

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21st January, 1962.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. N. W. BOXILL and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of the 17th December last year have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and if there is no objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a Pause*). Hearing no objection, I declare the Minutes of that Meeting to be now confirmed.

In respect of the Minutes of the meeting of the 7th January this year, my attention has been drawn to an important omission in those Minutes. I do not now seek the confirmation of those Minutes which will have to be corrected.

Honourables W. A. CRAWFORD, J. C. TUDOR and A. DaC. EDWARDS entered the House and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to lay an account of the transactions in Rum in the Several Districts of the Island for the Quarter ended 31st December, 1963.

Mr. SEALAY entered the House and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$780 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64 No. 45 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

QUESTIONS

The following Notices of Questions were given:-

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Government aware that the dumping of garbage is now considered an uneconomical and outmoded process which has been superseded by converting garbage into fertilizers and selling it?

2. Will the Government make the necessary enquiries from the Government of Jamaica re the organization and working of the Jamaican Organic Fertilizer Company Limited which has been granted pioneer status in that territory for this purpose?

3. If the Government is not interested in this modern and highly profitable garbage disposal, will the Minister state the reason for this lack of interest?

Mr. GODDARD entered the House and took his seat.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next series of questions are in the name of the hon. and learned member for St. James, who, I observe, is not in his place.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the money Resolution of which I gave notice earlier today.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 103 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, is ready.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 140 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 143 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is ready.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution has as its purpose the supplementing by \$7,500 of the current Capital Estimates under the Ministry of Education, Head 6 — Education, Item 5 — Technical Institute, and the reason for this supplementary provision as required is that the Government proposes to set up a training school for the better equipping of hotel employees. This is in the interest of the tourist industry.

Tourism has for many years now been a very important part of community earnings, and it has grown not only in volume but in quality. In recent years from very small beginnings, we have managed in this Island to establish a very highly important industry which has worked wonders for our economy, and which, as we think, will do even more for it. However, for some time we have also reached the conclusion that if our tourist industry is to expand in the way it should, there has got to be a very much greater degree of skill and technique imparted to those who work in the tourist industry, particularly those who work in hotels and in the catering trade. It is true, of course, that there is training of a sort and has been for some time, but the training of hotel employees has been by no means systematized as it should be; and since it now seems to be the case all over the world that people who work in tourism are regarded as people who should acquire the highest possible degree of skill, it is unreasonable to suppose that in this Island our tourist industry should be suffered to lack that degree of training necessary to make it a first class venture; and so with the setting up of a hotel school, we have decided to establish under the administration of the Technical Institute a school to provide training for existing and prospective hotel employees.

We would like these training courses to begin early in the next financial year — if all goes well from the 1st April — and if what we look forward to in that respect is to come about, we must purchase some very necessary capital equipment within this current financial year. To that end we are asking for a sum of \$7,500 to get the necessary capital equipment, furniture, demonstration material and what not in order to make the start for hotel training at the beginning of the next financial year. I should also like to tell hon. members that with the approval of the Cabinet, I propose to set up a Hotel Training Advisory Committee to advise not only on training which is to start in a few months, but to advise me on this whole question of how best and how most efficiently we can put this whole question of hotel training on its most advantageous footing, and that Advisory Committee — and I want to emphasise that it is purely advisory — will consist of two representatives of Government, one of whom will be Chairman of the Advisory Committee, two representatives of the Barbados Hotels Association, one representative of the Tourist Board, and two other persons whom I shall put on in my discretion. I am hoping that with the constant assistance of the Hotel Advisory Committee, though they will have no statutory authority, its members will still nevertheless be people of sufficient knowledge and experience to give valued advisory service to the Ministry, and to hold an informal but still important watching brief over the whole question of hotel training.

I think we are on to something, Mr. Chairman, which has untold possibilities. It is common ground, at least I hope it is among us, that in attracting people to these shores on holiday or at any other time of the year we want to make them feel as happy and as comfortable as possible, and the provision of comfort in the tourist industry is now no longer a matter of chance, but a matter of skill. The preparing and serving of food can no longer be left to chance; and if people who come to our shores are to get their money's worth, and if in addition to that they are to receive what one might call valuable instruction in our ways and customs and our manner of living, not the least part of that instruction must be the way in which we prepare our foods and the way in which we serve them.

12.35 p.m.

That, apart from anything else, is the most important aspect of this matter. But there is more to it than that, of

course. There is the more important question of providing the sort of services on the highest possible level of expertise to make visitors feel this is a worthwhile exercise and he is receiving *quid pro quo*.

I think, happily for us in Barbados, we have never had that conception of tourism which obtains in other places that all we want to get out of tourists is their dollar and give nothing in return. All over the world, praises are sung that we do provide the services which we ought to provide, and by and large people who visit this Island as tourists can give us a good report on the manner in which we treat our guests and the comforts which we provide for them.

It is because we wish to see these high standards maintained, and because we do not wish to see this trade slipping away, that we feel we must put this whole matter on a systematic basis, and that people in the hotel industry operate their business in the best possible way. In the Old Testament, Mr. Chairman, if you will forgive me, there is a very frightening example of what hotel training ought not to be. There was a man called Sisera who escaping from the heat of battle went out to find himself in the home of a woman called Jael; and, unnerved and exhausted as he was, he relied on her very much to provide that sustenance which an exhausted tourist ought to have; and the first part of the exercise which she paid him was that she brought him butter in a lordly dish and she gave him milk; but unfortunately, when he fell asleep, she drove a tent peg in his head. Anyone who keeps hotels will always make it possible to make butter brought to their guests in a lordly dish, but would wish to escape having a tent peg pushed in their heads.

Sir, I commend this Resolution to this Hon. Committee.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Sir, I am very pleased to see at last that a Resolution of this nature has come to the House. Although I do not like to remind hon. members of efforts which were made to have this industry put on a sound footing, I know in 1952, we tabled in the House an effort to encourage the Government of that day to realise that this Tourist Industry was something to seriously consider. Among the proposals which we put to them was the establishment of a hotel training school because it was inevitable that we would have to have one. In everything which we are putting our youngsters to do, it is wise to give them some training in the job which they are to embark on. A youngster leaves school, and when he gets to the age of 18 years or 19 years, he drifts into a hotel and applies for work. There is nowhere for him to take his training, but he presents himself in a white suit and a pair of pumps and he says that he wants work. It is only from observation that you can hire him, because the management of a hotel cannot undertake the training of their staff.

You may say that the management of a hotel should busy themselves in the establishment of such a school. This has been attempted from time to time, a measure of training has been given; but there are many phases of hotel work such as a maid's work in making up a bed and the provision of a clean bedroom. That is the most important part of it.

I am not a hotel manager, but I do know that we are embarking today on something which would assist the industry quite considerably. The Management of hotels are always on the lookout for efficient workers, and the conditions of employment for workers in our hotels are good and they are well paid by Barbadian and West Indian standards.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see that there are groups, not from any one section, but from every section seeking to enter the hotel industry as a career, that is to say, from the management back down to the lowest paid worker. I know that there are openings for all these people, and hotels can employ people from all walks. Unfortunately, today, the season is short and at the end of March or April quite a good number has to be laid off. This laying off

also coincides with the beginning of the harvesting of our crops.

However, Sir, we do hope if we can provide good services and adequate services at reasonable rates — and that is important — that we will be able to attract North Americans to these shores in the summer. Today, there are aeroplanes flying at the rate of 600 miles an hour and you can get from Toronto to Barbados in a matter of hours. Another good thing is that airline rates are coming down, especially in the summer, and we do hope that in the very near future we will be able to make a break through in that aspect and that would make the hotel trade more economic. If that happens a transformation would take place, and then you will see the industry on the move. We have a lot to offer the tourists in the matter of service, but there are many things which still can be done. The hotel amenities are not enough; therefore, you would have to do other things to attract tourists. You can provide the establishment of a botanical garden somewhere for the people to go and see places, somewhere for them to move around — even that they would be able to visit other West Indian Islands.

I hope in the very near future that the other Islands would be so developed in the industry that tourists would be able to leave here and go to, say, St. Vincent, and enjoy the tropical scenery there and return to Barbados and finish off their tour. Then, there is such a thing as night life, but it must be clean and varied.

Sir, I cannot enumerate the number of things which I wish to see done. But what I wish most to emphasise is that we must give good accommodation in our hotels, good services and good attraction both by day and by night. We want established someone who can come along and organise game fishing; someone who can take these people out on fishing trips. This is done in Bermuda; but unfortunately for Barbados, this aspect is not as good here as it is in Bermuda. We have not got the shoals to provide good game fishing.

12.45 p.m.

I commend the Government on this matter at this stage, and I do know that the hoteliers will co-operate to the full whether by means of lending instructors from the hotels or by other means. Mr. Chairman, this is a good beginning and I commend the Government on it. I wish it well.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest and care to the introduction of this Resolution by the Hon. Minister. There is no quarrel where we are concerned with this Resolution, although we are spending a considerable sum of money on tourism. There is the idea of making use of the Technical Institute for the training of numbers of our people who are working with the London Transport and as domestics elsewhere. I do believe that one would arrive at the figure of \$7,500 based on the cost of the equipment which would be required. I do not know whether this decision was arrived at in collaboration with the Hotel Association and the hoteliers in Barbados and at least some members of the Barbados Workers' Union. We are carrying out this matter at some cost to the Government, and one would imagine that there would be little room for training for the existing and prospective hotel industry. The Hon. Minister is interested in the preservation of food, and I quite agree with him that we must pay some attention to this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I got the impression that this scheme was hatched in the breast of the Hon. Minister, that he himself had decided on this matter and then he got the approval of the Cabinet. It may be that the Hon. Minister would enlighten us further on this matter and let us know whether this decision was a decision of the Cabinet or the Committee after much discussion and collaboration with members of the Hotel industry and the Barbados Workers' Union. For the growth of this industry I take it that the Hon. Minister must agree with me.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to support a Resolution of this sort because I feel that it is a wise step which the Government is taking to train the youth of

this country; but what I would like the Minister to know is that we, as the representatives of the parish of St. Joseph, are still anxiously awaiting the fulfilment of his promise relative to the St. Elizabeth's Village School. Before you can carry out one person to train him, he should have an elementary knowledge; there is no use in our trying to train anybody who does not have any education at all. We have been made a promise by the Hon. Minister relative to the school in St. Elizabeth's Village, at which school the children can only get half a day's learning as a result of the bad repairs of the school. I would like to point out to the Hon. Minister that if it is possible they should make an addition to the existing school where the children will be able to enjoy a whole day's learning. Just to be going on with half a day's learning for so long is a very bad thing and I would like the Hon. Minister to do something about this matter as soon as possible.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, while commending this venture I should like to say that it is about time that somebody draws to the attention of the Government as well as to the attention of the hotel owners in Barbados that they are pricing themselves out of the market. I must commend the hon. junior member for Christ Church on the statement which he has made with regard to reasonable rates. I think it is unfair to ask a man to pay an amount of money, whatever it may be, to come to Barbados, and then when he goes to certain hotels on the West Coast, he is asked to pay a dollar for a coke. That is what I would call robbery with a "V" — robbery with violence. It is rather unfair to expect people, who can get a coke in their home town for ten cents, to have to pay one dollar for that coke in Barbados. A man comes here and he likes Barbados — which is a good little country with quite a number of amicable residents; but when he goes to some of these West Coast hotels they are pricing themselves out of the field. These hotels are charging exorbitant rates per day for boarding and then they are charging exorbitant fees for lodging.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that that is at all fair when the Government has been asked to make a grant of half a million dollars to help the tourist industry. I can say without fear that the members of the Tourist Board have not left any stone unturned in their endeavours to try and get tourists to Barbados. They have done everything that they possibly could do to get them here. I believe that this tourist season would be the brightest in the history of Barbados. But, Sir, if we allow these people to go on as they are going on, charging these exorbitant rates, they are really out to kill the goose which is laying the golden egg. As you know, Sir, the tourist industry is next to our sugar industry and we cannot therefore allow a few managers or directors, just for their selfish gains, to run all the tourists from Barbados.

I should like to say, Sir, that today in 1964 is not like in the 1920's when only the idle rich could afford to go on a tourist trip. Nowadays you have ordinary workers like yourself and myself who make use of their insurance money for the purpose of going abroad, and some of these workers go abroad on the "Pay Later" plan.

12.55 p.m.

