and the work-people there are in many cases better off than the employer. You know how this Bill works across the water, where there are great capitalists banded together for great businesses, and they take this charge in the common run of their business; but it is a very different thing in districts like ours, where there are a number of small employers, who cannot afford compensation when a man is injured or killed through his own neglect. I illustrated a case before, which, I think, was a fair specimen, and I don't want to go over the ground again. We are told that the employer has a way out by insurance, but every man ought to be insured, the workman as well as the employer. We have Old Age Pensions and National Insurance—(A Voice: "They are in the future!"). We have them under consideration. Two wrongs do not make a right, and to penalise one man for another man's fault is not a proper way to do things. Take an injury that is not permanent—a man, with eight or nine children, may be in bed for five months, and, because his injury is not permanent, that man is not to get a farthing. What is to become of his family during that five months? Because, if he is not permanently injured, he will not get a farthing. I do not think that a charge of this character should be put on the employer, and if it has to be paid, it should be borne by the general revenue; and, therefore, I propose that from the revenue the man should be paid the same amount as he would be entitled to under the Act. I do not want to labour the question, but we should try and do the right thing between man and man. It is no reason because the English Parliament has adopted this clause, that we should do a wrong thing. I do not think it fair that a man should be entitled to assistance if he gets killed, but should get no assistance in case of injury. I do hope that the House will adopt the amendment, and provide this money from the general revenue.

Mr Walton: Cannot we have the whole amendment read out?

Mr Callister: It is only the lines over the page that are altered.

Mr A. Qualtrough: If you are so anxious about this, strike the whole clause out, and then a man will be entitled to compensation drunk or sober. Take the whole clause out if you are honest in your concern for the workman.

Mr Walton: If you read it slowly we can take it down.

Mr Callister: The amendment is:—

If it proved that the injury to a workman is attributable to the serious and wilful misconduct of that workman, any compensation claimed in respect of that injury shall be repaid to the employer out of the general revenue of this Island.

Mr Garside: I agreed to the suspension of the Standing Orders, but I protest against this waste of time. Members have had the Bill before them for five months, and any amendment should be read. If hon. members want it, let it be passed round, and in the meantime we can proceed with the debate.

Mr Quine: I rise to second the amendment, though I am not really in agreement with all of it. I disagree, because if an employer is insured under the Act the claim will fall on the insurance company, and this relieves them of that and takes it out of the general revenue. "Why not have National Insurance, and everyone would be protected?" some may ask. The reason for that is that some trades are more risky than others, and it was felt that these people should bear the risks of their own trade. That is why it was made that each trade should bear its own risk, because it is only fair that where there is a dangerous business the men working that business should bear the charges on it. Why should we be called upon to pay for injuries or death caused by the man's own wilful neglect caused through drunkenness, because it will only apply in cases of drunkenness. I cannot imagine that a man would wilfully put his hand in a machine. Should an employer be responsible for that? But suppose a man is injured through his own fault, are we going to punish his wife and family? Are we, as this clause proposes, going to penalise them for the husband's fault?

Mr J. Qualtrough: The clause does not apply to them.

Mr Quine: We can make it apply by this

amendment. I am here to do justice between all parties, and if we amend this clause we will help the workman's wife and family, and if any person says that in proposing this amendment we are out to wreck the Bill, they are saying what is not true. I am honestly in favour of this Bill, and I will vote in favour of the Bill whether this clause is amended or not. Under the clause as it stands, you are punishing the man's wife and family for a fault caused through the husband's drunkenness. When I was a member of the Malew Poor Relief, and cases came before us for relief, where a man had been earning good wages, and had been drinking, some of the members said that it was his own fault, but I was never in favour of punishing his wife and family for that. Whether the accident was premeditated or not premeditated, in this case a man might get full compensation, but it is not right that that compensation should come out of the pocket of the man who is not in any way responsible. The hon. member for North Douglas says that the judge has discretionary power. It is rather the other way. Where the injury to the workman is attributable to the serious and wilful misconduct of that workman, no compensation shall be paid unless the injury results in death or serious and permanent disablement. The judge cannot alter the law. We make the law, and the judge administers it. He has got discretionary power with regard to the amount of the compensation. I cannot take the position that the hon. member for Michael does, and oppose the Bill if this amendment is not passed. I am in favour of the Bill, but while it is before us we should make it the best Bill possible. I will vote for it, even if we cannot get this amended.

Mr J. Quattrough: I believe that the whole House has the same object in view, to do as much justice as possible without injury to the family of the working man, who, through his own misconduct, has injured himself in the course of his employment. But if it were possible to agree to the proposal made by the hon. member, it would kill the Bill, as far as this House is concerned, for the reason that it would make it a financial bill, and over financial matters we have no control. We cannot insert any clause in the Bill making the revenue liable for any expenditure, and if we do, it will not be passed. Even if the Governor, as far as he was concerned, was

in favour of the proposal, we can be sure that he would not for one moment accept it, and thus bind the hands of his successor. He could not agree to it in his present position. You propose that where a man is injured by his own neglect, and the injury is of a temporary nature, that the expenses of that should be borne by the Government. Where is a Governor who would accept such a proposal as that? I think you had better pass the clause as it stands in the Bill. If you are against the Bill, say so, but do not try and kill it on a side issue.

Mr Cowell: I will vote for the third reading and the clause, but there is one word here I would like to alter. You will notice it says:—

If it is proved that the injury to a workman is attributable to the serious and wilful misconduct of that workman, any compensation claimed in respect of that injury shall, unless the injury results in death or serious and permanent disablement, be disallowed.

I would like to move that the word "and" be deleted, and the word "or" substituted.

The Acting-Speaker: That is a further amendment after this is disposed of.

Mr Cowell: Then I give notice of a further amendment.

Mr Carine: I hope the House will pass this Bill as it stands, without any amendment. It has been argued in the course of the debate that cases under this particular section are frequent. I have followed the cases in the Press, which come up very frequently, and while it may be put in by opposing counsel in some cases as if it was done by wilful neglect of the worker, it is very rarely persisted in, and it is very rarely a conviction is obtained on those lines. Several members have spoken about accidents happening through drink, and anyone listening to this debate would imagine that it was a common thing for workmen to be under the influence of drink while at work. I claim to have had as large experience among workmen as many members in this House, and I say that it is a libel on the workmen to say they are in the habit of being drunk while at work. There are other reasons why accidents will occur. Very often they occur through carelessness; very rarely through drink. To carry out the amendment which the hon. member for Glanfaba has proposed simply means to upset the Bill and prevent it being passed.

