

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th July, 1951.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*),
His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*),
Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr.
H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M. Messrs. M. E. Cox,
F. E. MILLER, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., J. E. T. BRANCKER,
H. A. DOWDING, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., E. K. WALCOTT
K.C., and E. L. WARD.

Prayers were read.

Messrs. GILL and BETHELL entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings which were held on the 19th June and 3rd July, respectively, having been circulated were taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. ALLDER entered the House and took his seat.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council as follows:—

*The Legislative Council
To*

The Honourable the House of Assembly

The Legislative Council have the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that they are of the opinion that in order to investigate the question of over population in Barbados it is desirable that a joint Select Committee of both Houses of the Legislature should be appointed with the following terms of reference:—

“To examine the question of over-population in Barbados and to make recommendations for dealing with this problem.”

2. If the Honourable House is in agreement with this proposal the Council will be glad to receive at an

early date its nomination of members to serve on the proposed Select Committee.

ROBERT CHALLENGOR,

Senior Member Presiding.

Legislative Council Chamber,
17th July, 1951.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following documents:—

The Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month of June, 1951.

The Report and Statement of accounts of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for the year ended the 30th June, 1951.

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker:—I have the honour to present from His Honour the Governor's Deputy and from His Excellency the Governor Messages as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 21/1951

*His Honour the Governor's Deputy
To*

The Honourable the House of Assembly

His Honour the Governor's Deputy has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that His Excellency the Governor proposes to set up a Body to be known as the Scotland District Conservation Board under the Chairmanship of the Director of Agriculture with the following terms of reference:—

“To study the problem of the conservation of land in the Scotland District and to advise the Government of Barbados in regard to measures to be taken, initially and from time to time, to effect its solution.”

2. It is proposed that the Board should be comprised as follows:—

The Director of Agriculture (Chairman).

The Member of the Executive Committee in charge of Agricultural affairs.

One Member to be nominated by the Legislative Council.

The two Members of the House of Assembly for the parish of St. Joseph.

The two Members of the House of Assembly for the parish of St. John.

The two Members of the House of Assembly for the parish of St. Andrew.

One Member to be nominated by each of the Vestries of St. Andrew, St. Joseph and St. John.

Two Members to be appointed by the Governor.

R. N. TURNER,
Governor's Deputy.

Bridgetown,
12th July, 1951.

MESSAGE No. 22/1951.

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

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to the Address dated the 17th of April, 1951, from the Honourable the House of Assembly on the subject of assistance from the Labour Welfare Fund to enable labourers to equip their houses with proper sanitary conveniences, and to inform the Honourable House of Assembly that the Government has never withheld approval of loans for the purpose of installing proper sanitary conveniences, which have been requested in accordance with the provisions of Labour Welfare Fund (Housing Loans) Regulations 1950. As has been the policy from the very inception of the scheme whereby labourers have been loaned money for the repair of their houses from the Labour Welfare Fund, Government is ready and willing to consider applications from labourers to assist in the equipping of their houses with proper sanitary conveniences.

L. SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados.
22nd July, 1951.

PAPERS LAID

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

Thirteenth Annual Report of the Peasants' Loan Bank—1st June, 1949—31st May, 1950.

Quarterly Return of Transactions in Rum to 30th June, 1951.

Scheme of Government for the Coleridge and Parry School, 1951.

Barbados Colonial Estimates 1951-52.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:

Mr. ADAMS: (on behalf of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT) Resolution to place the sum of \$1,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951-52, No. 15, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to sanction the Regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 14th day of June, 1951, under the provisions of section 17 of the Immigration of Paupers (Prevention) Act, 1909.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to sanction the Scheme of Government for the Coleridge and Parry School made by the Director of Education on the fourteenth day of July, 1951, under the provisions of section 32 of the Education Act, 1890 (1890-12).

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Resolution to authorize the Governor-in-Executive Committee to lease in small plots to agricultural labourers a parcel of land of an area of approximately five acres forming part of Dodds Plantation situated in the parish of St. Philip.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Resolution to authorise the Governor-in-Executive Committee to lease to the Vestry of St. Michael that parcel of land known as The Princess Alice Playing Field situated in the parish of St. Michael and containing by admeasurement 6 acres, 3 roods, 32 perches.

Mr. COX: A Bill intituled an Act to encourage the establishment and development of new industries and to make provision for the granting of certain relief from package tax on customs duty and income tax to persons establishing factories in connection with such industries and for purposes incidental to or connected with any of the foregoing purposes.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$7,800 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1951-52, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1951-52, No. 16, which form the Schedule to the Resolution. I should like to tell honourable members that this Resolution is in connection with the matter of purchasing a car for the Governor—something which we have agreed to do.

I would like to announce that I have cyclo-styled copies of the Scheme of Government for the Coleridge and Parry School. I am instructed that it is essential to get through with this Scheme today, and I shall ask leave to deal with it. I am also instructed that the Governing Body should be appointed immediately, the Headmaster has to be appointed and, if possible, we should deal with the matter before the end of the month.

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at the next meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has been given today.

Mr. GODDARD entered the House and took his seat.

QUESTIONS

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT:—To enquire of the Appropriate Member of the Executive Committee at the next Meeting of the House.

1. Has any money been allocated by the Government for repairs to Tenantry Roads in the various Parishes of this Island? If so, will Government please state which Parishes have been dealt with and the amounts granted to such Parishes?

2. If the answer is in the negative, why has no money been granted?

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

1. Is the Government aware that dissatisfaction exists among Day Labourers employed at the Department of Highways & Transport, Housing Board, Waterworks Department, Pine Plantation, Seawall, Government Industrial School and other Departments of Government where casual labour is employed, due to the low rate of 6/- per day?