It is hard to expect these people to come here and be really throwing around money as in the days of Mr. Pomeroy. Those were the days known as the good old days, and we do not have those days now. Everybody must work for what he wants. It is true that I will never, ever agree with this Government or any Government interfering with private enterprise. It is the only way you get good competition. But, at the same time, it would be stupid for me to see a thing like this happening and not tell these people. I cannot go to St. James and shout it out; so I think here is the best place for me to say it. If they do not stop this stupidity in trying to kill the golden goose, they are going to find themselves eventually with a lot of hotels in Barbados established on the West Coast with only workers in them; then it would not be profitable to themselves, to the workers or to the community as a whole.

Another thing I should draw to the Government's attention is that I want hoteliers to realise that it is another

unfair practice for a management to be sharing in the 10% profit which they charge the guests. That was specifically because the bell boys are not being tipped now as they formerly used to be, and was to be shared among the staff, not management. I do hope they will hear what I am saying and stop this practice, because if the manager is sharing in the small profits they get in the boxes, he is not going to share it equally; he is going to take out the manager's portion, and then what is left will be divided among the other men. The manager, I am sure, is already well paid — some of them in my opinion are overpaid — and it is not right that he should be sharing in this extra 10% profit which they charge the guests.

While on this there is another very important point of which I want the Government to take heed. Sometimes when tourists come here, especially if the ships happen to dock in the Careenage, they will ask the police at the gate what are the rates and he tells them \$3 an hour; but sometimes a taxi driver in order to get the job will underscore another taxi driver and arrange to drive these people for \$2 an hour. It is rather unfair because it makes the police look as though he is collaborating with someone to rob the tourists. If the police tells a man it is \$3 an hour, and another man comes up and says he will do the same job for \$2.00 an hour, the tourist begins to get suspicious about the police. This is putting the police in a rather tight spot. Here is where I feel that just as you pass legislation to charge a taxi-driver for overcharging someone, there should be legislation to charge a taxi-driver for underpricing. I am sure they are not training these men at these schools because of Barbadians; they are training them for the tourist industry, because if the hotels were left to Barbadians, I am sure they would not be hotels. They would be places like Harry's.

I should like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing that it would be a good idea to ask the Department of Highways and Transport to put a roller on the carpark outside the Harbour to make it more level so that it would not go so hard on the wear and tear of the taxis. It is a rather ungodly sight right now and it is very hard on the taxis. Inside the Harbour itself, there is another ungodly sight of which I spoke some time ago. (Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot say 'ungodly' in a debate.) There is another unsightly looking place inside the Harbour; the shed down there where people sell their wares is a very unhealthy looking sight, and I do hope that something can be done to erect a proper shed instead of having these bits of old wood stuck up. As you are beautifying the place, it would be better to build a little shed, not only for the tourists, but because it needs to be beautified for the people who live here, and I happen to live here. I would be glad if they would try to erect something where these people can stand and sell their wares.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get back to the debate with which we were dealing, and that is to provide a training school for hotel workers. I find that the debate has gone the rounds as to prices charged by taxi drivers, and there is even a suggestion to impose what would be a very outrageous legislative penalty if someone is so ignorant to charge less than the prescribed charge. I think that comes from members who do not pay enough study to what they are going to say. One member has even brought you up from St. Bernard's School which has now become another matter. Though we are talking about schools, it seems that you can talk about anything in the debate, because you would at least think that a member would have in a sentence addressed his mind to the main item in the Resolution which is to provide a training school for hotel workers. What I would say is that I commend this Resolution, and I would throw out a warning. But I would not throw out the warning we have been hearing about how hotels are priced and that they will price themselves out of business, because some people like exclusive living, and those who want to barge in with the exclusive would have to pay for what the exclusive want; those who want the moderate would pay what the moderate want, and those who want no standard at all will find their own level. That is in a general way; but in a specific way I agree with the Hon. Minister in the idea of training, and I hope that in this idea of training em-

ployers do not make the wrong conception. I will say incidentally that the hon. member on my immediate left, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, must marshal his facts that fall outside the field of legislation. Members of this Assembly have been parading for many years in the fields that really do not come within the province of the House, but some members of the House have this glorified idea about membership in here, that because you are elected to the House, you are also elected to preside even sometimes over the private destinies of people in their own private capacities, and some people like to even slaughter and assassinate people in their own private capacities. I will say to the hon. member that he must not begin to believe that in an industrial relations matter which he does not really understand he can say in a pontifical manner that the 10% which is being charged is taken out by the managers of the places. He must not get confused between managers and management. (Mr. BOXILL: I did not say "managers", I said "management".) The hon. member precisely said that no manager should take out.....

Mr. BOXILL: On a point of order,

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot get up and snatch the thing out of my hand.
1.05 p.m.

Mr. BOXILL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALCOTT: Why?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not go in for this sort of burlesque behaviour.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas has risen on a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am a serious man. No hon. member should rise in the House of Assembly in that off-hand manner. We can be friendly, but jokes have a limit in so far as how they can be introduced in Parliament. I am not joking in debates. When I am in a debate I am serious. You cannot rise on a point of order and in doing so pull the microphone from in front of me.

Mr. BOXILL: I am sorry that I pulled the microphone from in front of the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman, my point of order is, that my friend the hon. senior member for St. Peter seems to think that I said "manager" in the course of my remarks. I said "management".

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I will hate to press him to have his speech read back because he said "managers". He said "that some are too well paid". What is the point in his now saying that he did not say "managers"? He said both "management" and "managers".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas did say "managers".

Mr. WALCOTT: He said, also, that they were well paid and the people did not come off to all they have said. (VOICES: Order, Order.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am still listening to the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. WALCOTT: If the hon. member is so positive that he still says that he did not say "Manager", I am sure that even if that part of his speech is read back that he would say that the Reporter wrote down something which he did not say.

However, I say that this broad statement is on a different basis. I can say that because I have had dealings with some of the people in this matter and there is no agreement where managers take out gratuities for themselves. "Management" is a broad term. Management deals with

somebody who is working in the desk; and those of us who have paid attention to the running of hotels in Europe and other places know that in Europe, gratuities are included in service charges by law and it is not confined to persons who work as waiters, or to those who work in the kitchen and in the service trades only. You get people in the service trades who work as cashiers and who have to give information to guests, and you deal with these things on an escalator basis where a certain percentage is taken out as gratuity.

What is unfair to other members of the staff where there is no service charge in operation is that the food supplied to guests is cooked by persons in the kitchen, but the guests never see those persons. You must consider that as not fair. Again, a guest can go to the Bar and the person who serves that guest with drinks does not know anything about the mixing of the drinks; but as regards the barman who mixes the drinks, nobody knows him and he never gets a tip.

Sir, I have just mentioned that to show that it is a bit more complicated to discuss in the House of Assembly than with the people who have to negotiate with the people in the industry, and who deal with them on a closed basis.

Although the hon. junior member for St. Thomas may have had something to do with hotels in the past, the days are long past when he has had anything to do with them. I heard the hon. junior member for Christ Church say something in his remarks, and I think this must be removed from the employers' minds that the employers are too busy doing other things, and therefore, they cannot train staff. This is a question of training, according to the hon. member, and he is glad that the Government has taken it on. I have the honour to sit on a Committee dealing with trade and industrial matters and I am not going to say what this Committee is doing; but I would say that I represent an organisation which believes in industrial and vocational training, and the technological changes taking place in the world today are so many that you have to be training people for these changes and in order to make them adaptable. I have always said that in the second part of this century you are going to get different things taking place from what there were in the first part; therefore, what I would like the Hon. Minister to insist on and to begin to project — I hope that we project it too — is that after this Committee has reported, employers must understand that in any vocational training they have an important part to play in its formation and in its continuation. Too few employers want to utilise their building only for utility purposes, but within the very sector of the economy they do not want to provide any portion of land or space for what can be basic in training. I say, that is not good enough. In the United Kingdom the Government is dealing with a Bill for industrial training and it proposes to spend something like £50 million on it. If it is not £50 million, it is some fantastic figure like that. However, within that Bill itself, they are calling upon the employers in the industry to make a contribution and they are doing so by means of a levy on the employers.

Sir, I am going to say that where the Government provides a basic and fundamental training for any given industry, the industry should be required by law to make a positive contribution to the upkeep of that industry, that school or that organisation. There is no point in your saying that you want a hotel school without stating what part are you going to play in the financial contribution to that school when the Government is playing its part in providing the basic education and in implementing and stimulating vocational training so that the nation itself will benefit from it.
1.15 p.m.

I cannot subscribe to the idea that the hotel owners of this country should make money and do not make positive financial contributions to specific needs. Hotel Training Schools are for hotels mainly; you do not train a boy in a hotel for him to work in the docks or in a store or in any other industry. This will underlie all basic concepts of vocational and industrial training. The Government should make it clear to people who are insisting on this kind of vocational training that they must of necessity be prepared

to make a positive financial contribution to the upkeep of these things. It is not a question of just sending advisers or asking help from people who can train others, but there must be a financial contribution made by these hotel people because this is a job which will provide you with the technical assistance which you require. That is assistance which is very valuable.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in this Training School for these hotel people in its broadest form. When we give people training like this, we do hope that, in the process of time, these people will have a broad knowledge of certain basic things which they will require if these boys and girls and men and women will undergo this training. I do not want to make any open criticism of our hotel management because all of these hotels are passing through a transition period. I have already said in this House — and I will repeat — that I would like to see hoteliers in Barbados getting down to the understanding that Barbados is a community with coloured people or black people predominantly or people other than those of the European race. It is a stupid concept that you are perpetuating the idea that this is a white business and that you will have only a staff of black waiters, black dish-washers and cooks; but when it comes to the other sections of your employment you want to preserve that for fair-skinned people or imported people. I am positively against the idea of importing people here to serve as Clerks and in employment of that nature. It is an insult to the educational position in Barbados that you have to bring in English, Canadian or American people here to act as Receptionists, that in Barbados you cannot find people who are equipped to perform such services.

The Hilton Hotel is coming here. I have been to countries where the Hilton Hotels are operating. I have been to Berlin where there are hotels in operation and it would be fantastic to bring an American girl to place her in a Hilton Hotel in Berlin. They will find sufficient girls in Berlin to do the job. I do not subscribe to this position of inferiority in Barbados. I regard that in any community you have evil people, and in Barbados you have more evil black people than white people because the black population is greater than the white one. The white people will get the black people to do certain things because they feel that they will get the things done better. However, Sir, in a place with a redundant population and in a place which is exporting human beings, when you are doing that, you are importing unemployment. That is what you are doing when you bring people into Barbados to do jobs which Barbadians can do. We cannot afford to do that. The hotels must face this broad question. If you want to operate in Barbados, if you want to have these Trade Schools, we are not going to have these schools only to supply the hotels with dish-washers, cooks, gardeners and sweepers; we expect the hotels to be staffed from top to bottom, not only with Clerks, but with Managers or Manageresses who are capable of running businesses in Barbados. If you cannot invest money in Barbados and utilise the talent in the country which you are adopting as the place in which you are making money, then you should not adopt the country at all.

I am not a pussy-footing Barbadian who feels that because I ask for aid you must give me aid with all sorts of tentacles placed around my neck. I have no objection to a hotel bringing in in some instances, managers, because I realise that there are aspects of colonialism which exist in Barbados. The community of Barbadians has not yet been emancipated from the idea that any black man cannot be their boss. They still belong to the slave era in which they feel that orders should come from the white boss. Some people believe that a black Bishop would not be a real Bishop at all, but that he would be a play-play Bishop, as I used to see down at the Black Star Line. (Laughter). In the same way, some people believe that a black doctor cannot be a real doctor. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it will take a little time to get over this state of affairs because some servants will tell you definitely that they do not like to work for black people; they feel that black people should not give them any orders. That is a sociological analysis of the temperament of the average Barbadian worker. That has been accepted by some employers because some of them say that it is difficult to get one of their own people to employ because they have no respect for them.

As an hon. member has said, sometimes we have to project things a little in advance. The Hon. Minister is fortunate that in anything he proposes to do, he will get the utmost support from industrial quarters. I did not hear quite clearly what the hon. junior member for St. George said about our Organization, but I want to say, Sir, that our Organization does not need to have any favours. My Organization has been accorded recognition; and if it comes to the question that advice is required from my Organization in matters relating to labour or in industrial matters or matters in which labour would have to play a part, the Government, and in particular the Minister of Education, has shown a very keen interest in the Barbados Workers' Union.

1.25 p.m.