Mr Southward: I rise to support the amendment proposed by the hon. member

for Glanfabla. I want to make my position clear, as far as I can, before the House. I am not against Workmen's Compensation, and even if this amendment is not carried, I am going to vote for the Bill. (Hear, hear.) But I feel nevertheless, that this sub-section as it stands is unfair and unjust. It has been said during the discussion that this procedure obtains in England, and that there has been no objection raised by the masters with regard to it. Well, now, my position is this—if in England they perpetrate an abuse, then I am not one here in the House of Keys to continue that wrong, and if any Act can be made better, fairer, or more just, I think it is up to members of this House to see that it is done. Now, this clause refers to wilful misconduct. In the previous sub-section it refers to the ordinary injury caused through the neglect of the employer. This sub-section refers altogether to the wilful misconduct of the workman, and, on the face of it, to say that any employer should be responsible or be penalised for the wilful misconduct of his employee is not fair and not just. In looking at the sub-section as it stands, it appears to me in this light. Here is an employee, a workman, and he puts his hand, for instance, into some machine—it may be his finger—and he sustains a temporary injury. The result is, through the crushing of his finger, blood-poisoning sets in, and it results in the workman's death. Now, up to a certain point, that workman would get no compensation. The law does not recognise that it was just, or fair, or right, to give him any compensation. But they recognise—or this says, in fact—if that injury is continued on, although in the first instance it was caused by the man's wilful misconduct, then he has a right to compensation, and the case becomes just in the eyes of the law. Now, I say, if it is recognised by the law, in the first instance, that a temporary injury is not entitled to compensation, then I say the whole thing right through should be recognised as unfair and unjust. It is in this way the hon. member for Rushen, Mr Quine, has put it before the House, and I largely endorse what he has said. I take it that this section is to provide some sort of compensation for the wife and family of the workman who has been permanently injured, or who dies owing to the injury. Surely, if a man is entitled to compensation on account of permanent injury or death, is it not right that a man

should be entitled to compensation if the man remains three months or six months with a temporary injury? Who is to support these people during that time? Are they to come on the parish, while the bread-winner is laid to one side? The proper and most honourable way to do would be not to throw the onus on the employer, but upon the State. (Hear, hear.) I support very heartily the suggestion that has been included in the amendment that the State should pay the compensation in those cases. I want to say again that, whether this amendment is carried or not, I shall certainly vote for the Bill, having raised my protest on this point at the present time.

Mr Walton: I heartily endorse the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member for Ayre, and also from the hon. member for Rushen, Mr Quine. I think that every member here is really genuinely in favour of this Bill, but, as the hon. member for Rushen has said, whilst we are making a Bill we ought not to insert injustices in it, simply because they have been inserted in England; and, whilst the Bill is going through, it is perfectly legitimate that members who think that certain clauses are not right and fair should have an opportunity of voicing their views without being charged with an attempt to wreck the Bill. Every man knows in his conscience why he has taken up a certain line of action, but no other man has a right to say what that man's real intentions are. This Bill deals largely with the protecting of the working man, and we have an equal right to protect the master. As the hon. member for Ayre has pointed out, if it is wrong in the beginning, then it must be wrong in the end. If a man is not to receive compensation whilst he is laid up through an accident, caused by his own wilful doings, then there is no right for the master to pay compensation when he is dead. I shall support the amendment to this clause.

Mr Dalgleish: I would like to say that I, for one, have always agreed with Workmen's Compensation, and I object to any member here saying because I am trying to make this clause a better clause than it stands in the Act, that I do not agree with the Bill. There seems to be in this House, at the present time, a great chase to assist the working man, but where has the mistake been made if it has not been made formerly when the Bill was previously before the House? I venture to say that

some of these men who are in full chase to-day with this Bill, and would accept it, whether right or wrong, are out simply to catch the votes of the working classes. I venture to say these men would be against Workmen's Compensation when it came before the House years ago. It seems to me that the only acceptable course before the Isle of Man now is to do everything possible to catch votes. That is a wrong motive. I think it is unfair to suggest that those who are opposed to this clause are against the Bill. I take it we are as many in our sympathies as those who try to make out we are unsympathetic to the Bill. I do not know that I have anything more to say, only that it has been rather tiresome to me to consider that men are playing a wrong game, simply to pander and to catch votes. I support the amendment.

Mr Teare: I rise to oppose the amendment. Although I seconded the clause, I think I am within the rules of the House in opposing the amendment in a word or two. I am one of those who give the utmost credit to hon. members for perfect sincerity, and, equally, I strongly repudiate any suggestion that we, on our part, are out to catch the votes of the labouring classes in view of the coming election. So far as I am concerned, I value the vote of every person in my constituency—rich and poor alike—and I am supremely indifferent to the vote either of the rich man or the poor man, the working man or the retired man, provided I have fulfilled my duty. With regard to this amendment, the hon. member for Rushen has asked—"Is there the remotest possibility of that amendment being accepted?" Do any of us believe for one moment that an amendment of that character will be accepted by the second chamber of this Legislature or by the Head of the Executive? To my mind, it is a fruitless attempt. What we should do is to accept the challenge I ventured to throw out this morning and bend all our energies as a responsible unit of this Legislature to devise an Insurance Bill which would meet this situation, instead of leaving it for the Governor or for the second chamber. Surely, twenty-four men, representing the people of this Island, have business acumen to devise some Insurance Bill at once, to meet the difficult and delicate situation which this clause puts forward. Personally, I agree with what has fallen from the

hon. member for North Douglas, Mr Carine. He is a gentleman of great experience in employment. He is one of the largest employers in Douglas; and he assures us, after long experience of business life, that the possibilities of claims arising under this clause are, in his opinion, very few. I attach great weight to opinion of that kind. I earnestly trust that this House will reject this amendment, and that hon. members will have an opportunity of saying that they support the Bill, and will take the necessary steps to amend the Bill afterwards by providing a system of insurance to meet the difficulties that arise.

Mr Corlett: I support the amendment. I cannot quite agree with my hon. friend the member for Ayre, Mr Southward, in what he said. He said distinctly that this clause was unfair and unjust. Those are the very words he used, and yet he says that if the amendment is not carried he will still vote afterwards for the third reading. That is a position I do not understand a bit. (Laughter.)

The Acting-Speaker: You are speaking on the amendment?