2. Will the Government cause an increase of wages to be given to all members of the unestablished staff of Government, and other casual Employees?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have in my hand a copy of the questions which have just been asked by the honourable member, and paragraph 2 of these questions has been crossed out by me for reasons I have given to him. I heard the honourable member read out that same paragraph and that is an insult to the Chair. When questions come before me it is my right to examine them. I have examined these questions put before me by the honourable member and I told him that some argument was contained in paragraph 2, that I could not allow it and he has read out that same paragraph. How must that action be considered? I put the matter to this honourable Chamber; I will not stand this behaviour on the part of any honourable member of this House. I am asking hon-

ourable members to support me in this respect. What the honourable senior member for St. John has done is nothing but a plain insult to the Chair. I will await for the House to take the action which should be taken in this matter.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I suggest that it is not necessary to invoke the help of the House; the procedure in Great Britain is that these things are handed to the Clerk of the House and if he thinks that they offend against the Rules, he does not accept them, and honourable members abide by the decision of the Clerk. In this island Your Honour does the acceptance or refusal and I suggest with great respect that if Your Honour feels that paragraph 2 of those questions should not be accepted, that is an end of the matter. It is out of order for the honourable member to attempt to put that part of the questions; whatever our views might be, just as no barrister would dream of questioning the ruling of a judge, so no member of the House should dream of questioning the ruling of the Chair. I therefore suggest that it is not necessary for the House to express any views on what Your Honour has just said, but that it should be enough for Your Honour to say that you will not entertain that portion of the questions which is not appropriate. In short, Your Honour will not permit that portion of the questions to go to the Government and when that is done, the matter ends there. I think that the honourable senior member for St. James will approve of what I have just said. I think that that is the proper procedure and this House would not intervene except to express its desire that normal, regular procedure should continue.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I think it is right that I should support the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, only I should say in addition, that your Honour does not bear so hard on some of us as on others. The training which some of us have is so ingrained in us that we do not question the ruling of the Chair in this case or of a judge even when we think we are right. That is second nature to us. I entirely agree with what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said; but I am yet appealing to Your Honour that you should feel a little more kindly towards those who know less, than towards those who know more. The younger members of the House will always feel that they are a little restrained, not having had the advantage of being trained in the way in which some of us were trained in our earlier days, if I may put the matter in that way. The procedure is simple; what Your Honour says is carried even if you are wrong, and I am suggesting that you are wrong. I feel sure that the honourable member will appreciate that he should not have read out that paragraph which Your Honour had not allowed in the question; I do not believe that the honourable member will think of doing that again.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must say that I highly appreciate the sound advice given by the two honourable and learned members who have just spoken; but I do not think I will ever attempt to bear hard on any honourable member. What I have done to the honourable senior member for St. John I have done to almost every honourable member in this Chamber. I took the honourable member in my office before the House convened and I told him that I could not allow that particular paragraph of the questions. I thought it my duty to point out such irregularity on the honourable member's part. I thank honourable members for their advice.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. Cox, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill intituled an Act to encourage the es-

tablishment and development of new industries and to make provision for the granting of certain relief from package tax on customs duty and income tax to persons establishing factories in connection with such industries and for purposes incidental to or connected with any of the foregoing purposes was read a first time.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL 1951

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to take Order No. 10 as the first Order of the Day. I ask honourable members to agree to that because, having regard to the timing done by the Government in making preparation for the next election, we should get this Bill through by the end of the month. Time is so short and this Bill is so long and important that I am asking honourable members to agree that we should make some attempt to finish it to-day. I hope that honourable members will not refrain from asking any question or making any suggestion, and that we will get through with this Bill to-day.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I should like to say that certain honourable members on this side of the House did not get their copies of this Bill until yesterday, and I am only too willing to go through it again. I am in a different position from honourable members of my Party; they have not had much chance of discussing the Bill with one another. Personally, like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, by reason of my profession, I know a good deal about this Bill, and therefore I am in a better position to carry on than other honourable members of my Party. However, I hope the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will not finish this Bill to-day, so that if honourable members want to ask any questions about it they will have an opportunity of doing so.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member to proceed with the Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day now stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the direction and supervision of the election of members to serve in the General Assembly of this Island, the procedure at such elections, the expenses at such elections and for other purposes in connection therewith.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take charge of this Order.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill is so important that I am sure honourable members will forgive me if I read the whole of the "Objects and Reasons" and stress particular points; so that before we begin to deal with the Bill honourable members may be well aware of the difficulties which might arise in the course of its consideration. The "Objections and Reasons" state: "The provisions of this Bill are intended to be supplementary to the provisions of the Representation of the People Act, 1901, and the Ballot Act, 1931, in respect of the holding of an election of members of the General Assembly and provides the necessary administrative machinery in connection therewith." When we have passed this Bill, we will have added things which should be done to those which, by law, are done to-day. This Bill does not abolish anything which obtains to-day; it adds certain things. The "Objects and Reasons" go on to state: "As a result of the introduction of adult suffrage some 96,000 persons have been registered as electors under the provisions of the Special Registration of Voters (General As-

sembly) Act, 1951. That Act also provides for the division of the Island into 213 districts in which it is intended to establish one or more polling stations. It is therefore obvious that the administrative machinery necessary for the efficient conduct of an election must be substantially increased. It will be necessary to appoint some 450 election officers that is, returning and presiding officers, election clerks and poll clerks in the case of a General Election and the general superintendence of such matters will be carried out by a Supervisor of Elections."

That is something new; for the first time we are being up to date and will have a general Supervisor of Elections for the whole island. Hitherto there was no real general Supervisor of Elections; the only person who was somewhat in that position was the Registrar who was responsible for seeing that proper lists were circulated to the sheriffs. But now there will be appointed a General Supervisor of Elections who will see that proper supervision is carried out. That is the practice in other places where adult suffrage has been introduced.

The "Objects and Reasons" continue:

"Actual voting on polling day will be conducted in the same manner as on previous elections, but it is considered advisable to depart from past practices in the following respects: the time and place of holding the election will be fixed in the writ and polling day will not be earlier than 14 days or later than 21 days after nomination day." The feeling is that with the franchise for candidates as well as for electors lowered, and the opportunities for printing being so bad, it might be found difficult for the "Advocate" to do the necessary printing in the usual time. It is therefore suggested that we should give the "Advocate" 14 days in which to do the printing. The "Objects and Reasons" continue: "This is to allow sufficient time for the printing of the requisite number of ballot papers. Nomination must be made in the form to be provided and be signed by two electors of the constituency and must be handed, together with the receipt for the deposit, to the Returning Officer between the hours of 9 a.m. and noon on nomination day." That is a departure from the present practice. The normal up-to-date practice is for nomination papers to be handed in, signed by two electors. I believe it has been said that somebody had to nominate himself as he was unable to get an elector to nominate him; but I do not think that that state of affairs will arise to-day. Nomination will be made a comparatively easy matter by having two electors as the necessary number to sign the form. As the law stands to-day, you have to be present and declare that you have the qualification to be a member of the Assembly; to-day you only have to stand up and everybody sees that you have the qualification, that is, you are over 21 years of age. In my experience several people swore that they were working for \$80 a month, when, in some cases, that was imaginary. "Provision is also made for the adjournment of the election in cases of emergency," and all honourable members will agree with that.