I would mention here, because it is a school, that the Minister in his own planning proposes a Trade Union Industrial Labour College in this Island, not for the Barbados Workers' Union, but for the training of people in industrial relations matters, and all the techniques that will be required to make industrial development possible; so I hope that it will be supported with the same ardour with which this Resolution was supported. I feel that the hon. junior member for Christ Church is sufficiently emancipated to know that the remarks he made are not personal remarks. I meet the hon. junior member for Christ Church around a table, and I would say here as I say there that I do not believe that a small community like Barbados can go any longer on this dividing line between white and black in the question of industrial employment. We may carry that to a certain extent in our social life, but that would disappear in the process of time, because the biological processes of nature would make them disappear. You only have to begin at one stage, and all the superficialities about that will disappear; but in industrial employment and in our behaviour in industrial and public life, I believe that must be a memory, and we must positively put our foot down on it that we cannot face an issue like that in a community like this. I feel there should be no further importation of any type of labour in Barbados whether the labour be white, black, blue, pink or green, if that labour is available in Barbados. Moreover, I feel it is an affront to this community to be importing labour into Barbados on any pigmentation basis to take jobs on the guise that you cannot get people here to do them. If you want to start here you can give preference to white, but do not bring an English girl because there are some here whom you can employ, though they may not want to do that type of work since it is not acceptable to everyone.

I say that, Mr. Chairman, because I want to put this on the highest level. I feel without any objections to any strangers, without any objections to an Englishman, American or Canadian, that you should not import labour. I should like to say, however, that some of my best friends are non-Barbadians in public and sometimes in private. I am involved in a national crisis in my own country, and I have had the privilege of receiving from an Englishman only yesterday something which I doubt any Barbadian of my own colour would have the guts to write to me at this time. I could not bring that Englishman to work in the Trade Union in Barbados because our friendship is on a different basis. It is not a friendship based on employment because he can be employed in England or quite easily in Europe as against a Barbadian who is finding it difficult to find a job in Barbados. I say that because ignorance is at a premium in Barbados, and when you make a speech like this, the most outrageous and slanderous and ignorant statements would be made after the speech is taken out of the context of what you say, and some ignorant person would meet me at a cocktail party and take up my whole evening with an amount of ignorant talk that I say Englishmen should not come here or that I do not like white people, and then that begins to gain currency around Bridgetown. I am a character whom that part would not worry. You say these things, however, not to satisfy the ignorant, but to make a statement which is likely to be involved more intelligible. If you want progress in a community, you cannot have industrial progress based on colour.

Mr. Chairman, if I ran a business and had an ignorant son, I do not have any more obligation to my ignorant son

reducing the business to pauperism as I would have to a white boy or anybody else running it, and I would say that people in business here have to drop that idea of paternalism. By all means you have to try to help your own. If you have an ignorant son running a business, you had better put him on charity and let somebody with sense run the business; if not the business will fail and both of you will be in a charitable institution. Charity begins at home only in the case where he is capable of running the business. The community in Barbados is roped around a small ring of families, and if you perpetuate this idea, a man only has to breed about three ignorant children and therefore it presupposes that in the next 75 years you will have to run out, unless you go and commit some felony to get rid of them rather than wait on the natural processes. I have had the experience of working with a man who had an ignorant son that was not fitted for business, but because he had to project his son into the business, it failed, because his idea was *ipso facto* that his son must start off as boss. That son in the community today does not make half the contribution that I can make because he had the wrong father. I say that, Mr. Chairman, because in this hotel business there are a lot of family affairs going on, and I say that with the exception of the hon. junior member for Christ Church and his family who have made good success, but I must admit that it is very difficult when you work in a family firm to be able to penetrate through the sound barrier of the races. It is all right for the family, but it is not all right for the community as a whole, because if by some misfortune any of us have to work in the hon. member's family firm, where do you see yourself other than in 2089 ever coming through, because from their family tree they can run a business for the next 100 years without in any way losing the very first name of the Goddards, without even getting down to the other names where the daughters become married.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken longer on this than I would have, but there were comments made by my colleague and friend, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, not with any wicked feeling about them, but they are likely to give a slant on this gratuity business that he might not intend and then tomorrow somebody may come up with the correction that the managers are getting 10%. He did not mean the 'managers', but parts of the 'management'. What I would like to correct is that I do not think nor do we in the Union consider that there is anything wrong with persons whom we regard as management — that is those who are not working on the floor — getting some of the gratuity, because it is distributed on a percentage basis. They do not share the gratuities on an equal basis; you have an escalator clause, because the highest percentage is to go among the greatest number of people. The hon. member said "managers" when he meant "management". As far as I can remember, he said that he knows that managers get.

1.35 p.m.

I do not know of any place; we do not have anything as regards managers taking out anything for gratuity for themselves. We know of places where the lady who works at the desk is entitled to something, that is to say, that she would not get a gratuity but some percentage.

Sir, what I would like to explain to hon. members is that the total amount of money is put into a pool, and a percentage of it is allocated to various sections of the workers. Obviously, you give the biggest percentage to the place with the biggest section of workers. For example, I was at the Blue Waters Hotel some time ago, and the Manager told me what they did. What he said is something which all of us would be willing to support. He said that the manager is paid a salary all the year round and he gets other gratuities.

This idea of a training school for hotel workers is a sound one and I hope it will get the full co-operation and support from the employers. I can assure the Hon. Minister that we, in the Union, will give our wholehearted support.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I just only would like to say that the points raised by hon. members on the

other side are very well taken and I probably would make only two comments.

The first is that this matter has only come to my Ministry as a matter of administration purposes, but it was supported and carried through to its conclusion by the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour under whom the negotiations of the whole business to do with it more properly comes. It so happens that under the Ministry of Education, there is the Technical Institute which possesses the facility which the training school can use, and since the Technical Institute is going to have the general oversight it has been transferred to this Ministry. For those reasons, it must not be supposed that we are at the beginning of negotiations on this matter. We are at the end, and that is why we came to the House with a certain amount of hard work behind us. The Hotel Association both individually and collectively will be contributing quite substantially to this venture and certainly by the provision of part-time instructors. There are chefs, head barmen, senior maids and housekeepers who will, from time to time, be joining in these exercises to assist the other instructors and they are quite willing to allow some of their equipment to be used from time to time for the purpose of instruction. I did not think it expedient to give these details at this stage because we are only asking for a capital grant. When we came to deal with the Estimates, I would, of course, give the House the full details.

On the second point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, naturally, it can be said without fear or favour that this Government would not, in any case, assist foreigners where it is manifestly clear that Barbadians can fulfil the obligations required of them. Therefore, the Government does not have to hedge on this matter. We are certainly not pleased about certain aspects of hotel employment. We feel that the points raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter deserve very careful attention, and it is not part of our policy to encourage people from Canada, the U.S.A., or any other place for that matter, to come here to take up jobs which Barbadians can discharge quite fully.

As I have said, more details will be given when the Current Estimates come before the House and, in the meantime, all that has been said by hon. members on the other side would be given very careful attention.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$7,500 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1963-64 No. 44

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$450 is required for books and stationery and for travelling under the Head, Statistical Service. As far as I have been given to understand, as regards the item for books and stationery, the Statistical Services undertook some work to do for the Windward and Leeward Islands and that is the reason why this item has been overspent. I believe that part of this amount is recoverable, but I am not quite sure at this stage, because final accounts have not been concluded. Then again, this Department is called upon to undertake a greater selection of statistics and surveys which necessitated considerably more travelling and it is estimated that additional provision of \$250 will be required for this financial period.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

WEST INDIES HOSPITAL FUNDS LIMITED BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister: Second reading of a Bill to provide for the operation in the Island of a Company to be known as the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited and for various matters connected therewith.
1.45 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the Second reading of a Bill which is intitled an Act to provide for the operation in this island of a company to be known as the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited, and for various matters connected therewith. Notice of this Bill was given during my absence from this island by the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, and a lot of misunderstanding was created by hon. members who got the impression that the Government was trying to stampede this Bill through the Legislature. That is far from the truth. The understanding was that the promoters of the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited were ready to pay the licence fee, which amounts to something like half a million dollars, into the Treasury and there was an unfortunate misunderstanding that this had to be done before the end of the year. It is supposed to be done before the end of the year, but the year happens to be the financial year, not the calendar year. As long as this Bill gets through the Legislature before the 31st March, the Government is in no hurry to prevent hon. members from making a thorough study of this Bill.

Sir, I do not like to make the introduction of Resolutions of Bills by going on the defensive for something which does not have to be defended. The general public knows the attitude of this Government in relation to casino gambling; for sociological and other reasons the Government does not consider it desirable at this time or at any time in the immediate future — not the foreseeable future because we are not gifted with prophesy; but certainly the Government is not considering casino gambling like the other Governments which have promoted that type of gambling. If casino betting is the only way in which we can capture the second largest trade, then the Government may have to consider that question; but I do not see the Government considering that question in any short time to come.

The rationale of this Bill is based not on tourism, but on different considerations altogether. You will notice that the Hon. Minister of Social Services recently made a statement to the effect that the operation of the New Hospital would involve the Government in an additional expenditure of some one million dollars per annum. Therefore the Government has two alternatives; it has to re-forecast the means of financing or impose additional taxation. The tax base of this economy is from income; people are always crying out for social services and they expect the Government to perform miracles when we cannot even print our own currency so that we could inflate the fiduciary issue in the interest of the expansion of our economy. As Minister of Finance, it is my duty to raise money for the carrying on of services, not only the services which we have undertaken in our programme of the expansion of our educational facilities and so on, but services which were left as being recurrent or as a burden on the Treasury of this island, one of such services being the Barbados General Hospital. We have free medical services and free medicine in Barbados. Not only are we giving free medical attention or free medicine from the Central Government or from the Local Government, but we have undertaken to send people for what would be in other circumstances expensive operations to some of the best institutions in North America, in the neighbouring territories of Trinidad and Jamaica. We cannot now say that because we are a country with a relatively low income per capita, we must cut down the hospital services and our educational services; and the community has to make up its mind as to whether they will trifle with political matters and anything which the Government

introduces and find some opposition to it or whether they will put their hands deep down in their pockets and pay for some of these services which they are to some extent, and I would say to a considerable extent, entitled.

When the proposal came forward that it would be feasible to establish what is called in continental Europe and in other continental countries a national lottery, in Barbados, we examined the matter from every possible angle and we have come to the conclusion that it is in the interest of the island and in the interest of the people in this island that such a Company should be established. We have a Gaming Act of the 19th century which is hopelessly antiquated. We do not intend to legalise all lotteries, raffles and so forth, but we do have sweepstakes in Barbados and those are operated by the Barbados Turf Club and they are legally protected. All other sweepstakes in the island are illegal be they Irish sweepstake or else. The gambling instinct is so highly developed throughout the world that people in Barbados frequently break the law. I myself do not have money to break the law with, but I receive tickets from the Irish Hospitals, from Malta and Jamaica and from all of these lotteries which are supposed to be illegal.

I said, Sir, at the beginning of my introduction of this Bill that I do not believe in going on the defence in these matters; but I think I can save debate on this Bill by giving a little historical background. The first thing is that we have the religious dominations to whom all gambling is anathema, although they rely on raffles, bingo drives and matters of that kind; but as soon as the Government is making money out of these things, all the sins of Sodom and Gomorrah will be visited on Barbados.

1.55 p.m.

Let us go back now 2,000 years. Lottery was already established in the communities, because you will remember, Sir, if you are as good a student of the Bible as I think you are, that they cast lots at the foot of the Cross for the raiment and garment of the Lord; so the Bible mentions lotteries as far as I remember and this was the result of prophecy several times. I cannot remember how many times you find reference in the Bible to lotteries, but let us come a little closer to home. I can see the roof of an edifice from here, and that is the building called the St. Michael's Cathedral which was at one time destroyed by fire, and the Church organised a lottery to rebuild the Cathedral and no public outcry was raised. This was not money going into the public purse or to private owners in the operations; this was purely for one denomination in this country — St. Michael's Cathedral — and that was rebuilt out of a national lottery, as it were.