Mr Corlett: I am referring to the amendment solely; I never spoke on it before. If we think a clause in the Bill is unjust and unfair, why should we vote for it? I also think it is unjust and unfair, and I am not going to vote for it at all. The amendment suggested by the hon. member for Glanfaba takes the responsibility from the employers and puts it on the State. That is, if anything, more equitable. It seems to me more equitable, in a case of this sort, where a man is killed, perhaps entirely through his own fault, that the State should pay, rather than the employer. It only amounts to the same thing as I suggested before—that the State should be the Insurance Company, and let all employers pay in to the State, and whatever profit there may be—and I am sure there will be a profit—let it go into the Revenue. The hon. member for Ramsey is keen on starting; he says, pass this Bill first, and then do the other thing. But if you pass the Bill first, you may not be able to do it. If that clause is put in the Bill and carried, I shall be very pleased to vote for it, but I do not see my way to vote for what has been called an unfair and unjust clause, and I do not think it should be made the law of the land.

Mr Southward: As a personal explana-

tion, seeing the hon. member for Michael has brought in my name and position, I might say he has already stated to the House that if this National Insurance came into operation he was willing to vote for the Bill, and vote for that which was unjust and unfair—exactly the same position as he charges me with.

Mr Corlett: I pointed out that it would be more fair in that case for the State to pay than for the employer to pay. It is quite a different thing.

Mr Southward: In this case, I have opposed the section as it stands. There are other points in the Bill I should like to see in operation, and I am not going to vote against the whole Bill. (Hear, hear.)

Mr Garside: Before the motion and amendment are put, I would like the privilege of replying on this clause. As I said, when the Standing Orders were suspended, I had no fresh argument to bring forward, because nothing had been put up against me to rebut; so I waited for what would be said against the clause. Members have had the Bill in front of them for five months, and, after passing the second reading and going through the consideration of the clauses, they found there were things they had never thought of sufficiently or had not opposed strongly enough. A privilege has been given to them, and what is the result? To my mind, there is a bit of change about, and because it is attacked they resent it rather keenly, and attribute motives to other people of catching votes. I think both accusations can be put on one side, and we may grant that each is trying to do the best. With regard to the clause itself, members have stated that they do not want injustice to be done. In recommending this clause to the House, and in asking members to vote for it, I want them to know that I think there is no injustice whatever in the clause, and that it will not create injustice. I also want them to bear in mind—what I know to be the fact—that this clause has been drawn up and has been used, not only in the interests of the working man, but largely in favour of the employer—to give protection to him as well. It has been passed to try to give justice, and not injustice, and to give each of the parties protection against the other. If you read the clause carefully, you will find the workman is entitled to damages under very exceptional circumstances, which may, if looked at in some lights,

appear to be unreasonable. You may find; if evidence is brought of an accident before a judge, a man may be deprived of any compensation. The man may contend he had not been careless or negligent. In all the cases for or against employers or employed, it is left to the discretion of the judge to decide the case from the evidence brought in front of him. Now we come to the amendment, and two points stand out, it seems to me, for discussion. The first is, How is it possible, or how is it just, to make the State pay any losses which occur in a business of any description, so long as businesses are conducted personally or individually? (Hear, hear.) I ask the plain question in this House, without going round the subject—is it fair or reasonable? ("It will never happen.") Is there any law we know of where businesses are conducted personally and individually, and where any loss happens to either employer or employee, which says that the State is to be called upon to pay?

Mr Callister: As a point of order?—Yes, a great many.

Mr Garside: That is a question of fact, not of order.

Mr Callister: If a man is employed, and his employment is so hard and strenuous that his health fails, in comes the old age and disablement pension that the State provides for him.

Mr Garside: The cases are not at all parallel. Before the case happens that the hon. member for Glanfabla speaks of, both employer and employed have paid contributions over a series of years in the national insurance fund. In this case, before the amendment happens, so long as we have no Insurance Act, neither the one man nor the other is paying to anything. As I argued, in moving the second reading of the Bill, supposing an accident happens in a man's workshop, and it costs him £200 to put that machine right, he either has a depreciation fund to pay the money out of, or else he pays it directly out of his pocket. But if a human machine meets with an accident, are we to believe that the £200 is not to be found from anywhere? This is a Bill which provides that when an accident happens to the human part of a machine they are not allowed to suffer.

Mr Southward: You must make a difference between wilful misconduct and the other.

Mr Garside: So long as the business is conducted personally and individually, we have no right to ask the State to pay any losses that occur in the matter of accidents. Now, we will take the question whether they shall be paid compensation or whether they shall not. One salient point has come out in this debate—that all should be paid. In the clause we have in the Bill, if wilful misconduct is proved, if it is proved that it is done absolutely for some purpose, and the man is living, he should not be paid. ("No, no!") If the judge thought a man had so wilfully misconducted himself as to cause injury, compensation is not allowed.

Mr Quine: It is the evidence, not the judge.

Mr Garside: If the judge thinks the evidence points to wilful misconduct. It is argued—if a man was ill for five months, what would happen to his wife and children? I do not want to answer the question. I want those who put the problem forward to decide the answer. I never heard anyone say they ought to be paid in exactly the same way, as a man who suffers from a pure accident. Yet the essence of all the arguments is that they should be paid.

Mr Quine: The amendment says so.

Mr Garside: This is a point that never loses appeal to me. You may say it is hard-hearted, but, if the man wilfully does it, why should the employer pay, or why should the State pay? We are not speaking now of the point which my colleague rebutted—I do not think workmen are addicted to drink in that sense, or that they are liable to accidents so luridly depicted here. Consequently, if a man does it, it means that he does it intentionally when he is sober and in his right senses.

Mr Quine: You are quite in favour of the wife getting nothing?

Mr Garside: I am not in favour of that. The man who does that ought to suffer himself, but I do not think any of us feel that the wife and children ought to suffer. But the point is not one for us to put in this Bill; that would be compensation for practical dishonesty. Really, it is only a suppositious case that is put forward. The Bill does not pre-suppose that a man would do such a thing, that he would deliberately kill or injure himself. It is suicide, and if a man commits suicide, he is insane. Do you mean to say the em-

ployer is employing insane people? That is stretching logic to a very fine point, and asking us to make legislation for very extreme cases. I am sure the accidents that would occur, and that would be outside the scope of this Act, would be very few indeed. You cannot legislate for such extreme cases. The hon. member for Michael used the argument with regard to a man being drunk in charge of a horse and cart and getting killed. He said the employer ought not to be responsible.

The Secretary: It was the hon. member for Glanfabla.