It is further set out in the "Objects and Reasons" that "the expenses incurred in the election which were previously borne by the various local government bodies will be borne by the Central Government and the duties of Parochial Treasurer in relation to such an election are transferred to the Supervisor of Elections." The honourable senior member for Christ Church smiles but that smile might be an ominous one. "The opportunity has also been taken to insert provisions intended to ensure orderly conduct throughout the elections by the closing of liquor shops; there will not be any distribution of "J & R" and so on. The prohibition of the use of loudspeakers, banners, flags, favours and

bands of music is only an extension of the present law. It is really illegal for any voter at election time to wear anything to show that he is on the right side; it is illegal, for instance, for you to wear a marigold to show that you belong to the Electors' Association. The assembling of crowds within 100 yards of any polling station is also prohibited; I believe that some honourable member will propose that that distance be extended. I think that all honourable members will agree that the old-time method of voting was going back to the Victorian days; I think the honourable junior member for St. Andrew will bear me out in saying that the amount of canvassing done by the side of the Returning Officer is tremendous and that should be stopped. Provision is also made for prohibiting any attempt on polling day at influencing any person to vote for any particular candidate, and for preventing the interruption of any public meeting called for the purpose of promoting the election of a candidate. It is the normal practice of the Opposition to try to interrupt the meetings of the Government (Laughter) but they may have seen their error.

The next point made in this recital of the "Objects and Reasons" will appeal to honourable members as being not merely essential, but an excellent thing. "It is an offence to make or publish any false statement in relation to the personal character of a candidate." We can say quite honestly that there is more decency and fairplay and a greater attempt at doing things in the right way in Barbados than in most of the other Caribbean territories; but, on the other hand, unfortunately, from time to time there have been exceptions to that general rule, and you do get people occasionally making false statements about candidates, which mar the comparative decency when elections are conducted in this island. It is a pity that in recent years—it was a Victorian practice—slandorous references have been made to persons, in their private lives and so on, it is therefore essential, no matter how decent a community may be, to legislate against those members of the community who might be inclined to depart from what is fair and decent and honest. The Government consider that we should put in a Clause making it an offence for any person to make any false statement against the character of a candidate. The emphasis is on the word "false"; if you suggest, for instance, that the honourable junior member for St. George is always at Church and therefore he is too ecclesiastical to be a good politician, that is a false statement and it is therefore an offence. Finally, the "Objects and Reasons" set out that "Provision is also made whereby employers must allow employees at least one hour to vote and no deduction shall be made from wages in respect of the time taken accordingly. I hope that honourable members on my left will see that that is a reasonable provision to make and that all employers will accede to it. Some employers tell their employees: "You leave me here to go and vote for Mr. So and So"; however, employees should have an hour free to vote for any candidate. I hope that honourable members on my left will say in public that employees must be allowed at least one hour to vote and no deduction shall be made from their wages in respect of that period of time; because if they do not say it, other persons who are less inclined to obey the law than those honourable members may not allow their employees that hour, or they may tell the employees: "If you leave, you will lose your wages for that time."

If we do not finish this Bill today, possibly I may be able to circulate to honourable members a provision which the Government may deem it necessary to insert in this Bill—a provision which exists

in Jamaica, Great Britain and in most countries which are up to date with their parliamentary law. It is a provision as to the total amount of expenditure which should be incurred in respect of an election. If a man has to spend \$10,000 on his election, then that election is not free; if he is in a position to pay canvassers so much money, if he can afford to be generous to the electorate, then that election is not free. It is true that when elections are coming on, certain people buy sweepstake tickets for their employees; it is also true that some people buy motor lorries which they purport to lend to some of their friends; but if we are having a democratic election certain expenses are inevitable. You are perfectly entitled to publish pamphlets or send letters to the electorate, and spend money to that effect; but how can there be in a democratic community a fair election if it is possible for Mr. "A" with an unlimited amount of money, to spend \$10,000 on an election and Mr. "B" is unable to spend 10,000 cents? While we are discussing this Bill I hope to have printed a new Clause providing for the amount of money which a person might be allowed to spend on his election. The Jamaica law has quite a number of Clauses dealing with this question; as far as I remember, the United Kingdom law is equally full and it might be necessary for me to have new Clauses printed and circulated before we finally pass this Bill. With those preliminary remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Messrs. CRAWFORD and MOTTLEY entered the House and took their seats while Mr. ADAMS was speaking.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the second reading of this Bill, and there are one or two points which I would like to make. I feel that with the qualification for voters and candidates being merely that they are of the full age of 21 years, they should only be called upon to swear to their qualifications if they are required by some elector to do so. Otherwise I do not see the necessity for a man with grey hair to declare that he is of the full age of 21 years merely to satisfy the law. If somebody questions your qualification, then you should swear to it as a safeguard. The next point is this: I think it is unfortunate that this Bill had to be got ready in time for the end of this month so that the Elections might be held before the close of the present year, because we might find it difficult in this hurry to insert the Clauses dealing with the election expenses of candidates. That is a most essential thing in this colony; if you give every person of the full age of 21 years the right to vote and you allow people who have money to go around and corrupt voters by offering them any amount of money that suits these people to give for votes, I think that that would be a very unfortunate thing in a thickly populated place like Barbados. Only today we have been asked by the Other Place to confer with them to see what can be done about this question of over-population; but as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said, you cannot say that you have a free election if it is possible for people to buy the rights of voters from them, especially with the Election being near Christmas, and add that on to their election expenses, if the people who have the money feel it is beneficial to do so, and that not being against the law. In other places near to Barbados the election expenses of a candidate are published; after the election the candidate's expenses are examined; an elector can scrutinise the election expenses of a candidate and probably help the Government in ascertaining whether the law has been contravened or

not. It is regrettable that no provision has been made for such a thing in this colony and especially at this particular time.