There are in the world today 15 countries — and I will enumerate some of them — who organise national lotteries, and I will give you an idea of the amount of revenue which is earned. There are Ireland, England, France, West Germany, Malta, Italy, Spain, Thailand, Australia, not to mention Puerto Rico. The revenue from Puerto Rico which has a one crop economy like ours from lotteries is in the vicinity of \$20 million U.S. I think the figure of \$26 million U.S. was quoted to me recently in Puerto Rico when I was investigating it, but I do not have my notes here. Sixty-three million people in the United States of America go in for a lottery of this nature, and the amount of money in 1960 which was spent in lotteries in the United States of America was some \$15,000 million. In Great Britain, of course, the Gaming Act, as you know, has recently been amended and betting shops have been established all over the United Kingdom, and the British Treasury is reaping a substantial harvest from the legalisation of betting in the United Kingdom. The point is that all these religious taboos and so on are not effective if more than 50% or 60% of people in a country do not recognise that it is a criminal Act to indulge in matters like lotteries. The British Football Pools, of course, are a substantial source of revenue. The amount which has been invested by the eight major ones was something like £100 million in the year 1959.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 o'clock p.m., this sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock p.m.

On re-sumption:

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I observe that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. junior member for St. Michael. Let the Bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If Your Honour would approve, I propose with Your Honour's approval and the consent of the House to deal next with Question Time and then suspend the Standing Orders so that we may be able to return to the Bill we were discussing previous to the suspension. Your Honour will probably perceive that that is the only matter on the Order Paper remaining to be attended to today, and I am sure that hon. members would like to have the possibility of an early break. I can assure them that the Government only proposes to continue with the West Indies Hospital Fund Bill after we shall have disposed of Question Time; so I beg to move with Your Honour's permission the suspension of Standing Orders.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is premature. The Hon. Leader of the House has sought my assent to move the suspension of Standing Orders. I have no objection to giving my assent, but since notice was not given earlier, I am seeking, as I am required under Standing Order No. 62, an expression of the general assent of the House. I am looking around seeking a general expression of assent from the House. The Leader of the Opposition is not in his place.

I observe no indications whatsoever of dissent; I assume there is general assent of the House and my consent has been given. Let the Leader of the House proceed to move the suspension of the relevant Standing Orders.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 and 18 for the remainder of the sitting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been advised that answers to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 103, 140 and 143 are now ready. No. 103 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, and that Question is found on page 5, lefthand column.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:- To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Would Government explore the possibility of providing a Dental Mobile Equipment Service for the rural parishes in an effort to reduce the number of children that travels to town to get their dental extractions and treatment? 2.40 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Following is the reply to Question No; 103, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on the 5th February, 1963:-

"The possibility of securing a Mobile Dental Unit has been examined and the Junior Chamber of Commerce has signified its intention shortly to present such a unit to the Government for the use and benefit of the community.

STANDPIPE IN WATERFORD HOUSING AREA

Mr. SPEAKER: The next is Question No; 140, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael, whom I do not observe to be in his place. I will allow that question to stand over until the next meeting.

GUARDWALL IN CHAPMAN'S VILLAGE, ST. THOMAS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next is Question No. 143, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas:-

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Government aware that the guardwall in Chapman's Village in St. Thomas needs extending in order to check the water from flowing under the houses that are located at the said point?

2. Will the Minister issue a directive to have the same remedied in order to protect those people living therein who experience much difficulty in getting in and out of their homes after a rainfall?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Question No; 143, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, is as follows:-

Government is not aware that the guardwall in Chapman's Village, St. Thomas, needs extending.

2. The houses situated in this area have been erected on gully lands much below the level of the road. The road curves sharply and is superelevated. Due to the steep gradient along Springvale Hill, surface water overrides the road edge and flows into the yards of the houses below. A concrete kerb will be provided and the roadway further superelevated during the current financial year, with a view to relieving the situation.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as have been suggested, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE WEST INDIES HOSPITAL FUNDS LIMITED BILL

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before the suspension, I was dealing with some historical data, and I was explaining what part national lotteries play as a means of raising revenue without the taxpayer being dispossessed of his goods and possessions.

In the Caribbean, it is only Jamaica where national law exists for the operation of lotteries, and the Government of that territory derives substantial revenue from this operation of lotteries.

In 1930, the Irish Parliament passed an Act giving a similar undertaking to the one which we are now considering, and the bulk of the revenue accrues from the sales of these tickets outside of the area - prizes, of course - and the amount of money involved is something which I cannot actually tell hon. members at this stage.

It is a matter of public and general knowledge that a lot of our citizens, either in syndicates or individually, purchase sweepstake tickets, and it is not possible for the Government to assess the revenue which leaves the colony in its wake. The position in the United States is not one of parity in the sense that with the exception of certain states in the Mid-West, gambling and lotteries are illegal; but yet the United States derives a substantial amount of revenue from the earnings and winnings of the drawing of the Irish and other sweepstakes abroad. Any capital which ac-

crues from the winnings of sweepstakes is treated, as far as the Government of the United States is concerned, as income earned in the year in which it is drawn. Although this whole operation is illegal and people are actually prosecuted for purchasing and selling and for such institutions like that, yet on the drawing of the sweepstake the Treasury Department or the Department of Revenue is the first body which has a knowledge of the results of these drawings, and I have heard from somebody who won money, as much as \$75,000 (U.S.) that the Revenue Department informed him about it before he knew, and told him when he was notified that he did win this money and that the tax will be the first charge on it.

I do not think we should be hypocritical in Barbados, and what we intend to do in Barbados is to put a 20% tax on the tickets, restricted of course to this operation, and not to the drawing of the Barbados Turf Club, in addition to the licence fees and other charges which would be paid by the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited to the Treasury of this Island.

I am not going to make any estimate whatsoever of the potential earnings in this field, because I do not know the information of gambling in this field.
2.50 p.m.

The Barbados Government has nothing to lose and a lot to gain. The employment figure is in the vicinity of 200 persons, and there is an indirect taxation on the wages and salaries. The Post Office has a considerable amount of revenue to be derived from an operation of this kind in this year. By 31st March the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited, which will be registered in Barbados, will pay into the Treasury the sum of \$500,000 as the fee for the operation this year. The implications of this, of course, are quite fantastic; if this operation develops, unorthodox although it may be in the field of financing - I do not make any promise in this year, but - in future years there may be quite a let-up in the incidence of taxation if we can get substantial revenue from sources such as this. We must not forget that in these undeveloped countries we have to make tremendous concessions by way of the remission of import duties, tax holidays and actual borrowing of money at high rates and lending money at low rates to encourage industrialists to come down here. We guarantee concessions to pioneer industries so that we try to expand employment in industry. We have to face what is one of the paradoxes of 20th century capitalism; the infra structure is not as highly developed as in the countries which need expansion, and those are the countries which have to make the sacrifices.

People will sign up in the columns of the newspapers and fulminate against the iniquities of this Socialist Government in introducing this measure and give foreigners all the concessions, not the local people - and the local people have been here all the time. My answer to that is that Barbados is exporting money which people send out to Nyasaland, Middlesborough and other places on short-term loans at six and a half per cent; they are out for quick returns and they take their profits out of Barbados and invest them overseas. We do not have exchange control such as the British Government had which permitted them to restrict the flow of capital from Barbados and other parts of the Empire, not only during the War but after the War until the balance of payment position in the United Kingdom had improved. If we try to restrict the outflow of our capital, there will be every kind of hue and cry about the irresponsibility of Government and that sort of thing. We cannot have free hospital services, we cannot have that high standard of roads and communications which we have in this country and the heavily subsidised water services to the expenditure of three quarters of a million dollars a year without money. I did not mention free Secondary Education, free University education and so on. If people were to make some contribution towards the Medical services, and if the Civil Servants did not descend on the field like the Assyrians in 1961 and expropriate the Treasury by way of additional salaries, the position would have been a little different. The Civil Service which behaves in this way in a country like this is not involved in the development of the country, but is like an army of occupation all the time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to listen to a tedious exposition to the effect that we are not taking care of the Barbados Turf Club and that sort of thing. There are those who run sweepstakes like anybody else, but they will sit down and allow people to write things in the newspapers just because they do not happen to be in power. I do not want to be personal in this matter, but I do want to say that during my absence from this colony a lot of misinformed criticism was levelled against the Government for the introduction of this Bill. Without reciting the Objects and Reasons of the Bill, I have given some explanation of the thinking of the Government in our asking the Legislature to pass a Bill of this kind.

In conclusion, Sir, I want to summarise the reasons why a Government, particularly in an undeveloped country, should have some sort of lottery. The first reason, in my opinion, is that money is going outside in lotteries anyhow, so that it is better to mobilise the excess earnings of people for the benefit of the community, and there is no more laudable service than the Hospital service for us to spend money on. Despite the rigid enforcement of the Gaming Acts of the United States which we do not have in this island, gambling has extended to a position where it is something like \$15 billion worth of earnings every year. That shows you the futility of suppressing people's instinct of taking a chance. The poorer a person is, the more he has to believe in things coming from the sky or he has to speculate with a sweepstake ticket in the hope that he gets some additional money coming into his pocket so that he will enjoy those things which he would like to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with one of the strongest human instincts. The British Government felt this when the Gaming Act was repealed and a new Gaming Act was passed establishing and legalising these things, and they are earning a considerable amount of money. Just a few years ago we had the National bonds where prizes were given out on the amount which you may be holding on these Government bonds.

3.00 p.m.

Quite apart from that, Sir, it is better to have a national lottery to mobilise and to harness this flow of money which goes out than to allow the present operation to continue where nobody is respecting the law at all. There have been arguments about racketeering and that kind of thing, but a national lottery of course gets around that because it is organised in such a way that you do not allow every kind of joker to come in and say he is going to run a sweepstake too.

The only matter which I have to deal with is the Barbados Turf Club. I know the Barbados Turf Club has a very strong lobby in this Chamber, a traditional lobby, the same lobby that would be opposed to peaceful picketing, the same lobby that would be opposed to increasing Workmen's Compensation, and the same lobby that was opposed to the setting up of an oil refinery in Barbados and so on, and you can go through a long list of matters. The sole *rationale* of the existence of those members in this Chamber is to lobby against progress in anything which is not confined to the operations of a limited few vested interests in Barbados, and so they will come up now to say that you are going to kill the Turf Club, and that people cannot afford to buy these tickets and buy Turf Club tickets too. Fortunately, I think they had better go and get their instructions from the Turf Club. They have had plenty of opportunity since the introduction of the Bill by the Hon. Leader of the House, and they will find that the Turf Club has had meetings with the West Indies Hospital Fund Directors and they reviewed the situation in which the Turf Club might stand to lose. The Hospital Fund has actually guaranteed prize money to the Turf Club to the tune of \$25,000, and in addition to that they have given an undertaking that if the Turf Club can during one quarterly period or otherwise establish that their earnings have dropped, the West Indies Hospital Fund will actually subsidise the Turf Club to that extent in addition to the \$25,000.

I do not know whether to say that we on this side of the House have the privilege or misfortune of having an

owner of racehorses in the person of one of the young Ministers — the Minister of Social Services — because no matter which Government is in power, the Minister of Social Services always happens to be a tamer of horses — although another Minister says he is raising these horses for corned beef; but the Minister of Social Services has assured me that the highest prize money which is given out by the Turf Club is in the vicinity of \$2,000 or \$3,000 as compared with \$25,000. What I can foresee is that if you can pay \$25,000 for a single race, you will be able to attract to Barbados the best possible type of horses, and the people from Demerara, from Trinidad, from Jamaica, from Puerto Rico and elsewhere will be given an incentive to send these very high class horses to Barbados; so, if anything, to establish this Fund from the assurances which they have given to me and — I do not know whether you call it the Committee of Management or Stewards, but anyhow — to the governing authority of the Barbados Turf Club, indicates that the operation will actually enhance the Barbados Turf Club both in sweepstakes and race meetings, rather than detract from them in any way.

The last question with which I should like to deal, Mr. Speaker, is the question of whether Barbadians would be able to buy these sweepstake tickets. The tickets are at very high cost because they will be in the vicinity of \$3 U.S. which will be \$5.10 at the current rate of exchange. The point is that the average Barbadian could not afford to pay \$5.10 for a single ticket; so what are we to do? Are we to do like the people in Puerto Rico in respect of casino gambling where they have prohibited any local residents from taking part? My answer to that would be "No". We cannot say that we are running a national lottery for the Barbados and West Indies Hospital at the same time say that it is such an iniquitous thing or so socially undesirable that our local inhabitants should not take part. Once we get over the objections about the diversion of revenue from the Turf Club to this Fund, we are faced with this difficulty that we cannot restrict the operation to countries outside of our shores. It would be immoral to do so in my personal opinion, because we would be asking people in the United States to subscribe to the idea of a West Indies Hospital Fund, and at the same time saying that our own people cannot take part in it. Although it is illegal in the United States, some tickets may find themselves in the United States and they take taxes when you win. This is a specified market; it is a \$10,000 million market, and its promoters are Americans and Canadians with one or two local directors and advisers, and therefore it would be immoral to say our people cannot take part in this. It should be a perfectly legitimate and above board operation.