Mr Corlett: I have known a case where a man of mine was going to the warehouse with a cart and horse drunk, and he might have been killed on the spot.

Mr Garside: If an employer is not to be responsible in that case, what about the responsibility for an accident happening in that case to a third party? Would not the employer be responsible then? He has empowered that man to be in charge of that horse and cart. If an accident happened to anyone would he be able to disclaim it, in the sense he is disclaiming now?

Mr Callister: It would be better to have one injustice instead of two, if it did happen.

Mr Garside: In conclusion, knowing what I do of industrial life, I say advisedly that this clause is vital to this Bill. (Hear, hear). Without this clause in it you have very little more in the Bill than you have in the Employers' Liability Act. I hope members will vote against the amendment, and pass the third reading of the Bill in its entirety. I do not wish to hold out threats of any description. I know it is a common practice in cases like this, but it is not agreeable to me. I do not care who is with me or against me; I do the thing I think is right. But I do recognise the seriousness of the situation in the industrial world. The Isle of Man is not immune from labour trouble and strife, and, so far, we have not here much of the legislation which has been an amenity in the lives of the working-classes across the water. Latterly our lives have been coming nearer and nearer to theirs. This Bill, proceeding along the lines of legislation which the working-classes have in England, I would ask the House to pause before imperilling the Bill, simply because of a difficulty with one clause. I am grateful to those members who have said

they will vote for the Bill, even if this amendment is lost, and I hope they will carry their intention into effect.

Mr Quine: I hope the gentlemen on the other side will carry out their opinion too; that they will vote for the Bill, if the amendment is carried.

The amendment was then voted on:—
For: Messrs Callister, Dalgleish, Corlett, Southward, Walton, and Quine—6
Against: Messrs Kitto, Curphey, Anderson, Kerruish, Cowell, W. Christian, J. Qualtrough, Teare, Carine, Garside, Cunningham, and A Qualtrough—12. Amendment lost.

Mr Cowell: I move now that the word "and" be deleted, and the word "or" substituted, so as to make the passage read, "serious or permanent disablement." If a man has a broken leg or arm, for instance, and he is laid aside for six or eight weeks, he is denied compensation, simply because the injury, although serious, is not serious and permanent. At the very time when an individual requires special nourishment and care, and requires assistance for his wife and family, he is not to get it. Of course, if the injury was a minor one, and only lasted for a few days, it would be neither serious nor permanent. But an injury may be as serious as it is possible to be, and yet not be permanent, and in that case there would be no compensation. I don't want to weary the House; the matter has been discussed fully, and the general desire seems to be to make the clause fair to every individual, and I think this amendment would be a great improvement. It would be a matter for the decision of the judge, and I quite agree with the hon. member for North Douglas that the judge has a great deal of discretion allowed him though I don't think it goes so far as to allow him to grant compensation unless the injury proves to be serious and permanent. I am quite aware, as someone has just reminded me, that this clause only applies to cases of wilful misconduct. But even in cases of wilful misconduct, I could relate a concrete instance. Some years ago I employed a young man, who was ploughing in a field on top of a quarry, with anything from 100 to 120 feet of a straight drop. A neighbour persuaded the lad that he could take the reins off the horse. It was a quiet horse, and he believed it would answer to the word of mouth, with-

out being held by the reins. But the horse got away, and it was more by good luck than good management that it did not go over the brow, man and all. I don't know whether you would consider that action wilful misconduct, but it is the kind of case that would come before a judge. Suppose the man was to blame to a certain extent, yet, if he got off with a broken arm or leg, he would have to lie in bed and perish, with his wife and family. If we are trying to do our best for the people of the Island, let us improve this clause in the way I suggest. Even if it is not the law in England, there are many cases where we in the Isle of Man could improve in the English law, and before long, no doubt, it would be followed in English legislation.

Mr Anderson: I second that. I don't know that I can say any more than what the hon. member has said. I am sure this amendment would be a great improvement to the law.

Mr Cunningham: The effect of this amendment would not, I think, be what the hon. member intends. To make the clause read serious "or" permanent, would mean that if the injury was permanent, even if it was not serious, the clause would take effect. It won't do in that form. I think the hon. member would be well advised to leave matters as they are.

Mr Southward: There seems to be some misunderstanding in the mind of the hon. member for Middle as to the meaning of the word "and." I should read it as if the clause refers to serious disablement and permanent disablement—to both classes of disablement, not one.

Mr Quine: Conjointly, though.

Mr A. Qualtrough: I am against this amendment. It is a very curious thing that members have had this Bill for five months, and it is only now that they are wakening up. Cannot we let this Bill pass, and try it for three years, and then it will not be hard to put in an "and" or an "or," if we find it necessary. Surely the House will be sitting again in the course of the next three years. Let us get the Bill through, and see how it will work.

Mr Garside: I can quite understand the spirit in which the hon. member has moved his amendment, and I appreciate it. But I am doubtful whether it would

work out exactly as he suggests, and I think there are more difficulties in the way than he has taken note of. In the first place, this clause casts the onus on the judge of finding out whether an accident has been caused by wilful misconduct. In cases that I have known it has taken a very long time to go through the evidence on that point, and the judge has had his work cut out for him to come to a decision. You can understand the judge's feelings if, in addition to deciding upon contradictory evidence of that sort, he has further to decide whether the disablement is serious or not, or is permanent or not. I have never taken much cognisance of the word "serious" in this clause, because if disablement is permanent, it is bound to be serious.

Mr Quine: It could be serious without being permanent, though.

Mr Garside: I think that when the hon. member for Rushen has the floor, he does not need to be prompted continually. He seems to think himself called upon to play the part of prompter to this House, and we don't always appreciate it. It is quite true that the amendment does distinguish between "serious" and "permanent," but who is to define the word "serious"? It may be so that the judge could easily say whether the injury was serious. No doubt he could. Any of us walking along the street could say that. But does the definition of the word "serious" begin or end there? How long is a man to be away from work before he is considered a fit recipient for consideration? The clause really hinges on the word "disallowed"—the claim shall be disallowed—and the word "serious" is also applied to the man's misconduct, and the judge has to consider how serious the misconduct must be before the claim is disallowed. To compel him to consider, also, the seriousness of the injury, apart from whether it is permanent or not, is placing too big a responsibility on the judge, to my way of thinking. I rather think it would be better to keep to the Bill as it stands, but I make no hard-and-fast rule in the matter; and members are at liberty to vote as they like.

Mr Quine: I am glad to see that the hon. member for North Douglas allows us to vote as we like. He makes no serious hard-and-fast rule for us. (Laughter.) I am glad to see that I am free for once to vote as I like.