In looking through this Bill quite casually, I find that there is nothing whatever to compel the Supervisor of Elections or Sheriffs or Returning Officers to conduct the counting of the votes in a particular way. In the constituency which I have had the honour to represent for the past number of elections, the candidates and their agents have been allowed to see the front and the back of the ballot papers as they are taken from the ballot box. By that system, I can assure you that the utmost satisfaction is given; but I understand that in some of the constituencies in the country, that is not the case. The sheriffs seem to think that the elections are theirs and I think that some provision should be made in this Bill to allow these people to see that the elections are not theirs. As soon as we find that there are people who will not do what is just and right if you do not compel them to do it, I think it is a mistake, after the experience which some candidates have had, for this Bill not to set out the method to be adopted in counting the votes, so that these people will know that that is the method by which we expect the votes to be counted, and that candidates or their agents will be allowed to see both the front and the back of the ballot papers. That lends an air of satisfaction to the whole proceedings, which any person who has been appointed as Sheriff and Returning Officer should be very glad to have, and if I were in that position that is the sort of thing for which I would like people to congratulate me.

The next point I would like to make is this: it would be a good idea if at least one of the methods adopted in Trinidad were to be adopted here, and that is that the Police are allowed to vote about two days before the populace. After the Police have got through with their voting in their Stations then they could assist in keeping order at the polling stations. I am wondering if the absence of such a provision would prevent us from having either the votes of the Police or the protection of the Police. However, I have no doubt that the Government has taken care to see that if policemen are not available, other people will be available because, undoubtedly, you will have a certain amount of the old being carried over into the new. I think that the Police should be free to render every assistance and that they should be given some lectures on the provisions of this Bill and any regulation which may follow.

I think the suggestion that liquor shops should be closed is a good one. I have made that suggestion myself in connection with elections in the past; but I must say that I do not regard it as being so essential in this colony as it is in others. It is said that in Barbados at every other house or building there is a rum shop and in spite of that, the number of people whom you find intoxicated in the street is infinitesimal; that is really due to the good sense of the vast majority of Barbadians. They should either not drink at all, or if they drink let them drink and be sober.

In looking through this Bill you will find that for committing offences there are some fines which I would make a little greater. There is one offence relative to candidates, which, in my humble opinion, the option of a fine should not be put in the law; however, that is something that will be dealt with when we are in Committee. I have no desire to delay the passing of this Bill knowing the urgency of it, and therefore with those few observations I beg to second the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was not here in time to hear the opening remarks of the honourable Leader of the House, but I understand that he merely read the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill. I also understand that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition made a statement to the effect that some of the members on this side of the Table did not receive copies of this Bill until yesterday. I stand here to verify that statement; I have just made that statement to the Deputy Leader of the House. I am in a position to say that a copy of this Bill was taken to my office yesterday and I got it in the afternoon; that is a statement of fact. As a matter of fact, I had been looking for this Bill for some time now, because I actually hinted to the Deputy Leader of the House, who I thought would have been in charge of the Bill that I thought it would be absolutely necessary to get through with the Bill as soon as possible in view of the elections taking place later in the year; therefore I strongly support the remarks of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I understand further that the honourable Leader of the House suggested that while he wanted to begin consideration of this Bill today, there is no intention of trying to rush it through this afternoon.

As the honourable member said, this Bill is of great importance to this island and I think I am speaking for every member of the Opposition when I say that we are entirely in agreement with the principle of the Bill. However, because you are entirely in agreement with the principle of a Bill, it does not necessarily mean that you should give up your right of going into the Bill section by section and eliminating anything which might not appear to be workable in keeping with local conditions. Hence we are supporting the principle of this Bill this afternoon and I take it that we will go into Committee in due course and later in the afternoon we will ask for a postponement of the consideration of the Bill so that we will be able to go very carefully into it and bring forward any suggestions which we may have to bring forward. Some honourable members might have had this Bill in their possession for about three or four days, and if they have had the opportunity of going through it, that is all well and good; but honourable members will agree with me that the Government members are always in the happy position of knowing more about a Bill and seeing it long before even their backbenchers see or know about it. They are therefore in a position to know what is in the Bill, but in keeping with the principle of democracy, we, as the Opposition, are entitled to offer our suggestions and criticisms and if necessary secure amendments.

I have listened to the honourable members who moved and seconded the second reading of this Bill respectively, and from what they have said, I observe that there is some provision made in the Bill to restrain the foul-mouthed, illiterate type of candidate who cannot get on a platform and make any kind of speech without abusing people. I wondered whether the honourable Leader of the House when he was speaking did not think of the difficult position in which he would be putting some of his own candidates. Every decent-minded person must welcome the provision which has been made in this Bill for the protection of people who must offer themselves as candidates and who, by breeding, training, scholarship or otherwise, cannot bring themselves down into the gutter with others who feel that they have their only opportunity to rise unnecessarily, at times wickedly, and not only say ill-bred things about prospective candidates, but also about their families. I see that there is in this Bill a Clause which only refers to a

person saying unkind, untrue or derogatory things about candidates but I wish it could be carried further and include those who would willingly get up in public and violate people's families who, in 100% of the cases, are innocent and who are not even interested in what is being discussed. We agree with the principle of the Bill but we feel that there are a lot of things which should be amended; there are certain provisions which should be made stronger, not only for the protection of candidates but also for the protection of their families. There are some people who are so wild that they cannot even understand culture even if they see it written in letters as big as Lord Nelson's Statue; the only way in which they can say anything on a public platform to convince people is to indulge in billingsgate—filth, mud and mire. I hope that the passing of this Bill will make some people speak politics which the people want to hear.