What the directors of the company have assured me is that their tickets will not be available locally. It is a different thing altogether; but this will not prevent — and I am speaking now off the record — an agent in Mexico or Jamaica from having a mailing list and mailing tickets into Barbados. We are not going to make the operation illegal in Barbados, but the promoters themselves, since they are after an overseas market, have their agents all organised and listed and they are all outside Barbados; so you cannot walk into the office of the West Indies Hospital Fund and say you want a book of \$5 tickets, but there is nothing to prevent you from getting your tickets mailed in from outside. They do not want to go into direct competition with the Barbados Turf Club by the encouragement of the sale of these tickets locally in Barbados, but the Barbadians can purchase these tickets if they get them from an agent outside. The amount of prize money involved, at least once a year, will be \$1 million U.S., but there will be several prizes three or four times a year in the vicinity of \$200,000 U.S., and this is a big attraction which this Sweep is going to have over the Irish Hospital Sweep. They have all the experience of the Irish Hospital Sweep behind them, and I have no doubt that if the House gives this its support, it is bound to be a success and will redound to the benefit of the Treasury of this island.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that
3.10 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, when the Hon. Premier said that the public of Barbados became unduly alarmed over the introduction of a Bill to permit West Indies Hospital Funds Limited to run a sweepstake, it was because of a lack of information. We were given this Bill one Tuesday and it seemed as if the Government had intended to deal with it that day. They did not do so after representations were made. The public took it up and letters were written to the Press.

Now, Sir, we have been against gambling in this Island for many, many years. It is true that it is an instinct of man to gamble and we have seen recently the introduction of betting pools on football matches and money is leaving these shores and going overseas; therefore, Government had to impose a tax so as to keep back some of that money going out of this Island abroad.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would give way. This is really not a point of order; this is actually something which should have been included in my second reading speech.

There is an amendment to this Bill which I think the hon. member would like to deal with and which I consider I should have told the House about. It is something to do with the price of tickets and this was introduced as a result of an objection — not an objection so much but as a query — to the Ministry of Finance.

This is the amendment. It is the insertion of a Clause to be numbered as Clause 17 with a consequential renumbering of the present Clause 17 to Clause 18 and Clause 19 to Clause 20 respectively, and it reads as follows:—

“ 17. The Governor-in-Executive Committee may by order published in the Official Gazette prescribe a price as the minimum price at which any ticket or chance in any lottery or sweepstake organised, controlled or conducted by the Company may be sold and any person who sells or offers or exposes for sale any ticket or chance in any such lottery or sweepstake at a price below such prescribed minimum price shall be guilty of an offence under this Act.”

The reason why we have put this amendment in is because the Barbados Turf Club said that they recognised that the tickets which the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited would be selling would be sold at a price higher than theirs, but there was no safeguard in the Bill to prevent the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited from reducing their price and going into almost direct competition with the Barbados Turf Club. This amendment is put in to ensure that the price of their tickets will be maintained at the level at which the promoters have given the Government the undertaking that they will be maintained; and if they do want to change that price, we can hear an objection from the Barbados Turf Club or such body.

I shall beg to move that this Clause be inserted as Clause 17 when the Bill is being discussed in Committee. I just thought that the hon. member would like to deal with that point.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we became alarmed because of the lack of information on the Bill and we have seen attempts in the neighbouring Islands to introduce casinos for the sake of attracting tourists to their shores. We, in Barbados, have always resisted that and I am pleased to hear the Hon. Premier say that casinos will not be introduced here, at least not in this Government's time do they envisage the admittance of casinos for the purpose of attracting tourists to this Island. I do not believe that the introduction of casinos here will attract tourists to this Island; far from that, it may drive tourists from our Island.

We all admit that it has become burdensome on the Government to find the funds for the expansion which we all are looking forward to. This Government has admitted — and we have always admitted it — that the taxation in this Island has reached a point and that it is beyond the capacity of anyone to try and find other means of revenue

to provide the expansion which we so much need. We have been able to balance our budget, but we have not been able to put by reserves sufficiently enough to make it comfortable for us, should we ever have a set back in the world price of sugar which is our main source of economy or should any disaster befall us. Our direct taxation is on a level with big industrial countries and even beyond that, and in certain brackets we are so highly taxed that many business houses find it difficult to attract qualified persons to come and live in Barbados although the climate here is so good. They say that what is left in their pay packet after the Income Tax Commissioner takes out his tax is not enough to put aside anything for their family.

Sir, I know these things face the Government and they have to look around for other avenues to bring in money. This is a means of getting revenue from an operation which will be based in Barbados mainly and operated outside of the Island. That is the main feature of what has been said today. I am not one of those who is going to hide that if we turn this Bill down that this operation will take place in some other territory. I am not a party or one in encouraging gambling because it has a tendency to corrupt the morals of the young, and with the large sums which we are spending on education, on the one hand, in trying to raise the standards of the people, and on the other hand, trying to pull them down by a lot of lottery tickets sold all over Broad Street, I will turn it down. I have visited countries abroad — and France comes to my mind mostly — and have found that at every street corner there is someone offering you a lottery ticket. You win today and you find someone tomorrow offering you another ticket. To me, it is most unsightly and unsavoury.

However, Sir, at least this company has been able to assure the Barbados Turf Club that their revenue will not be lost as a result of their operation, and they have gone as far as to guarantee them an amount that would permit racing to continue in this Island. We all know without the sale of sweepstake tickets in this Island by the Barbados Turf Club, that they would have been forced to abandon racing years ago because racing is a most expensive game; and even those persons who return annually from Trinidad with large sums of winnings still in the end pull out of it and say that it is not a game for them owing to the fact that they have lost so much.
3.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, there are many points which would still have to be clarified in order to satisfy our authority as to how this operation will take place from Barbados and will yet enjoy large markets in America and Canada. We have been told that if the American mails are used for such things as gambling, that can be construed as being an infringement of the Federal laws; and I may say that we have heard of an instance of a very innocent Jamaican who sent tickets into America for sale or to a friend. The Post Office opened them up and that man's name was blacklisted so that when he applied for a Visa to enter America he was denied it. Our associations with America are so great and so many people of West Indian origin are so eager to enter the United States of America that I would want to be assured that this Government and the people of Barbados would not have to suffer as the result of this lottery. If it can be deemed by the American Government to be something which is undesirable, they will resist it.

Mr. Speaker, if that should happen, then the \$500,000 which we would gain by way of this licence fee would be but a small part of what we would lose in the overall picture. We have to protect our name; we have to protect our good name with the United States of America and Canada. This matter is so new to us that even the Hon. Premier admits that he is unfamiliar with the technique of running such a large affair.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the hon. member is making a plea for this Bill to go to a Select Committee, we would decide whether it should go to such a Committee or not. I have mentioned my ignorance of this technique, but it is a question of my lack of finance to gamble. I am not in that bracket with those who own

racehorses. My ignorance of the technique is no reason for going to a Select Committee with this Bill because I do not intend to go prying into corners which are no concern of mine. The United States of America has an arrangement with the Irish Hospital whereby they mail a list to find out certain things. What the hon. member says would appear to be irregular in another aspect. I do not think we should concern ourselves with where these tickets may be sold because that is no concern of ours. We are having this company coming to Barbados and it will be registered in Barbados.

There are those who may consider this to be unrealistic or anything else. I would not like to investigate all the possible international implications of something which does not concern us. I know that the hon. junior member for the City is lobbyist No. 1 and he would be very effective at this, but very often he has a lot of second-hand information. I saw the hon. member briefing the hon. junior member for Christ Church and I thought I would take the wind out of his sails. If the members of the Barbados Turf Club wanted to consider this matter, I may say that they have had time to consider it since the introduction of this Bill. The hon. member should have had discussions with the Ministry of Finance.

I do hope that hon. members have had their briefs for today. However, Sir, I do not want to be misquoted for the hon. member to say that I want time to consider this matter. As a lawyer, I have looked at this whole matter quite carefully. I can show the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Party over there the reports which I have here so as to satisfy them. I am not going into any Select Committee with this Bill in order to consider what the international relations are. I do not know that these tickets will be sold in America or in any other place.

Mr. GODDARD: I did not accuse the hon. member of gambling; what I said was that he admitted that he did not know the technique of gambling. Whether it is a question of high finance or not, it is beyond the realms of those who do not indulge heavily in gambling. I am saying, Sir, that if this Bill affects the lives of Barbadians in the relationship with America, then it needs to be investigated. That is my contention and that is what I think should be investigated. When the Government lays down the minimum price for a ticket which should be sold in Barbados, well, we know that many charities in Barbados still exist as a result of small raffles. It is not the law of the land, but it is permitted, and it is done with the knowledge of the Police. I want to know whether these things will be allowed to continue or not.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this does not interfere with the permission which is being granted to any religious, foreign or charitable organization which wants to get permission from the appropriate authorities for carrying on these things. Of course, Sir, it is more a matter for the Minister of Home Affairs and to be exercised by the Permanent Secretary. The Permanent Secretary to the Ministry can deal with such matters. This Bill does nothing more than legalise this operation; it does not make illegal anything which already exists. The Church authorities may be able to appeal to the promoters of this company to divest themselves of some of the funds.
3.30 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I was not here for the conclusion of the speech of the Hon. Introducer of this Bill, but at the beginning he made it quite clear that the Opposition seemed somewhat worried about the anxiety of getting the Bill through the House by a certain date, which was true; but having explained that away, we quite understand it is a question of the end of the financial year and not the end of the calendar year. Now my colleague who has just spoken has, I believe, made it clear that we are offering no objection to this Bill, as might have been thought, on any religious grounds. I do not believe, in this idea that you are not to take a chance in a lottery, because if you did win, the Church would accept some of the money from you. I have absolutely no interest

in the Turf Club, because I believe I am unique in this country, speaking personally, in saying that no one alive can testify to selling me a sweepstake ticket yet; I am yet to buy my first.

I must say that as far as we are concerned over here we are in sympathy with the Government in having to find money for administering what could be considered one of the most modern hospitals in the world, and this hospital is going to take a lot of money to run. We would therefore be very stupid on this side of the Table to think if you could raise money to the extent of \$500,000 annually plus a further 20%, of making stupid or serious objections upon religious or any other grounds. However, there are things which the hon. junior member for Christ Church has raised which I am bound to ask, and though the Hon. Premier says this is nothing to go to Select Committee, there are things that everyone must know. We wish the Government good luck, and we do hope that \$500,000 will be raised.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the amount of revenue which is anticipated is not \$500,000. The hon. member was not here when I introduced the Bill. I explained that a misunderstanding arose because when I went away to Africa, some representation was made that the Bill should have been through by the end of the year. It was not the end of the calendar year, but the end of the financial year, because the licence fee, owing to the agreement we have, of \$500,000 for this year must be paid by 31st March, and that is where the misunderstanding arose. The revenue is 20% of the gross receipts, plus 20% of the prize money, which is better than if they paid companies tax at 40%.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I must thank the Hon. Premier. That puts us in a better position, and I think we should get it tomorrow.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation, the Financial Secretary accused me of driving a very hard bargain, because they came up with 10%, but we eventually got 20% of gross receipts plus 20% of all the prize money, and the prize money is probably about ten prizes of \$200,000 each and one prize once a year in addition to all that of \$1 million; so when you work it out we are in a better position than in getting 40% from companies tax. It is therefore \$500,000 for the licence fee, plus 20% of gross receipts, plus 20% of prize money.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The thing itself sounds very enticing, and I do not see that any Government interested in social reform, whether for religious reasons or not, could afford to refuse such an offer. The Hon. Premier will however realise that there was first of all this misunderstanding which we had. On the other hand, we know that this \$500,000 licence as compared with \$100,000 tickets from the Turf Club is just a bagatelle, plus 20% gross receipts plus 20% prize money. The Hon. Premier said that he was accused of driving a hard bargain, but sometimes people go in for bargains although they seem hard, and although there is no real security as such it does not matter. I am hoping that there is some real form of security.