Mr Cunningham: Move a vote of thanks for it. (Laughter.)

Mr Quine: When the proper time comes, perhaps I shall. It is wonderful what liberty we have. I take it that in any case the judge will have to decide whether the thing is serious and permanent—not the accident merely, but the disablement. Disablement, I take it, means inability to perform in the ordinary way the occupation the man is following, and the judge would have to ascertain that fact in every case. As the hon. member for Middle has said, a broken leg is a serious disablement, and would incapacitate the man for two or three months; but it would not be permanent, and the man would get no compensation. Under this amendment he would get something, and I think that that is a very great improvement.

Mr Teare: I think it would be a mistake to tamper with the measure to this extent, small as it may seem. The hon. member for Rushen, Mr A. Qualtrough, has rightly suggested that we might at least experiment with the Bill for a year or two. Take this subject of what is called "serious and wilful misconduct." Suppose a man in your employ is at work, and as he is pursuing his work, a runaway horse goes down the street. He leaves his work, and goes to stop that horse. Is that serious and wilful misconduct?

Mr Quine: He would not be in your employ then.

Mr Teare: A judge has decided that such a man can get compensation. In that case, the man has indulged in wilful misconduct, I suppose, in leaving his employ, and saving children from being killed. I am pointing this out to show that the Court has great discretionary power, and if that is so on the main question, which, be it remembered, is the serious and wilful misconduct of the man, it naturally follows that the Court has power to define serious and permanent disablement. What I fear is that if we make alterations of this kind, then, when the insurance negotiations commence, the question will at once be put, "Is your Bill on all fours with the English Bill?" If you say, "No," the next question will be "Then what is the nature and extent of the difference?" and all sorts of advantage may be taken by insurance companies in consequence of our departing

from the rigid provisions of this Bill, which has been proved to be satisfactory on the mainland, and which surely should have a trial here. If it is found, in the course of operation, to be harsh and unjust to any section of the community, then it is always competent for the House to make such amendments as are feasible.

Mr Callister: I shall oppose this amendment. It seems rather strange, after I proposed the former amendment, that I now oppose this. But I will state my reason. I think this alteration would disarrange everything. An insurance company would readily undertake this extra risk, so long as the State was taking the final responsibility. But now, the situation is quite different. You may have a man who is not very fond of work, and he gets a thorn in his finger, and he says, "Well, I am in for a good time." I am afraid it would mean that the insurance people would not take the business up. While there will be injustice, either way, I think that of two evils we should choose the lesser.

On a division there voted:—For the amendment: Messrs Anderson, Cowell, and Quice—3. Against: Messrs Kitto, Callister, Dalglish, Curphey, Corlett, Southward, Walton, W. Christian, J. Qualtrough, A. Qualtrough, Teare, Carine, Garside, Cunningham, and the Acting Speaker—15. The amendment was lost.

The clause was then put as the substantive motion, and was carried, only Mr Corlett voting "No."

Mr Teare: May I now ask that the third reading of the Bill be taken without comment? I move that.

Mr Garside seconded.

Mr Carine: I don't wish to take up the time of the House, but I think it is due to my constituents that I should state my reason for voting for the third reading of the Bill. As most members will no doubt be aware, I have up to the year 1915 opposed this Bill, for the simple reason that it was a cumbersome measure to introduce into a place where there really were no industries or factories of the kind contemplated. I have never heard anyone speak against this Bill as being unduly oppressive on the mainland, where there are large centres of industry. We have not such places here, and it was for that reason that I opposed the Bill, thinking that it was very much like setting up a steam hammer to crack a nut. But a

change has come over the scene. Since the inception of the war, our men have gone across, not only into the Army and Navy, but into civil life, and they are coming up against this measure, and up against National Insurance, and undoubtedly they are meeting with difficulties. They have felt that they were being unequally treated, and there is no doubt that a feeling of discontent has arisen in the minds of many workmen, many of whom I have met with myself, and who have said that they were labouring under a great disability. These are my principal reasons for my altering my mind with regard to this Bill, and I think the House has done well in adhering to the provisions of the English Act. We may find in the course of time that the Bill needs amending. But it does, on the face of it, seem a very cumbersome measure for so small a community, where there will be so few people, we hope, who will need to take advantage of it. As to providing against the liability created by this Bill, of course everyone who is an employer of labour will be very foolish if he does not sufficiently insure in every case for his workmen. We have an undue amount of casual labour on the Island, and it is from that point of view that I have my doubts as to how the Bill will work. Casual labour is not clearly defined by the Bill, but as we understand it, we have quite a number of such men, in the towns especially, employed for a few hours or odd days here and there, and it is with respect to them that I think difficulties will arise. However, I think it is well that we should err on the safe side, and I trust that the Bill will be of considerable service to the working men of the Island.

Mr Corlett: I oppose the proposition. I object to the autocratic procedure suggested by the hon. member for Ramsey, that we should pass this without comment.

Mr Teare: I meant without comment on my part.

Mr Corlett: It is the usual course that we should make comment on a motion before us, and I don't think the hon. member should suggest that we should depart from that course when dealing with this motion. That is going too far, even for the hon. member for Ramsey. (Laughter.) On account of his having made those observations, I shall oppose this Bill coming on for third reading on this day at all.

Mr Teare: It will have to come on. It is on the agenda for this morning.

Mr Callister: I am in favour of this Bill, and I am going to vote for it with all my heart. My only object in moving my amendment was to make the Bill better.

Mr Teare: The hon. member for Michael thinks that it is necessary to suspend the Standing Orders before the Bill can be read a third time. He is wrong. It is on the agenda for third reading now, and any opposition he has to make must be made now. We suspended the Standing Orders in order to permit the discussion which has just finished.

Mr Corlett: It may be down for third reading, but we have been amending the clauses on the second reading, and we have had practically a second reading discussion. I don't see how you can take the third reading on the same day.

The Acting Speaker: The reconsideration of this clause took place on account of a supposed misunderstanding. That has been cleared away, and now the third reading, which has been on the agenda for a month, is before the House.

The Bill was read a third time, only Mr Corlett voting "No."

ADULT SUFFRAGE BILL.

The House took up consideration of the Council's amendments to the House of Keys Election Bill.

The Acting-Speaker asked Mr Teare to take charge of the Bill.