There is in this Bill a section to which my colleague referred—that section in respect of the closing down of liquor shops. I believe I am standing alone in my Party on this question, but I am letting it be known that I am not voting for that section, even at the risk of my opponents and detractors saying that I want to get people drunk. If you attempt to close down liquor shops on polling day, you will close down 90% of the provision shops, because these shops are partly provision shops and liquor shops. Why should we, as twenty-four sane men, pass a section which we know cannot work? We can say that the shops can be opened but no liquor must be sold. There are some experienced members of this House who will make their contribution to this debate. I want to say that I have had as much experience in campaigning as any other member in this House and it is not true to say that the only way in which you can win the favour of the electorate is by offering people rum. I ask honourable members to think for a little; little do people know how often they insult the electorate of this colony by suggesting that the only way in which people of a certain type can secure election is by offering the electorate rum. There are hundreds of people in this colony who, on any day to which they have been looking forward as not being a working day, will pull their own pockets and drink a grog; that is a statement of fact. I have had the opportunity of seeing elections conducted in every parish of this island; I have heard members of this House make sweeping statements, but I ask a lot of them to examine their election and see whether it is not a fact that, at times, they had a drink with somebody knowing well that they were not buying any vote. We are supposed to have the highest standard of literacy in the West Indies and if in this 20th century with our standard of literacy, we were to pass in this Bill a section prohibiting the sale of liquor on election day, all that will mean is that the man in the street will not be able to get a drink, but liquor will be available at the hotels and the clubs. My colleague says that they are prohibited from selling liquor; but imagine your prohibiting the sale of liquor at the Aquatic Club! The Commissioner of Police will station two policemen in Baxters Road, but not at the Marine Hotel. On the other hand, let us see the position in this way; on election day no person who holds a licence can sell or even give away liquor. We must take these sections as they apply to Barbados: what about the night before election day when liquor shops are open and there is as much liquor flowing about as possible? The honourable junior member for St. Joseph is paying rapt attention to this matter because

it must affect his business; however the consideration of this particular section dealing with the closing of liquor shops on polling day is one which should be postponed this afternoon.

As to the provision that all employers should give an hour to their employees to vote, I pledge that not only will this Party support that provision in this House but we will go on any platform in this island and we will ask people of the employing class to allow their employees an hour to vote. That is democracy. I will tell members of the Government lest they forget that only three years ago when men looked officers and members of the Union in the face and told them "We will go and vote for Mottley" they were dismissed and told "You cannot join this Union." As I have said, we will go on every platform and say that it is the duty of every employer to give his employees time to vote; it is your duty to see that your employees are given time to vote, and the voting might take longer than an hour. I am asking the honourable leader of the House to see that it might take longer than an hour for employees to vote and we are prepared to support the granting of more than an hour for this purpose. We have absolutely no fear; why should we fear? In spite of the intimidation and dismissal of people, I align myself with the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. If it can be proved that any employer dismissed people because they had to go to vote, that is where I would say that he should be locked up. There are a lot of people who will not allow employees an hour to vote if they say that they will vote for Mottley or Goddard; there are those on that side of the Table who would want to give those employees a dose of arsenic. As I have already said, we support the principle of this Bill and we hope that when its consideration is postponed we will be able to come back and offer suggestions or amendments with which the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will agree. I do not think that there is anything more I can say at this stage: I will reserve further comments until we go into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. HAYNES: I think that I should say a few words in connection with this Bill. Some time ago I asked this House to pass an Address asking that the expenses in connection with these elections be borne by the Central Government instead of the local government bodies, and I am glad to see that that is now proposed in this Bill. As regards the question of liquor shops being closed on polling day, the honourable senior member for the City seems to have taken objection to that provision, but I happened to be in another country five months ago and you could not buy a pint of beer during polling hours. That is a day on which all voters should have their wits about them and should not be affected by the taking of liquor. I think the proposal to have liquor shops closed on polling day is a most excellent one. I see that bands of music and so on cannot be used on polling day, but those are very harmless things and I do not know whether the honourable leader of the House will consider amending that particular Clause.

Mr. GODDARD: I endorse the principle of this Bill. Like the honourable senior member for the City, I do not see the necessity for having liquor shops closed on polling day. (Hear, hear). Under the old system when there was one voting centre in each parish, it might have been necessary to have liquor shops closed; but now that you will have polling stations all over the colony, I think we could do without the closing of liquor shops. I am glad to see that the Government has taken the opportunity to implement the Address which was introduced by the

honourable junior member for St. Andrew asking that the expenses incurred in the holding of elections be borne by the Central Government instead of the Vestries. The expenses in connection with the holding of elections place a big burden on the Vestries and with the added expenses that burden would even be greater in the forthcoming elections. I am glad that the Government has implemented the Address brought forward by the honourable junior member for St. Andrew. As the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has asked members on this side of the Table to say publicly that employers will give their employees time to vote, I will say that now and upon any platform on which we might be standing. I cannot imagine that any employer would not encourage his employees to go and exercise his right to vote; I might say that at the last elections I actually gave a day off to people living in St. Peter. I know that any merchant in Bridgetown will be willing to grant any time which is necessary for any employee to go and vote for any candidate he thinks fit.

Mr. SMITH: I heartily welcome this Bill. I feel that a Bill of this sort should have been placed on the Statute Book long ago. As regards the closing of liquor shops on polling day, I am sure that that provision will prevent a lot of robbery from some of the poor people who carry on liquor businesses. I know that at the last elections a poor woman's entire stock was lost, because whereas I thought she was selling her liquor, she never got a cent. I feel that we are doing justice to some of these people who carry on liquor businesses and we might be doing an injustice to some others; however, I feel that liquor shops should be closed on polling day; that will not hurt because it is a known fact that there are some voters who will not otherwise get to the polling booths. They will take a few drinks and they will not arrive at the polling booths. I feel that an injustice will be done to candidates if voters cannot get to the polling stations owing to the influence of liquor; there are some people who will fight and instead of going to the polling booths they go to the Police Stations. We should do all that lies in our power to safeguard a poor, unfortunate elector from drinking so much free rum on election day; if a particular candidate is out for giving a "freeness", it should be given on the night before election day. (Laughter). I see that honourable members are laughing, but there is a very serious election coming and we do not know what might be the outcome of it. In fairness to some honourable members I will say that we will have some very weak-kneed horses in this race and in order to strengthen them we should put our feet down on the sale of rum on polling day.

I think it was the honourable junior member for the City who raised the point that candidates should be allowed to see when the votes are being counted. I have been told that in some parishes the Sheriffs keep the candidates very far off; but I think that candidates should be allowed to remain near enough as to see the counting of the votes so as to justify themselves. There is in this Bill a Clause whereby a blind person will be able to take to the poll with him someone who has been sworn to secrecy, and who will be able to cast his vote for him, but I do not see any provision made in the case of a person who can see but who cannot read or write; he should also be allowed to carry along with him a friend or a member of his family to vote for him. I do not know if I will be able to move an amendment to that effect, but I hope that some other honourable member will see this matter in the same light as I have seen it and

and move the necessary amendment as soon as we get to the particular Clause of the Bill in Committee. I feel that that is a necessary provision to be made.