I understand that the Hon. and Learned Premier said while I was not here that this company will be run by Americans and Canadians with certain local advisers. What I am worried about is that this lottery business is outlawed in the United States of America with the exception of a few States in the Mid-West, and also in the entire Dominion of Canada, and though rumour might be a lying jade, I understand the persons making these negotiations and entering into this agreement with Government are a Canadian solicitor and Canadian hotel proprietor; so the running of a lottery must be a big business. I think the Premier mentioned that there were about ten countries in which it is legal, and I believe that in some of these countries the State itself runs these lotteries. Malta and the Irish Sweepstake are run by the Government. The bargain which has been driven by the Government seems very advantageous to Barbados if that bargain is carried out, and I could not see any Government refusing \$500,000 for a licence fee plus the percentages of which the Premier has spoken. If this is outlawed

in the United States and in Canada, I suppose the Premier will be able to explain something for me.
3.40 p.m.

I do not want to go into the intricacies of it, but if it is so, and the gentleman whom I have mentioned up and above board represent a syndicate or whatever it is for, they can hardly represent a legally authorised company in either the United States or Canada because, as I have said, I understand that the running of lotteries is certainly outlawed in those countries.

One has to be very careful, therefore, that this is not a front. I am just giving my views. Five hundred thousand dollars is a lot of money to pay for a fee just for the purpose of having the running of a large lottery legalised in Barbados. This company cannot sell the number of tickets in Barbados to pay \$500,000 as a fee at all and, therefore, it must be their intention to sell these tickets abroad.

As I have said, I understand West Indies Hospital Funds Limited is comprised of a Canadian solicitor and a Canadian Hotel proprietor, and they will be selling these tickets in the U.S.A. and Canada, which two countries have outlawed the running of lotteries.

However, Sir, I suppose from the point of view of receiving such a fee because we in Barbados are so much in need of funds for our social improvements that this has been such a windfall to us.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was saying that we in Barbados would look at this as such a windfall for this country if we can get them to come and carry on a business of the magnitude that would give us a fee of \$500,000 which is \$1/2 million. If these persons can pay us that percentage, then these persons must have a big faith in this enterprise and a wide field for their scope of operation.

What the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said is true. I go further than he. It is unfortunate that the Hon. Premier is out of his seat at the moment but, as I have said, it is not our intention to oppose this Bill. How can we begin to oppose it? As soon as this Bill is passed by us, according to the Bill we will receive \$500,000. After this Bill is passed and this company begins operation, you are going to get your percentage as set out.

However, I am thinking in my mind that it is a Canadian and American field of operation by this company. What I want to enquire is this. Is it not so that this company was turned down in Jamaica? Is it not a fact that it was turned down because of what the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said, which is, out of pure innocence a very reputable business man there was caught sending books out of Jamaica into the United States, and in the usual way they were taken over by the Emigration Authorities and in due course he was prohibited from entering the United States?

What I fear and what we must be satisfied about, although I welcome the 10%, is this: it is bound to be universally known, if this is a reputable company at all and if these two gentlemen are not just a front for an underworld gang, when this company is registered in Barbados and start operations from here; hence I say that every Barbadian in the United States would be buying or getting sweepstate tickets sent to them and so making it possible for other repercussions or reprisals to take place.

I am not suggesting for a moment that that is a reason for turning it down because people in this country should know that if we must run a hospital on modern lines, we must have money to run it and that would mean more taxation, either direct or indirect. However, they should know that it is against the law to send out sweepstakes tickets to the United States; and if they know, then I say it would be very stupid to observe the law in the breach. These things must be known and made known to the inhabitants of Barbados.

Innocent as this Bill looks, and with the financial implications which it provides for us in acquiring funds, I repeat, it also has its repercussions. If this Government can make clear to the inhabitants of this colony that as soon as we pass this Bill and these two people from Canada or the United States — I am not prepared to swear on oath that they are from those places but I am prepared to say that one is a solicitor and one is a hotel proprietor — one must begin to wonder if a lottery business of this magnitude could be run by a solicitor and hotel proprietor or if it is not that the solicitor is merely acting for people who have a lot of money to spend in this business. Bear in mind, this is not a business for which they can act legally in either Canada or the United States. I suppose that the only part of the United States in which they would be able to act is Nevada or Los Vegas. I am sure they cannot act in the Dominion of Canada at all. Therefore, what worries me is this. While it makes me feel happy to think that the Government is able to get somebody who can give us an amount of \$1/2 million as was suggested, it would take us \$1 million to run the new hospital.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is \$1 million more, not \$1 million.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As the Hon. Premier has rightly said, this stems from medical services given at the Barbados General Hospital which we cannot so easily stop. I am very glad about this. This may be considered as one of the legacies inherited from people of a political philosophy other than that of the Hon. Minister, and this free service in the Casualty is something which we cannot think of stopping.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that you will agree with me, a trained lawyer as you are, that the Bill in itself seems all right; therefore, who am I that I should be able to criticise its draftsmanship?
3.50 p.m.

Who am I, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to criticise the draughtsmanship of this Bill or anything else? We have had a very straightforward explanation about it from the Hon. Premier; we have been told that it is necessary to raise money and it is better to raise money in this way than by imposing taxation directly or indirectly. With that my Party will agree; but what we want to know is this; are we making enemies of friendly nations? Are we selling our birthright to one or two people? Would it not be more advantageous if we are going to face the matter squarely and say that we have to run this Hospital and it takes us half a million dollars more to run it? I repeat, Sir, that the Methodists do not believe in raffles, but if you were to win anything by means of a raffle you can put it in the collection; it does not matter.

Mr. Speaker, if we have to run lotteries, could we collect more money? the Government of Malta and other Governments run these lotteries. Of course, there is an arrangement made by which if you win money although it is illegal in America, you must pay income tax on it. The famous Al Capone had to pay income tax although he won things by fraud; as a matter of fact, the only way in which you could get at Al Capone was by means of income tax. You have a company in New York which must pay income tax and that is a company which is considered by its own citizens to be illegal or bad. Many hon. members of this House have been acquainted with that. There is a person who won £30,000 on the Irish Sweepstake. I am sure the hon. junior member for St. George knows him well. He had to pay income tax on that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. The hon. member has said more than once that the Irish Sweepstake is run by the Irish Government. That is not so; the Irish Sweepstake is run by a private company.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is the hon. member saying that the Irish Sweepstake is not run by the Irish Government? (A MEMBER: The Hon. Minister is right.) Well, Sir, if the Hon. Minister has authority for that, I am perfectly willing to accept his authority. You could very well say that the Housing Board is being run by a company and you

would be perfectly right if you said that. You can say that the radio Corporation is being run by a private company, but to say that it is run by the Government would also be true. Anyhow, Sir, my information is different from the information of the Hon. Minister. The Government must have entered negotiations on behalf of somebody.

As to this 20% we will get, what I am afraid of, what we on this side are afraid of is this. As a layman my experience has been that I have seen in Barbados alone that hard bargains were driven. Any two people can enter into a contract, but unless one or the other of those two people is worth something, then the contract is really worthless. We are going to pass this Bill today; it will become law and these gentlemen or this company will be able to operate in Barbados. I am hoping that the Government is perfectly satisfied that this \$500,000, as mentioned by the Hon. Premier as the licence fee, is really coming. That is the first point. I have no reservations in my mind as to how this money is coming, but I ask; are we quite satisfied about this 20%? Who is going to operate this company? I should like to say, Sir, that money today, or the lack of it, has caused a tremendous dislocation of business in Barbados.

The next question which I would like to ask is this: Who is going to see about the drawing of these lotteries? These are things which we should be told and which, in fact, we must be told. I hear the hon. member say something about the operation of the Turf Club. Well, Sir, I do not know anything about the operation of the Turf Club, but I have been told that these lotteries are drawn by people here. I want to know who is going to represent Barbados to see that we get this 20% of which we have been told, and I also would like to know where these lotteries are going to be drawn. 4.00 p.m.

After all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are as much concerned about the welfare of the people of this country as the Government is, and we are entitled to know these things. We agree that this is a better idea than taxing directly or indirectly to raise \$1 million. I think you are going to need more than that to run the hospital; but when I go through this Bill as a layman, I see set out that the sum of \$125,000 will be paid within one month of the appointed day; a further sum of \$125,000 within five months of the appointed day; a further sum of \$125,000 within nine months of the appointed day; and a further sum of \$125,000 immediately on the expiration of twelve months after the appointed day, and then it goes on to mention the 20% of which the Hon. Premier has spoken.

Now anybody paying \$500,000 for the right to run a company must at least be running a \$10 million business; otherwise he could not afford to pay that out. Now who is to see about our 20%? Are we just to accept their word when this Bill is passed? I hope the Ministers who are in their places presently will appreciate the fact that my speech on the Bill is not a speech in opposition, but one in which I should like to see the Bill perfected to the extent that we in Barbados are not possibly making enemies of friendly nations in one way or the other by passing this, because in some places where you have a strongly Protestant community who might place objections upon this, there might be politicians who might some day for some reasons best known to themselves say: "These people have done so-and-so; let us put a spoke in their wheel". How are we going to get this 20%? Will the tickets be drawn in Barbados? All we have been told is that this will be run by Canadian and American directors with a few advisers from Barbados.

Finally, Sir, I heard the Premier say that he had no intention of sending this to Select Committee. That may be his view, but we have our views and we might have to stand alone on this matter. We should like the questions answered, and if it is not convenient, is embarrassing or not expedient to answer them on the floor of this House, we will suggest sending the Bill to Select Committee at the appropriate time. We support the Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but under the circumstances, we would rather get certain information and be sure that we are not passing a Bill as a front for somebody who might be working with the underworld in Canada or the United States of America.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, unlike the last speakers, as a representative of the Barbados Labour Party, we are unable to agree with this. It is rather strange and to some extent a little wonder that speeches should be made in favour of this in this Parliament of nearly 300 years. Conservative Government have for over 240 years opposed this, and we have had a number of requests in the last Government which we were forced to decline on grounds of simple morality. What is awkward about all this is that this is the first time you want to include in the name of this organization the word "hospital", and all the speeches indicate that the additional cost of the new hospital will be \$1 million. Everybody understands that if you increase the capacity of a hospital it is going to cost more, and for that reason you are going down to this form of gambling. We know that next year educational facilities will cost more than \$1 million; so why do you use the hospital? I believe you see a Sister of Mercy or the mural on the hospital wall of a pregnant mother with one child at her side and one on her breast, when you know that 80% of this money will not go near the hospital, but will be put in the coffers of those who want to support this Resolution. It is a sad thing with a teeming population of 4,000 children coming out of school, and the psychological effect it will have on this country is disastrous. We were told that a ticket will cost something like \$3 U.S., and we know it is illegal to operate such a company in Barbados. What reflection are we going to project to Canada and America when we are bound to ask for help in a Federation and Independence?

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown, Mr. Deputy Speaker, gloated over this \$500,000 and would sell his soul and the souls of the population for a mess of pottage. Suppose it was \$5 million; do you mean that you would sell all you preserved for 300 years? The Premier's remarks about the lottery at the foot of the Cross is not correct, because that had no national effect or interest. Here was a couple of cutthroat Roman soldiers who were snatching the sandals and robes of the Carpenter's Son, and having a little thing at the foot of the Cross where a spot of gambling was going on. It was nothing to do with national glory. What are we going to project with a teeming population where we will have to go on our knees to Canada and the United States of America? What is more, Sir, for the Premier to say that the tickets will not be offered for sale in Barbados means that we will have a roundabout scheme. Several plantations in this Island are breeding British thoroughbreds, and it takes you three years and over to produce a horse to send on the track, and all you may get is \$2,000 for a race when you pay \$100,000 for an animal. Think of the job and happiness of raising an animal where everybody in the Island can share in it. You cannot liken this to the Turf Club. You get something for your money even if you listen on the radio. There is an element of chance, and may the best horse always win. This is like Ali Baba searching for gold, and when you talk about 10% or a hard bargain or 20% and selling your soul, why use the hospital? Why not use education when you know you will need more than \$1 million additional next year? The fact is that this is going to have an effect on all of us. It is a sad thing that the Premier said earlier that there was no haste as long as he gets it over by the end of March, and yet he will deny members another opportunity of discussing this in Select Committee. It is appalling to think that we are up against the tenets of democracy in being denied the right to examine this thoroughly. Why could this organisation not set themselves up in St. Vincent or St. Lucia? Why is Barbados to be the seat of this? Barbados is now the psychological base for an organisation which we have for 300 years resisted. The Conservative Government has fought this for more than 100 years. As long as you pay 50 cents for a ticket, you know there is no *quid pro quo*, and the Minister of Social Services will tell you that he has had an opportunity to see it from inside. You may pledge your love and produce an animal and see it fail forever and it takes you three years, but the whole country can take part by going to the races and seeing the animals run. 4.10 p.m.