Mr Teare: I am extremely sorry that this matter has fallen to my lot, by virtue of the fact that I occupy the place of the member who introduced the Bill. I endeavoured yesterday to devote some time to the consideration of the amendments made in the Bill by the Legislative Council. The majority of the amendments relate to the alteration of the date on which the Bill comes into operation—"1919" in place of "1918," and I don't propose to make any remarks on any of them except those that deal with the main point of difference, the alteration of the franchise for women.

The hon. member then moved that the House agree to a number of amendments of date, to which the House agreed.

On clause 5, the Council had deleted the words "male or female."

Mr Teare: The reason of that amend-

ment is, that the Council have dealt with the question of the female vote in a new clause. I move, therefore, that the House adhere to the words in question. That has the effect, of course, of leaving the Bill as it originally went from the House. I don't think any argument is necessary.

Mr J. Qualtrough: I think the House should decide whether it will adhere to the position it took up in making men and women equal in voting power. What is suggested by the Council is to follow the course which has been adopted in the House of Keys Election Acts of the past, namely, to enfranchise women in respect of property. If you omit the words "male or female," that means every "person" who has property, for a female is a "person" all the same. I don't think that raises any important question. The words are left out in order to include the word "female" in the new clause. I hope that the House will adhere to the age of 21 for females, and not 30. (Hear, hear.) I think it is only fair, when we are making a stride, that we should adhere to what we did in the first instance. On that account, the Bill needs careful handling.

Mr Southward: Would it not be better, at this juncture, to deal with the new clause, and that will settle how this small amendment shall be dealt with?

Mr Teare: I was going to suggest that. The crux of the situation is in the new clause proposed by the Council. The effect of the Council's new clause is to alter the real meaning of the Bill. The meaning of the Bill, as it left the House, was to confer the franchise on males and females of 21 years and upwards. The decision of the Council is that the age shall be 30 years in the case of females with certain qualifications. I move that we adhere to the Bill. The law of the Island at present is that a woman, spinster or widow, of 21 years and upwards, who is the owner or occupier of property, has the vote in all elections, Parliamentary elections included. The old election law in England gives no vote to women for Parliamentary elections, but it did for local elections. The new law in England gives the vote to women of 30 years and upwards, owners or occupiers, or wives of electors. The Bill as it passed this House entitled women of 21 to vote, the only qualification being the residential qualification. The Bill as sent down to us now adopts the English policy,

but provides that no existing rights shall be sacrificed. The effect of the Council's amendment is this: A widow or spinster, who is an occupier or owner, has the vote at 21; if she marries before 30, she loses that vote. When a woman is 30, before she can vote, she must be entitled to be registered under the provisions of the Local Government Acts, or she must be the wife of a man who is entitled to vote. Of course, as we know in the Isle of Man perfectly well, through there being no Married Women's Property Act here, a woman cannot be an occupier or owner in her own right, if she is married. Under our almost Pagan system, as I might call it, she is the goods and chattels of her husband, and has no rights; she is a married woman, no matter what her ownership or occupation may be. The arguments why we should resist this clause are numerous, and will be fairly obvious. In the Isle of Man especially, we have a visiting industry, which is very largely a women's industry, and many women have to shoulder the whole responsibility of that industry. And yet, if they are married, they are deprived of the rights that naturally accrue through their earnings in that industry. But the main reason why I venture to oppose this amendment from the Council is that I hold, as my predecessor held, that women, when they have attained the age of 21 years, have become fitted by nature for the greater responsibilities of life, the responsibilities of wifehood and motherhood, and all that that involves, and, therefore, they have a fair claim to a share in the government of the country to which they belong. Not only so, but we have had throughout the war instance after instance of women of 21 years and over taking a very active part in the industry of the country, and contributing to its wealth. I fail to see where any good ground has been shown for depriving women of this right during eight or nine of the most useful years of their lives. The position of Woman in this country to-day is vastly different to what it was five years ago. Her position in the affairs of the country is one of extreme possibilities, and in it she has already displayed remarkable capacity, showing her adaptability for almost any sphere of life. The Isle of Man has to a certain extent been in the forefront with regard to the franchise, so far as women are concerned, and it will to my mind be a retrograde step if we now

slavishly follow the English Act, and adopt this clause, which is taken wholesale from the English measure. The Council, in a further amendment, have provided that women shall be eligible to sit in the House of Keys at 21 years of age; they are to have the privilege of legislating, but not of voting, or that of owning their own goods, if they are married. A woman cannot legally carry out contracts; she cannot contract debts—

Mr Quine: Oh, cannot she? (Laughter.)

Mr Teare: I beg the hon. member's pardon. She can contract debts, but she is not legally liable to pay them. It seems remarkable that ladies are to have the privilege of sitting in the House, and yet not have the right to pay election expenses, or to engage in contracts which are necessary to secure election. The reasons why this amendment has been introduced are not strong or conclusive, and the mere adaptation of the English measure is quite contrary to the spirit of the Adult Suffrage Bill introduced by my predecessor. I move that the House adhere.

Mr Quine: I beg to second that. I can quite understand the Council trying to alter our clause. A woman is a very sensible person, but if she gets married, she is no longer sensible. I can quite understand the members of the Council thinking that; but I will never admit that the wives of the members of the House of Keys—my wife, for instance—are in that position. I say that in accepting myself, she made the best choice possible, showing that she had sense. (Laughter.) Again, this amendment only gives the vote to women of 30 years and over. But I know very few women over 30 years old. It is well-known that when a lady arrives at 21 years, she only has a birthday every seven years—(laughter)—and, therefore, she only very slowly arrives at the age of 30. If we make the age 30, in actual practice a woman will never get it till she is 50. There is not the slightest reason why we should follow the English Act. We have already given a vote to unmarried women of 21 if they have property, and if we accept this amendment, we say two things: First, that a woman obtains her sense from owning a piece of property; secondly, that upon getting married, she thereupon loses her sense, and only regains it when she becomes 30 years old.

Mr Southward: The hon. member for

Ramsey has said that nowadays, when a woman gets married, she loses her vote. I should like him to inform the House as to what the definition is of the words, "the owner of real estate."

The Secretary: That is defined in the Act of 1866. "The owner of real estate" means either the woman who owns the estate, or the husband of the woman who owns it.

Mr Quine: A married woman in the Isle of Man can be in the possession of real estate, if there is a marriage settlement made before the marriage.