Mr. ALLDER: What impresses me in this Bill is that there appears to be some discrimination as regards the closing of clubs and that of liquor businesses. I feel that if you are going to compel small traders to refrain from doing business on polling day, you should do it in such a way that no one can say that you have forced the small traders to close their businesses, but you have not done anything as regards the big hotels. I notice that liquor businesses and clubs are mentioned in respect of being closed on election day, but we all know that hotels are considered as being different from liquor shops or the average social club where liquor is sold at times. I know of cases in which some wealthy candidates invite electors *en masse* to their seaside residences or elsewhere and treat them in the same manner as they would be treated at liquor shops or elsewhere. The possibility is still there for such wealthy candidates to invite electors to the Crane Hotel or Sam Lord's Castle or the Marine Hotel and treat them in the same manner as it would be done at liquor shops. You are not preventing the big establishments from trading on that day but you are preventing the small traders from doing so.

Another point to which I would like to refer is that which has been raised by the honourable junior member for St. Joseph; it is the point relative to allowing persons to go to the polls along with illiterates and assist them in casting their votes. I cannot agree with that at all. What I was hoping was that, in such cases, symbols would be used as was done in Trinidad and Jamaica. That would go a long way in assisting those who cannot distinguish the names of the respective candidates. I hope that when we go into Committee on this Bill, an amendment making provision for the use of symbols for the assistance of illiterates in casting their votes will be accepted.

Mr. MILLER: I am somewhat disappointed that a Bill of this sort was not passed before. I was looking forward to a Bill such as this for the past few years of my life. I think the age has come when every individual of the age of 21 years should be entitled to vote. With regard to the question of the sale of liquor on polling day, I want to say that I happened to be in Trinidad at the time of the elections in that colony and the sale of liquor on election day was prohibited. There was no closing of shops, but just the use of a sign prohibiting the sale of liquor; almost any other article in the shops could be sold. I would like to make it clear that the sale of liquor at hotels would be forbidden. There is also the question of policemen being in a position to suppress any crowds, but I do not think that that would be necessary in Barbados. I am happy to see that the Government did not find it necessary to make provision for the use of symbols in order to distinguish candidates, for some people. It is depressing to find anybody putting his mark against a cow or something like that, at the polling booth on election day. I think that we, in Barbados, should be very happy that we have reached the stage where we do not have to vote for some symbol: that sort of thing reflects unkindly on any country. I have one or two suggestions to make when we go into Committee on this Bill and I hope that the Government will appreciate my feeling in respect of those suggestions when the Bill reaches that stage.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I regret that the opportunity has not been given us to have more than a day in which to read this Bill. I, personally, should like the opportunity to read the Bill a little more thorough-

ly and compare it with similar colonial legislation. As the position is now, what I have been forced to do is to read through the Bill very, very casually, listen to the observations of other honourable members and then make a few remarks. We are more or less——

Mr. ADAMS: The present attitude of the Government is that we should continue this debate up to 5.45 o'clock this afternoon and then adjourn until Thursday at 5 p.m. so that honourable members of the Executive Committee can come from the meeting of the Executive Committee and continue with this Bill. Honourable members will therefore have time to consider this Bill after today.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I appreciate that, but if we go into Committee on the Bill this afternoon we shall not be given the chance of commenting on it in general; we will only be able to comment on the various Clauses. What I particularly have in mind is that it would have been better if we had more time to pay to the general principle of the Bill. All of us are agreed that proper conduct of our elections is absolutely essential, but at the same time it does appear to me that, in many respects, the proposals in this Bill are unsatisfactory. To begin with, we are told that 14 days and not more than 21 days shall lapse between Nomination Day and Election Day; and the only reason given for that suggestion is that it will allow sufficient time for the printing of the ballot papers and so on. That is not good enough; there is no financial principle underlying the suggestion, there is no question of conserving the interests of democracy or of assisting in having the elections conducted in any better manner, and we know beforehand how many electors are in the colony. We shall have a fairly good idea as to how many candidates there will be before Nomination Day and I do not see why 14 days should elapse between Nomination Day and Election Day. All the facts of a person's Nomination Day remarks will have been forgotten in three weeks, and unless you have a lot of money to flood people with pamphlets after Nomination Day, where are you? If the Government could advance some justifiable reason for having the space of three weeks between Nomination Day and Election Day, other than suggesting that the printers to the Government will be unable to get sufficient equipment to expedite the handling of this matter, then we should be able to agree with the proposal; but it should not be merely a question of the convenience of the printers.

There are one or two other sections in this Bill, with which I do not agree. In section 32 it is set out that "when the poll is open upon polling day, no persons shall assemble or congregate within one hundred yards of any building in which is situate any polling station." I am submitting that that distance of 100 yards from the polling station is too much. Unless you have a lot of money to employ a body of canvassers, you have to do a lot of your canvassing on Election Day; a lot of us have had the experience of going actually to the steps of the polling station to ask a person to give you a vote. I am convinced that this section will penalise a candidate. There is also section 34 which says that "every person who . . . incites, combines or conspires with another to act in a disorderly manner with intent to prevent the transaction of the business of a public meeting called for the purpose of promoting the election of a candidate as a member to serve in the General Assembly, shall be guilty of an illegal practice and shall on conviction by a Court of Summary Jurisdiction be liable to a fine of one thousand dollars or to imprisonment for one year. . . ." An election is not a Sunday School meeting, and provided that no breach of the peace is committed, or any violence is done, there is no reason why, if a number of electors do not want to hear a

particular candidate, they should not say so. To fine a man \$1,000 or send him to prison for a year merely because he says: "I do not want So and So to talk here tonight" is absolutely fantastic. I have never heard that in all my life. I have not had the chance to compare this Bill with legislation existing elsewhere; it may be possible that a similar section is found in legislation somewhere else, but from looking at the matter today, I am of the opinion that we are going too far. After all, we are supposed to be democratic, and as long as the atmosphere does not degenerate into violence, like the throwing of stones and bottles and so on, it seems to me that one of the things which the public should be allowed to do is to prevent a candidate from speaking if they do not want to hear him. I am not suggesting that there should be any bloodthirsty revolutionary opposition taking place, but, after all, one of the attractions of an election campaign is to have a certain amount of opposition, high public spiritedness and so on, during the campaign. We are not electing bishops; we are electing politicians and the public should have full opportunity, without any undue reflection on any person, to express in the most emphatic manner how they feel about any matter or person connected with the election.