It is not even like the football pools and it is bound to hurt the country. I dislike to feel that you drive a hard bargain to get 20% of funds or earnings which cannot be

thought of as earnings. It is not butter or cheese; it is like selling a slice of the population and glorying in the fee of half million dollars when you know that the country must pay for this.

These tickets cannot be sold in public. Surely they cannot be sold anywhere in the West Indies and they cannot enter in the United States legally. Why after 300 years you find that the only means of getting budgetary assistance is by recourse to gambling? It is something unfortunate and it is something which this country has resisted. I can think of myself in the last Government and in the Cabinet. At that time all sorts of phoney things have been thrown at us.

This is a cruel thing. What are you going to pass on to posterity? How can we excuse ourselves when we know of the repercussions which are going to come from this? When these tickets are seen in the United States or Canada, your country must pay for this. You are yearning for a place in Federation and it is America and Canada who are coming to your aid. How are you going to explain this thing to them?

Sir, I am sorry about all of this and what is regrettable is the discourtesy of the Hon. Premier. He says that this Bill is going to be passed today and that we would not be given any further study of this thing in Select Committee. He has said that when he, himself, has said that it will be in good time as long as it is passed before the end of March. Are we to be denied the opportunity of good, fair play? Is this consistent with our ideals and our dreams of democracy? Why must we have this departure after 300 years? There is no national interest in this: there is no national appeal in this. It is undemocratic and unchristian. We are throwing a burden on a population which we may not be even alive to help. These are things for which you can stay hungry.

You say that you need \$1 million more to spend on your hospital. You need more than that. You need more than \$1 million more for education. Sir, I appeal to the powers—that be that we be given the opportunity to study this in Select Committee. Give us four weeks more. This is something which we may not be able to repair. Of course, we would have to repeal it and it can be repealed; but it will leave a scar in our history because at some time it would be said that we had a Bill on the Statute Book to run a lottery. Must we sell 250,000 souls for \$1/2 million? I only say again: give us the opportunity to further study this Bill whether by debate in the House or by public expressions in the Press. I repeat, do not sell our souls for \$1/2 million. Do not say that you want it for your hospital because you know that is not true. You want more than that for education alone. I appeal to you to let us have a Select Committee to go into this. We should be granted the opportunity of a further study of it. I agree that I may be wasting time, but this is an appeal from an errant soul concerned with the future population of this country. Whether we would get 20% or 80% from this, it means that we are giving up our pride and selling our souls. I appeal to the Hon. Minister again to give us the chance of studying it for one month more in Select Committee. It deserves further consideration.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was rather amused, not concerned, when the Hon. Premier looked over here and accused me of being a purveyor of misinformation. I do not think he needed to cast his eyes so far; he could look nearer home. I would like to tell him that as a result of my misinformation, the personnel of the Marketing Board has been changed and I will continue to submit to this House such items of misinformation.
4.20 p.m.

That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is by the way. What we on this side of the House are concerned about is why a foreign company should have all the cream at the top and wanting to carry on the scheme as enunciated by the Hon. Premier. If this scheme is one which is sure to succeed in bringing in considerable sums of money to those who run it, why then does the Government not run it? Why should these two men whose origin is more or less unknown, who will not be men of any great wealth as far as we know, be allowed to come

here and float this scheme which they are going to float in their own company? The running of lotteries is illegal both in the United States of America and in Canada. It may be that the Hon. Premier has arrived at the right decision with the wrong set of findings, but some of the argument which he adduced today did not carry much weight with us on this side of the Table.

The Hon. Premier has said that this business in the United States of America is a million dollar enterprise and it is one which people are prone to follow. Well, Sir, that is an argument which could also be used in the case of prostitution which should be rejected. In that case, well might it be for the Government to promote houses of ill-fame. Why is there the necessity for posting tickets back in Barbados? Any ten Barbadians could buy a \$5 ticket with a prize of a million dollars before them. Why should the tickets be sent back to Barbados thereby perpetrating a fraud? Tickets which carry as high a prize as that of a million dollars (U.S.) will be strewn about Barbados like leaves in Vallambraiso. What is the guarantee of payment? Is it generally known to all the members of this House that such an enterprise as this was refused by the Government of Jamaica, a Government which cannot be accused of being particularly foolish when it comes to the question of making money? There are territories which have issued licences and given incentives, such as Liberia and others; and why should we select something which is illegal and which will bring us into bad odour with the United States of America and Canada? These tickets will be sold neither in Mongolia nor Thailand as the Hon. Premier has suggested. It will be necessary to have a large market for these tickets where they can only be sold legally.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what are we letting ourselves in for? We, on this side of the House, are in favour of any Bill which will bring in a certain amount of income and, of course, a decrease in taxation in a few years, but at the same time I would like to have the question which we have posed answered so that we can be sure in our minds that we are not compromising in calculating this sum of money which would be made and the island would stand to benefit therefrom. The United States of America will approbate and reprobate actions which will bring in money. The people have to pay taxes; the late Al Capone, Dutch Schultz and Baby Face Wilson and such people could only be indicted on the charge that they did not pay their income tax. The United States will both approbate and reprobate on such actions so long as they will bring in money.

This is no fly-by-night company. It is a well known technique that people who run sweepstakes of this nature send to each colony and buy a telephone book and get the girls to copy out laboriously the names and addresses in that telephone book and the tickets are posted to the telephone subscribers. I know as much about sweepstakes as anybody else and how they are run; but certain questions must be posed and they are questions to which we would like to have frank answers. In that case this investigation can best be made in Select Committee, with which suggestion I will agree. I suggest that time might well be taken to go into this matter most carefully in order to consider the pros and cons before we come to a firm decision in this matter. (Cheers).

Mr. SEALEY and Mr. SMITH rose to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My eyes caught the hon. junior member for St. Joseph first.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have but very little to say on this Bill because I am not a wholesale gambler, and therefore I know very little about this Bill. However, Sir, as far as I understand from the Hon. Premier, he has said that before these gentlemen start to operate this company they will have to pay the sum of \$500,000 by way of a licence. That seems to be very sweet, Sir, and I would only say that it is too good to be true. That is only the insertion of the thin edge of the wedge. Taking for granted what the Hon. Premier has said, that it was drawn to his attention that he was making a very hard bargain on these gentlemen, that would make me feel that the only way in which those gentlemen could convince the Hon. Premier or try to get him to back down, would be to offer him the amount for which he was asking regardless as to whether

they will be able to realise that amount or not. If the Hon. Premier has advised that this is a very hard bargain, then you would not want anybody to tell you what the position was between these people and the Premier.

I have in my hands, Sir, this amendment which is to be added to the Bill and the side note reads: "Governor in Executive Committee may prescribe minimum price for tickets." This new Clause which is to be inserted as Clause 17 reads as follows:-

"The Governor-in-Executive Committee may by order published in the Official Gazette prescribe a price as the minimum price at which any ticket or chance in any lottery or sweepstake organised, controlled or conducted by the Company may be sold and any person who sells or offers or exposes for sale any ticket or chance in any such lottery or sweepstake at a price below such prescribed minimum price shall be guilty of an offence under this Act."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to say this: if we had agreed with the passing of this Bill when the Hon. Minister introduced it on the 17th December, 1963, this Bill would have been passed without this Section having been inserted. That only shows us that it takes some time to study a Bill of this sort, and the Hon. Premier should not press or try to have this Bill passed today without thinking it over more seriously again because some other points might well creep up.
4.30 p.m.

I am sure that if on the 17th December the Leader of the Opposition had agreed with the Hon. Introducer on this Bill, it would have been passed without this Clause, which shows that the Government went into it again; so if they give us a chance, we may be able to raise points with which they might agree if it is sent to Select Committee. I understand, Sir, that these tickets will not be sold on the street, but may be posted here. How is this Government to know how many tickets have been sold or who are the winners? The Government is aiming at \$500,000 for the licence and 20% of the winnings? I suppose Government may not know if it has come to the Island at all, because if tickets are posted to me and I sell a winning one, I am going to do like the old man. When the young man wrote home to the old man for his daughter, he told the girl to put up the letter as if she were putting up a dog licence, because in those days you never paid for your dog; so you had to be very careful in putting up your licence; I would adopt that attitude if I sold a winning ticket. If tickets are posted to me and I am going to make a drawback, I would not disclose it. What would be the position of the Government if the Company does not care to disclose it? The Premier should state what will be the position if these people after paying \$500,000 at the start come back and say they have not sold the amount of tickets they expected and have therefore lost money, and they are therefore asking you to allow them to reduce the price on their tickets since they are too high in Barbados.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know that these people will be doing very little business with the typical Barbadian if the tickets remain at \$5.10. The price would be prohibitive, and they would never be able to compete with our local Turf Club at that price, and if they do not make money to suit the expenditure of \$500,000, they will come back to you. If they even sell the first prize in Barbados, how is Government to know who are the winners? Here in Barbados you have ticket sellers along the street, and the local Turf Club makes its returns. In other words, we take it they have given us a true and correct report of their winnings because they are our own people; but as hon. members have said, these people have been refused in Jamaica. If that is true, there must have been some reason. If you are leaving it to a person to make returns on himself in the dark, and he does not make the money that he expected, he is going to make his expenses, losses and profits to suit what he has to pay to Government, and that is why the Government should allow this Bill to go to Select Committee. You have to set up the machinery to prove what they are doing, and it will take some more studying, because it sounds too good to be true.

If the Government is thinking that the Hospital is going to take \$1 million more to run and this is an opportunity to help offset that expenditure, I am wondering, if this company did not come and make such a nice offer to Government what would happen with this new hospital when it opens. I am wondering if they have not made provision already for this \$1 million to start with; but it seems after listening to the Premier that they are relying on this money to help in the hospital. I do not know if he told us that to get us to agree with the Bill right away, because he knows we are in sympathy and would like to see the new hospital start off, and so telling us that would encourage us to support it. From the remarks I have heard about having to look for money to equip the hospital and to do this or that, I can only say that this Government is a gambling Government, and is going to get the money for the hospital by gambling; I think the hardest has been done and that is to get it in the air and get it started. I thought that by now they would know where they are going to put their hands on this \$1 million, but I can clearly see that they are waiting on these people to get it. They may be able to get the first \$500,000, but I am sure they would not get the second portion in haste, because these people are business people and are not going to run a business for the fun of running it. If they get the first \$500,000, all well and good; but they will not get another \$500,000 if the sale of tickets and the business being carried on in Barbados is to do everything. In my opinion they offered the Premier this \$500,000 to agree to this operation, but I will only believe it when the Premier draws it or it is paid into the Treasury.
4.40 p.m.

I feel that they are going to ask this Government to allow them to reduce the price of the tickets because, definitely, \$5.10 per ticket would prevent them from making a good business of this thing. That price is too much for one ticket when you can pay 50 cents for one of our local Turf Club sweepstake tickets and probably draw a prize of \$4,000 or \$5,000.

I will also like to say that I know that if you send the tickets out by post, you may not be doing a good thing because sometimes there is a possibility of money getting lost by way of post or, maybe, the sellers of tickets may forget to post in time for the particular drawing and the money would have to wait until the next draw if it goes at all. If you allow these tickets to be sold on the streets, well, the sellers will be making a living by selling them and I would be able to buy my ticket and put it down and have a chance of winning; and then again, the Government would have a greater chance of collecting from the winners here. But posting them to A and B is another thing because B may receive his tickets and he may sell them but, as I have said, the money may get to its place of destination too late for the particular drawing, if it does go at all.

We, Sir, are pinning ourselves to too many chances and there is the likelihood that the Government would not be getting the amount of money which has been promised them. This is what I would like to find out from the Hon. Minister. We must have the assurance that if West Indies Hospital Limited applied to you to be allowed to reduce the price of their tickets, at least, to the same figure as our local sweepstake tickets are sold, you will do something about it. This would be a very serious matter if that happens.

This is a book of tickets for the December, 1963 draw. It is from Malta.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: To what is the hon. member referring? I would ask him to pass it on to the Clerk of the House.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I will pass it on to the person who passed it to me. To strengthen my argument, speaking under correction, the Hon. Minister of Social Services contradicted the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who said that the Government of Malta does run sweepstakes.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the Hon. Minister of Social Services

has been misquoted. He referred to the Irish Government and not the Government of Malta.

Mr. SMITH: If I misquoted the Hon. Minister, I apologise for doing so. Anyhow, Sir, I will go on to make my point. We have to be very careful, especially in passing laws of this sort, because we have to protect our local people. In other words, we were told all over the place: "Buy Local: Support Local."