Mr Callister: I support the resolution that we adhere. I don't know why we should grant a young lady the vote when she is 21 years old, and yet, if she then marries, and has eight or nine years' experience of married life, and ought to be qualified to vote, if any one is qualified, deprive her of her vote till she is 30. It is not reasonable, and I hope that the representatives of the people will protest against such an amendment being foisted upon them. The time is come when the ladies are going to have their rights, and they are fully entitled to have them. Now that we are to have Local Option, and many other reforms, it is a slander upon the fine intelligent females of the Island that they are to be refused the vote. If anyone is entitled to vote, it is a woman with a family, for she has a very real concern in the good government of the country.

Mr J. Qualtrough: I must admit that the amendments to this Bill, as they come from the Council, are hard to follow. I have made a little study of them, and feel satisfied that we would do better to submit them to a committee of three members, who could go through them and put them into a form at the next sitting that we can grasp them. If the Attorney-General had issued those amendments in a reprint of the Bill, we could have followed them by comparing it with the Bill as it left the House. There are some questions raised which are of deep interest to the House. Take, for instance the property vote. A young female, 21 years of age, might, by this property vote, have a vote in every constituency in the Isle of Man; but, if she marries, she loses those votes. What we intended to do was, to limit that property vote and make one man one vote. I think that the best thing we can do is to submit the Bill to a committee of three, and let them re-draft the Bill.

Mr Southward: The statement of the hon. member, so far as the Bill when it was originally introduced, is correct. The late hon. member for Ramsey, in the original Bill, had one man one vote. I was responsible for the opposition to that, and the House, very rightly, I think, would not accept that proposal.

Mr J. Qualtrough: There is another thing. To this granting votes to those who have served in his Majesty's forces they have added a clause granting votes to young women of 18 years. The new clause reads—

And for the purposes of this sub-section, such services shall include service in any work of the British Red Cross Society or the Order of St. John of Jerusalem in England, or any other body with a similar object or serving in any other work recognized by the Admiralty, Army Council, or Air Council as work of national importance in connection with the war.

Mr Cowell: If the hon. member for Rushen has moved that the Bill be referred to a small committee, I will second it, and the matter will be in form for the next sitting.

Mr Currie: I think that it would be a big mistake to refer this to a committee, as time is the essence of the contract, if the Act is to be of the least benefit at the next general election. We ought to go on with it to-day.

Mr Garside: It seems to me that the only course to adopt is to adhere to the Bill as it left us. The first of the amendments are only technical, and the only real alteration in the Bill is in regard to female voters, and what we have to decide is whether they shall have the vote at 30 or 21 years. I object to the Council's proposals, on that point. In these democratic days the tendency is to do away with classes of voters, but the amendment proposed by the Council makes two classes of women voters, instead of one class. It is far too late in the day to attempt any such thing. The new clause 15 provides that women can sit in the House of Keys. Those are the only real alterations in the Bill.

Mr Callister: Is there any alteration in the property qualification?

The Acting-Speaker: No.

Mr Teare: I have a dozen good reasons why the Representation of the People Bill should be amended, but the important point at present is 21 or 30 years for females.

The House disagreed with the amendment with a view to a conference.

Mr Teare: The next alteration is the addition to sub-section 4. In the original Bill we gave the votes to lads of 18 who have served in the present war, and the amendment extends that to ladies who have done their share in deciding the war. I move that we accept that.

Mr Carine: I second that.

Mr Southward: I oppose that. Certain ladies are mentioned, such as those who have served in the British Red Cross and the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, and others who have done work of national importance; that leaves it very wide indeed, and might include land workers and munition girls, as they can all be said to have been doing work of national importance. It will mean that all the young ladies of the present day will have the vote at 18. I do not think that that is desirable, as there should be some limit, and I move as an amendment that we stick to the clause as in the original Bill.

Mr Quine: We gave soldiers under 21 a vote because we felt it was right that men who had fought for their country should have a vote, but we did not intend to give it to people who worked in munition shops, and I only support the age of 21 in their case. Where they have fought for the country, they should certainly have a vote, but where they have been in munition works we should not make a change.

Mr J. Quatrough: I strongly support that. It does not seem a wise course to give the vote to everyone who has worked for the war. This clause, as passed by this House, was to confer the vote on all those who had risked their lives for the country, for really the country belongs to them. They had taken upon themselves the task of defending the country, and, therefore, they are entitled to vote, but we did not intend that everyone who had worked in a munition factory should vote. I cannot understand why the Council should propose that these munition girls of 18 should have the vote, and yet refuse it to other women till they are 30 years old.

Mr Garside: I think that there is a little misunderstanding over this clause. It proposes to give the vote to everyone over 18 who has done work for the war. It is not a very big matter, because in two and a half years at the most all these people will be 21, and then they would

have the vote. Everyone is to get the vote at 21, men and women, and these people must be over 18 years now, so that this clause will only apply for the next two years at the most. There will be very few working for the British Red Cross and the St. John Ambulance who are not well over 18, and if they were 18 at the commencement of the war they will be entitled to vote now. I am inclined to support it.

Mr Ourphey: Thousands of these young girls will get a vote before men. Is that what is proposed?

Mr Carine: I hope that the House will pass this. There cannot be many girls to whom it will apply under that age.

The Acting-Speaker: What about the stocking-makers?

Mr Carine: They are not included.

Mr Cowell: It includes Red Cross girls and those who have worked for the Admiralty, Army Council, or Air Council, or work of national importance. That will include all land workers. Where is it going to finish? There are a great number of land workers in the Island.

Mr Walton: The amendment practically means all the girls in the Isle of Man. Girls of 15 now who have been doing any sort of war work will, when they become 18, be entitled to the vote. There are practically no girls in the Island who have not been doing work of national importance. I move as an amendment that all words after "Jerusalem in England" be struck out.

Mr Callister: I second that. I think that is reasonable. That will include all girls who have done sacrificial work. There are a number of girls of 20 who have stopped at home to do necessary work who will not get the vote, while girls of 15 will get it if we pass this.

Mr Southward: I think that the hon. member is mistaken in that; it provides that they must be 18 years.

Mr J. Quatrough: As soon as they become 18 they will claim a vote.

Mr Callister: If it does only include young women of 18 who have done war service, there might be others at home much more worthy of the vote. I think it is ridiculous that they should include these and exclude women of 20.

Mr Teare: This clause is taken bodily from the English Act. I have the Act

here. But in the English Act it provides that no woman shall get the vote till she is 30 years. They can vote in England only when they are 30 years. If they have no other qualification at that age, they can obtain it for war work. They have taken out the whole clause, but have not confined it to women of 30 years. As we propose that women of 21 shall have the vote there is not much object in including these. If we stop after the words "any other body with a similar object," it will be sufficient.