Similarly with section 35. That section says among other things: "No person shall, for the purpose of promoting or procuring the election of any candidate, hire any band of music." This section does not say whether these things should not take place during election day or during the campaign; that means that during the campaign you cannot hire any band of music, which is sheer stupidity. I agree that you do not want many rival bands within a small area, but it appears to me to be idiotic to prohibit any candidate from using any music during his election campaign. If you want to say that nobody should be allowed to carry any band of music and interrupt a rival candidate's meeting which is going on orderly, that is a different thing entirely. If the public have not signified their opposition to the holding of any meeting, by all means any candidate should be permitted to carry on unobstructed; but to lay it down that no person shall play any music in any procession six months before Election Day is farcical. Then section 36 (1) says:

"No person shall during an election call together, hold or address any election meeting in any public place unless notice of the intention to hold such meeting at such place has been given not less than three hours before the commencement of such meeting to the Officer of Police in charge of the parish in which such place is situated or to the Officer of Police in charge of the Police Station nearest to such place."

It has been my experience that candidates pass and hear other candidates holding a meeting and decide, because those candidates are making unfounded accusations against them, to go opposite and hold another meeting at the same time. Does this section mean that if you pass Mile & a Quarter at 7 o'clock and hear a rival candidate completely misinterpreting your action in the House on any particular Bill, you cannot voice one word against that? You must first give the Police three hours' notice and by that time everybody will have gone home! At any time of the day or night, election or no election, any person who preaches sedition or incites the disturbance of the peace, should be punished; if it can be proved that he preached treason or sedition or committed any criminal offence at an election meeting whether or not the Police had notice of the meeting, he should be prosecuted; but it does appear to me to be putting an undue and unnecessary imposition on candidates during election time in

compelling them always to give three hours' notice to the Police of any meeting which is to take place. That section of the Bill could not receive my support.

There might be other points in the Bill to which one should take objection in more detail later on, but just from the casual examination which I have given to the Bill, the points which I have made are some of the outstanding ones to which I regard it an obligation to express my opposition. I respectfully suggest that nothing, so far, has been said in support of those points either by the introducer of the Bill or by the seconder, and one waits with a certain amount of anticipation to hear the arguments which can be adduced by the proponents of those points and of the Bill itself.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker,—It is unfortunate that the return of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, the Leader of the House, should herald the practice of taking the Order Paper out of its order, and the pushing of matters which honourable members on this side of the table have not had the time to study and acquire proper knowledge about. I myself consider, as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said, that this Bill is not only important, but it is the most important piece of legislation that has come before this House for many a day. It is not statesmanlike for members of this side of the House to be given absolutely no opportunity to study such an important measure, especially when we know it is the habit of those whose job it is to copy these laws verbatim from the laws of other countries to include in many cases sections that are not applicable to Barbados. I regret very much that this is happening to-day. I sincerely hope that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will fix the Order Paper every Tuesday so that we will not be called upon to deal with important legislation completely out of its order. It is not proper and parliamentary conduct on the part of the Government. I have spoken on this matter over and over again, and I will continue to speak on it as long as I have a voice in these matters. It is unfair, and shows an unstatesmanlike lack of responsibility. It is in the realms of impossibility for any honourable member to have seen this bill for the first time at 6 o'clock yesterday evening, and to come here today and apply any sensible arguments in the debate on it. Now, Sir, from the few remarks that I have heard, and having been placed in this unenviable position, I will try to add something to the debate, which so far in my opinion has been lamentable owing to the fact that it was obviously not prepared. The only reason that we have been given so far for the introduction of this Bill is that it has been done in other West Indian Islands. I want a lot more reasoning than that. We have been holding the horses in this island for hundreds of years. We have now decided that our people are ripe for Adult Suffrage; but on the other hand we have decided that they are not ripe to shoulder such small civic responsibilities as refusing to accept a drink if it is offered to them. Well, sir, as the honourable junior member for St. Joseph said, there are many who are weak kneed; but if as my honourable colleague has said, it is unnecessary to have signs like a cow, a horse etc. for our people to put their marks against because we have passed that stage, then surely it is unnecessary to compel a man not to have a drink on Election Day. I think that point needs consideration. Because it is done in America, Trinidad or anywhere else, must it be done in Barbados? As far as I know it is not done in England — not that I am holding that up as

a criterion. Let us have some reason why these things have been placed before us today. Another thing is this: You are going to close all shops, clubs etc. as far as selling liquor is concerned on Election Day. But I have not had the time to look through the Bill and see how long Election Day is. I do not know if it is 24 hours, because you may change it and make it 48 hours. If those places are going to be closed on that day, and not on the night before, how easy would it be for me, or any candidate to purchase all the necessary liquor and take it home. I have seen no provision for that. What is the use of making a law which can be so easily broken.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The section says that liquor must not be sold or given away.

Mr. DOWDING: I am glad that you have brought it to my attention sir. It says: "No intoxicating liquor shall be sold, offered for sale or given away on any premises to which a license is issued under the Liquor License Act." Well, sir, my house or any candidate's house would not be licensed under the Liquor License Act. I must apologise, sir, if a provision for it is there; but I have not had the time to study the Bill, and I am only bringing out these points for the purpose of debate. However, it does seem a bit unnecessary to me to put in that section in order to prevent people from being offered rum. As far as I know, sir there is already a law to prevent a candidate offering rum or any other article. I personally cannot see how this section in this Bill will help the situation. There are some things in this Bill for which one must feel that there is something to be said. For example, there is a section which I have just read through and which I entirely agree with, although I hope that I shall never reach the stage where I or anyone whom I would vote for would have to malign in any way the family of any candidate or the candidate himself. But that is not in my opinion the most important point. The most important point for which I would have liked to see some provision, is a jail sentence for those who get on platforms and preach racial hatred in this beautiful island. Some people may well laugh. Perhaps that hits their conscience. There is another thing with which I am in entire agreement. I have practised it in the past with my employees, and I intend to practise it in the future, and I will preach it on every platform in this island. I am referring to the right of every employee to be given time off to be able to cast his vote for the candidate of his choice. That is something which in my opinion is due to every employee by every employer, and I make no bones about saying it here. I have spoken, sir, on the face of what I have seen here, not having been allowed to give the Bill any particular study. I hope, sir, that I have added something to the debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I want to tell the last honourable member who spoke that it appears that I have misled him as regards the giving away of liquor at private premises. I think that that will be treated under other legislation dealing with undue influence.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker—The honourable senior member for St. Joseph says that he hopes we on this side of the House will endorse the statement made as regards employers giving employees a chance to vote. I think that it would be monstrous if any employer, far from preventing any employee from casting his vote, did not assist him to have that chance. I do not think that such a thing would happen in these days. Apart from the morality of the thing, I think the employer, by hindering an employee in that way, would be actually