Mr W. Christian: We are giving the vote to everyone at 21 years, and I think if we do that we are going far enough. In England they are only giving the vote to women war workers of 30, and if we go to 21, we are going far enough.

The Secretary: The clause as passed by the House, "being of the age of not less than 18 years of age, and having his usual place of abode in this Island, and not otherwise qualified as a voter, has served in His Majesty's Forces during the present war," includes girls.

Mr Quine: How can it, when it says "his"?

The Secretary: It is a well-known rule that in Acts the male includes the female.

Mr Quine: Embraces the female?

Mr Garside: It seems to me, to take a common sense view, would be to do as the hon. member for Middle, Mr Christian, suggests. When I made my first remarks, I had lost sight of the fact that we were going a good deal in advance of England in giving the vote to women at 21. In the Council they have evidently adapted this from the English Act, but the English Act provides that all women voters shall be 30 years. Everyone here will get the vote at 21.

Mr Callister: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has spoken before.

Mr Garside: I am speaking on the amendment. Before, I spoke on the motion. There has been a good deal of light thrown on the subject since, and for one to change one's mind, even within half an hour, does not, in my opinion, tend to discredit. I can see the danger of granting votes to girls who are now only 15 or 16. There have been many girls who are now only 15 or 16. There have been many girls of 15 or 16 working on munitions and other work, and when they become 18 they can claim the vote.

Mr Teare: "Work of national importance" is very broad.

Mr Southward: I move that we adhere to the original clause.

Mr J. Qualtrough: Where do we stand with regard to the amendment at line 19, where we have inserted "male and female?" Do we accept that?

The Secretary: The House in sub-section 4 of clause 5 included male and female. There has been no alteration there as far as the Council are concerned.

Mr Walton seconded that the House adhere, and it was carried.

The Council's amendments in clauses 6, 7, 10, 11, and 13 were agreed to.

The Council inserted a new clause 14, providing for a supplementary list of voters.

The Secretary: In the Act of 1903 a special provision had to be made in case of an election before this list came into operation. In that Act, you will find dates were fixed for making the register, posting up, etc. To avoid that, it is provided in this Act that all that shall be done by resolution of the Tynwald Court. That is necessary in case this list is not completed before an election takes place. It is a formal clause necessary to bring the Act into operation as soon as possible.

Mr Teare: I move we agree to that.—Agreed.

New clause, 15, to be inserted as under:

A woman shall not be disqualified by sex or marriage for being elected or sitting or voting as a member of the House of Keys.

Mr Teare: I move we agree to that.

Mr Southward: I rise to oppose that. I should like to move an amendment—not that I object to ladies sitting in the House of Keys; they may possibly add a charm to our meeting which hitherto it has not possessed, and they might possibly reduce the long speeches which we sometimes have to listen to. (Hear, hear). As I say, I have no objection to a lady sitting in this House, but I find that this clause does not make any provision as to age. If this is passed just as it stands, a girl of 18 can put up for the House of Keys, and can occupy a seat in the House of Keys. I move as an amendment that a woman be not less than 25 years.

Mr Ourphey: I disagree with that, because it is entirely in the hands of the electors. If the electors choose to put a girl of 12 years in, let them do so. They are not fools; they certainly would not put

a girl of 17 years in, nor a woman of 70; so I think you are perfectly safe.

Mr Callister: I am in favour of making the age 25. It is all very well to say that it is safe in the hands of the electorate. If you can reduce the age to 21 you can find a sweeping number about that age who may say, "Look here, girls, we are going to run a candidate." You don't know what may happen. I think we are going on safe lines if we adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Ayre.

Mr Curphey: Such juveniles as that should not have the vote.

Mr J. Qualtrough: I think it is quite unnecessary on our part to interfere with the discretion of the electorate. Let them send in whom they will. I do not think we should take away the vote from old or young. I think they will pick out the most competent and sensible person. They will be not only an addition but an extra quality to the composition of the House in the coming time, and I hope when we get Council reform it will be possible for a lady to sit even there.

A vote was taken on the amendment. Messrs Callister and Southward voted for. Against: Messrs Dalgleish, Curphey, Walton, Cowell, W. Christian, J. Qualtrough, A. Qualtrough, Quine, Teare, Carine, Garside, Cunningham, and the Acting-Speaker—13. Amendment lost.

New clause 15 passed.

New clause, 16, to be inserted as under:

This Act shall come into operation when the Royal assent thereto has been by the Lieut-Governor announced to Tynwald and a certificate to this effect has been signed by the Lieut-Governor and the Speaker of the House of Keys.

This was agreed to.

The Committee to interview the Council on the Bill was re-appointed as follows:—Messrs. Teare, Carine, Dalgleish, Southward, and J. Qualtrough.

THE COMING ELECTION.

Mr Teare: I do not want to waste the time of the House, but there are a great many matters relating to the coming election which ought to be dealt with, and I

would like to deal with them by abstract resolutions instead of wasting time by introducing Bills. The subjects to be dealt with are Redistribution of Seats, Limitation of Expenses, and some other matters. But, instead of getting a Bill prepared on chance, it is desirable to know whether the House is in sympathy with it. I ask leave to propose abstract resolutions dealing with Redistribution, Elections on one Day, Limitation of Expenses, the Taking of Votes of Absent Voters, and similar matters contained in the English Act.

Mr J. Qualtrough: We should have elections on one day. I do not think we should lose the chance of passing this Bill on the question of Redistribution. I am strongly in favour of Redistribution, but I think it should be taken up by itself.

THE ADJOURNMENT.

Mr A. Qualtrough moved that the House adjourn for a fortnight, and Mr Carine seconded.

Mr J. Qualtrough: I move an amendment that we adjourn to this day week. There is a good deal of work to be done. Our agenda is being continually printed with neglected business on it, and there is a waste of printer's ink on it. We should get the work through. We are negligent. We are not getting through the work we are appointed to do. I move we adjourn to a week to-day.

Mr Walton seconded.

The House divided on the amendment. For: Messrs Callister, Walton, Cowell, W. Christian, J. Qualtrough, Teare, and Cunningham—7. Against: Messrs Dalgleish, Curphey, Southward, A. Qualtrough, Quine, Carine, Garside, and the Acting-Speaker—8. Amendment lost.

DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS.

The following were appointed a committee to confer with the Council on the Destructive Insects Bill: Messrs Cowell, W. Christian, Dalgleish, Southward, and Cunningham.

The House adjourned to Tuesday, March 25th.