injuring the person he himself wanted to vote for. An hour should be enough time in which a man could cast his vote, especially with the polling stations as they will be now. I am going to suggest that we only speak on the second reading of this Bill, and approve the Bill in principle. In this case the principle of the Bill does not apply to the various provisions section by section. As you have heard, sir, there will be some amendments. I think that what we all agree to is that some such Bill as this should be passed as soon as possible. If we had had an opportunity of studying it a little earlier — it was denied us for various reasons — we might have been able to shorten this debate. As far as some of the sections of the Bill are concerned, I more than welcome them. When I look at Clause 25 dealing with the making of slanderous statements etc. and I see what my opponents have done, I wonder if it is a case of their sins coming home to roost, and their wanting to see that those sins do not rebound on them. At any rate, it is welcome. Responsibility is undoubtedly taking its due place in the community, and with that responsibility should come the enforcement of conducting elections in the way in which they should be conducted. On the other hand I would like to suggest to the honourable member in charge of the Bill — most likely he has noticed it — that in some cases the sections do not cover the alleged offences sufficiently. If that is so, perhaps he will himself look into that. For example, the sections dealing with liquor and bribery do not seem to be full enough, and also the one dealing with the giving of notices of meetings. No duty is laid on anyone to give this notice of the intention to hold a meeting. It is a small matter, and I am merely mentioning it. I hope that those members who have in mind amendments or objections to certain sections will come here when the sections are being dealt with, and repeat their arguments and give us good reasons for their views; because on the second reading of a Bill we cannot help or hinder them as long as the Chair allows them to comment on any particular section or sections. I have often found that after a certain amount of talk on the principle of a Bill, some honourable members will absent themselves, and as a result some particular section which could be amended is not dealt with. No one will claim that a Bill is so perfect that it cannot be amended as you go through it. There is a point about having a liquor licence. Now Section 28 makes it an offence to give a drink for the purpose of influencing an election. It seems strange that you should pick out the giving of a drink and not the giving of ham cutters. You are picking on one thing and not on the other. But that is only by the way. We will be able to discuss the Bill more thoroughly when we deal with it section by section. I heartily support it. I do not find anything to complain about except that I do think that the sections could be made tighter here and there. On the whole it is a good Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker—I must thank the last honourable member for speaking as he has about the Bill. I agree that there are sections which could be made tighter, not that that is any criticism of the Attorney General. I did not have an opportunity of reading the Bill until 9 or 10 o'clock last night, and it did appear to me that some sections might be strengthened here and there. This Bill is a necessary one. No one can agree with every possible suggestion. My colleague will move an amendment because he feels that 100 yards from the polling station is too near, just as the honourable member for

St. Philip thinks that it is too far. It is rather a nuisance having to canvas people on the door steps, and many of us will feel relieved that we cannot do it. Where bands are concerned, there are bands and bands. The honourable senior member for St. George believes in steel bands. I think they are an abomination. Different men, different minds. The thing that really brought me to my feet was to say that this is perhaps the first time that I have heard the honourable senior member for Christ Church for purely party purposes—he may not have definitely intended it—make the mistake of thinking that the Government was waiting on the honourable senior member for St. Andrew for a lead on anything. When the latter honourable member tabled an Address to the effect that the Central Government should undertake the expenses of the Elections and not the Vestry, I tried to stop him, and told him that the Government had already decided on that, and he should not waste time. But it was just like the case of the honourable senior member for the City and the Milton King Address. To some honourable members it does not matter if you say that the Government is doing a thing; they will still table an Address asking that it be done so that it may appear in the newspapers. Even if the Electors' Association were in power they should have enough intelligence to know that the Election Expenses should now be borne by the Central Government. There is nothing really to reply on, but there will be differences of opinion on this and that. I do not think that any point has been made against the principle of the Bill, and I do not think that so serious a point has been made against any particular section that we cannot get an agreement on it. There are possible omissions, especially in connection with the question of candidates' expenses. That has got to be worked in. If after consulting with the other members of the Executive Committee it is considered appropriate to put in the four or five sections dealing with the matter, I will try to have cyclo-styled copies in the hands of honourable members by to-morrow afternoon. These sections will provide for how much per head of voters a candidate is allowed to spend. In the Jamaica Legislation no expense may be incurred in relation-

ship to the candidature of any person. £500. The sections will also deal with what may arise as corrolaries or personal living of a candidate during the election period. He may have to go and live at Bathsheba for the purpose of running an election in St. Joseph. The question to be dealt with is whether he can put in hotel bills as part of his expenses or whether he must exclude those bills. Anyone who gives away anything for the purpose of influencing a voter to vote for any particular candidate commits an offence. That also applies to the people who give away jobs. The giving of jobs is one of the greatest means of bribery. It does not apply to people who give lunches for their constituents; not that you can give lunches or dinners for them every Sunday. Even gifts of fowls, turkeys etc. if for the purpose of influencing a voter is bribery, and so is the giving of free legal or medical advice. There is nothing more that I can say at this stage. I will move the adjournment of this debate and then the adjournment of the House.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put to the House and agreed to *nem. con.*

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I am making this Bill the first Order of the Day at the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Thursday next at 5.30 p.m.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

ERRATUM

In Debates of Tuesday, 19th June, 1951, on page 891, Column 1, line 21, from bottom, please read "MR. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,—I do not think" etc., etc. in place of "MR. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I do not think" etc., etc.