I would like to know from the Hon. Minister what would be the position if these people ask for a reduction in the price of the sale of their tickets. There is also another thing which I am not happy at all about. Imagine that this new company will subsidise our local Turf Club in case that club presents a case that it is losing money. They say that they will make it right. I doubt they will be able to make it right. This is a company which is going to sell tickets here, and you are given the assurance that if our local Turf Club fails, they will subsidise that club. I think that if they do it the first time, they are not going to do it the second time. But why put our club at such a low ebb that these people would be able to compete against and push it down to the ground? It would mean that they will be doing all the business and then standing by to pay the local Turf Club. Sir, nowadays I see more people selling sweepstake tickets on the road than ever. You get even women now selling tickets. Of course, they can go and buy a book for \$5.00 or whatever it is and then sell it and get 50 cents on it. I suppose that their boyfriends prefer to buy the tickets from them and so help them on; but I say that we have to be very careful as regards this company operating here regardless of its offering us \$500,000 as a fee which I would be very much in favour of. However, we have to think of the people who may be put out of work as a result. If this company agree to subsidise the local Turf Club, the Turf Club on the other hand will not be subsidising the sellers of their tickets; so we have to get all of these points straight before we say "yes" to this Bill.

I am giving you reasons, chapter and verse, for the further consideration of this Bill in Select Committee. Here again, this Bill was introduced on the 17th December last, and it is just only a month ago and we have another new Clause coming in today to be added to it. That shows that the Government is still giving thought to this Bill. That Clause is to be put in to protect the local Turf Club and it is a very wise Clause. But there is nothing telling you that they will not be agreeing to the reduction of the price of their tickets. If these people can show figures where the sale of these particular tickets are such that they are not making a profit and they ask for a reduction in the price, they would have to be given it if this Government wants \$500,000 as their fee.

Sir, I do not know who is in charge of this Bill now, but I hope that they will agree that this Bill should be sent to a Select Committee.
4.50 p.m.

It is either a question of referring this Bill to a Select Committee or of the Hon. Minister giving us a full assurance now as to all the points which have been raised.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Objects and Reasons of this Bill make it abundantly clear that the Government intends to permit to operate in this country a company dealing in the sale of sweepstake tickets, and to this proposal there could hardly be any moral objection. As a matter of fact, you will agree with me that even the Church today tries to raise funds by means of the sale of lottery tickets. In my opinion, a company of this magnitude is not the same as an ordinary gambling casino which in any way attracts unauthorised personalities or adds to the unwholesome things or interferes with the morals of the people of this island. You will further agree with me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that many people in Barbados try to indulge in games of chance. According to this Bill, the company which is operating as the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited is a financial success. What is operating in my mind is this: the Government is permitting the establishment of a company which is to be organized by Canadians

because of the revenue which it hopes to collect. From the gross takings, according to the Bill, we will be able to collect 20% taxation together with the winners' prizes.

This Bill shows clearly not that these people have to pay \$500,000 as a licence; it shows that from the first year of the operation they must pay this \$500,000. That is a very hard and fast rule. I would like the appropriate Minister to tell me how this company will be able to make such an immediate success as to pay 20% taxation on its gross takings and 20% taxation of the prizes of its winners, and in the first year it will pay half a million dollars. That is a lot of money. As a matter of fact, in passing by and seeing the new General Hospital, I intend to throw in my weight on the side of this Bill. As a businessman I was wondering how the Government will be able to get money for the purpose of running that Hospital other than taking more money from the pockets of the taxpayers who are already very hard pressed.

I should like to point out, Sir, that this Bill reads in one way whereas the Statement from the Hon. Minister says something else. I would like to know what additional staff will be added to this particular department because this money is to be paid into the Inland Revenue Department which is a very hard pressed Department. The people in that Department have to do the checking, and at present they are finding it very difficult to cope with the volume of the work which they have to do. Sir, I cannot see this proposed West Indies Hospital Funds Limited offering tickets at this price and having to pay 20% taxes on the gross takings plus 20% of the winners' prizes and half a million dollars as an operating licence during the first year. This is something which is hard and fast and which I do not understand. Paragraph 4 of this Bill is something which I cannot understand and I feel that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee.

I would like to know how many lottery drawings per year this company proposes to conduct. This is a very important matter affecting this colony. Can the Hon. Minister give us any information about the size of the staff which it is proposed to employ when the company comes into operation? Another question is this: will Barbadians who are seeking employment on the staff of this Company, be entitled to preferential treatment? Can the Hon. Minister say whether the profits made by this Company will be invested in Barbados for the benefit of Barbadians or will it be the case of substantial sums of money leaving this island? In other respects, Sir, I am in thorough agreement with this Bill with the exception of one or two paragraphs which are not fool-proof enough. I join my Party in their expression of opinion that a Bill of this sort should not be rushed through. We might thereby run into difficulties which we may not have foreseen, and therefore I feel that this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to add my voice to the voices of hon. members who have put a case to the Government and who are appealing that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee. This is a very important piece of legislation and there are a few question marks hanging over it. I would like to warn the Government that all that glitters is not gold. This sum of \$500,000 and the 20% tax which has been offered looks very well, but sometimes these things are only a matter of bait sent out so as to catch somebody, and it is for this Government to stop and think for a brief moment as to this matter. We have been told that this type of gambling was refused in Jamaica, and if that is a fact, I am still wondering why is it that these people want to take advantage of a poor territory like Barbados.
5.00 p.m.

The money looks very good, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and all of us like money, because as you know, Sir, money is the root of all evil. Because of that I do not feel that this Government should be tempted to rush through a Bill of this sort with almost indecent haste. You will remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when this Bill was first introduced, had it not been for members on this side of the Table, it would have been passed without this Clause being put in, but by delaying, they have discovered that this is a Clause that

has been left out, and I do believe that if this Bill goes to Select Committee, they may find a few more Clauses to add to this one. We all agree, Sir, that in making improvements, it calls for increases, but there is still time for us to think for a brief moment before we push ourselves into things about which we do not know so much. I think the Hon. Premier has said that he does not know very much about gambling, but he still says that this Bill should be passed today without being sent to Select Committee. I am hoping, however, that the Government, though having the power, will hear a word from the Opposition, and give us time to go into the matter before rushing this Bill through the House.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on reading this Bill, I was at first impressed by the number of exemptions and reliefs from certain pieces of legislation that was being granted to this new company, West Indies Hospital Fund Limited, and it worried me, Sir, why this number of exemptions. There were exemptions from the Income Tax Act, relief from the Interim Traders' Act, the Pool Betting Duty Act and the Gaming Act, and I said to myself that a Government which proposes granting these exemptions to a new company must have very, very good reasons indeed for bringing this Bill down before the Legislature in this manner. I repeat, Sir, that that was the first thing that stood out most saliently in the Bill, and there must have been good reason to come and hope the Legislature would pass a Bill in this manner; but today I think I have seen the reason why. I think the greatest inducement must indeed be that \$1/2 million which the Government sees and probably sees very anxiously and hopes to seize it before March of this year.

Every hon. member of the Chamber who has spoken already sees the attraction of this \$1/2 million, but that attraction is not mentioned in the Bill. I do not know if that has come as a result of hard bargaining, but a licensing fee of \$1/2 million, if got as a result of bargaining, is certainly driving a terrific bargain. If that has come through negotiations, I think the driving spirit of those who were able to extract such an amount by means of a licensing fee may be commended. But that is not all, Sir. The speech to which I have listened very carefully, and the speech which has impressed me this afternoon in this Chamber is the one by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown. I do not know how much he knows about gambling, nor am I interested; but I think the hon. member as a responsible member of this Chamber would not come here this afternoon and speak in the manner in which he did unless he was very sure of the background from which he spoke. Now, Sir, I have read in the newspapers that this company would not be selling tickets on the local market. In some interview with the Press or some report of an interview by somebody, that was mentioned. Now they have got to sell these tickets somewhere, because to pay \$1/2 million licensing fee, to pay 20% on sale of tickets and to pay 20% on prize money, and to have penalties set out in the Bill where any violation of its sections is concerned, certainly puts on the company or what looks like a new company, a big financial strain.

We have got to concern ourselves, now that we know that Barbados has only a market in a very indirect manner; that is to say, tickets may be sent to Barbados, but they will not be sold in Barbados. If, as we have been told, this sort of gambling is prohibited in the majority of States in the United States of America and the provinces in the Dominion of Canada, what are the markets in this part of the Western Hemisphere where these tickets will be sold in such great numbers that this company can afford to pay such a heavy licensing fee, to pay 20% on its gross takings, to pay 20% prize money, and in respect of what appears to be a 12 months free holiday as outlined in subsection 2 of section 4 where the company is to pay in the sum of \$125,000 within one month of the appointed day, that is, the day when the tax holiday ends, and (b) a further sum of.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the appointed day is the day when the operation comes into being, not a year after it comes into being. If the appointed day was the end of this month, they would have to pay the first \$125,000 by the end of February. 5.10 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I thank the Hon. Premier for that explanation. That puts further strength in my hands. The point is that it is at the end of twelve months, but may be before. That further strengthens my argument. According to the Bill, they will have to pay into the Commissioner the sum of \$125,000 within one month of the appointed day; then a further sum of \$125,000 within five months of the appointed day; then a further sum of \$125,000 within nine months of the appointed day and a further sum of \$125,000 immediately on the expiration of 12 months after the appointed day.

That is money — and a lot of money too. I suppose that too is one of the reasons why this Government is giving so many exemptions and allowances. I am thinking very seriously on what has been said by the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown. If it is true that these companies cannot lawfully operate in many parts of the United States, and in the Dominion of Canada, might it not be, as has been hinted by the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown, that we may only get the first \$1/2 million? It is good that we should grab at this money; but then I do not share the view as has been expressed by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph because the Bill has its penalties and any business concern will see to it that they tax this money further. It does not matter where the prize winner lives. They are doing business if they show people that they are willing to pay taxes. I think there needs to be no fear on that score at all. However, I do not think that we are doing such a good thing with all these exemptions being given to this company. That, in my view, seems as if they are saddled with commitments even before they start operations. Those moneys talked about in sub-section 2 of section 4 means \$125,000 multiplied by four and that comes to \$500,000 which is a \$1/2 million.

Sir, I too share the view that this Bill should be sent to a Select Committee. I do not see any reason why we should be over-anxious to pass it. As the Hon. Premier has put it, some people do not have regard for any gambling as such, I believe it is just a game of skill, and not a game of superior skill. I do not see anything particularly trying so far as my morals are concerned. I do not have such a strong conscience so far as sweepstake gambling is concerned. May be, those who have such a conscience will not take part. I have read books on gambling and I can tell you that when you get through reading them, you are seldom any wiser; therefore, when it comes to these soft points in the consciences of people, it is just a choice in one form of gambling. If you depend on the spin of the coin and it was a real choice, I do not see anything wrong in doing it. I personally do not like it myself. I think that the evils from gambling come from when you lose.

Sir, I was very impressed with the number of exemptions and I think that the half million dollars licence is very catchy so far as the Government is concerned. I do not blame them, but I do not see how this company can be all the success it can be if it is not able to operate successfully in markets which are considered unlawful or if this company has to depend on the wider markets when such markets are considered unlawful markets. That is my reason for fear.

Sir, I was amazed why this company was so generous to the Barbados Turf Club. Surely, companies which run a similar line of business are in competition with one another. You get one company offering more than the other company but in this case, this company seems to be bending backwards in generosity to the Barbados Turf Club. They are offering that company a \$20,000 prize. That is alarming. If they are not going to operate in Barbados, they are not operating in Barbados. Personally, I do not see why they should not operate in Barbados. You may get some people importing these tickets back into this country. I say that if you are gambling, you are gambling. This is a form of gambling. It is taking a chance; but as long as you are sure that it is not a case of superior skill that you have got to win, it is taking a fair chance, and there is nothing wrong in that. I am not so happy as the Government may be as to how much we may benefit after getting the first \$1/2 million. There are other points which in this Bill can better be dealt with if it is sent to Select Committee and that is

why I associate myself with the members who are going to vote that it be sent to Select Committee.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I have waited a long time to speak, and during that time I have heard very much. I sometimes say after hearing the points that have been put forward, especially the point as regards conscience, that sometimes you can regard conscience as a matter of conviction, and sometimes you can regard conscience as something which you can purchase. I say that because I have good proof that when people talk of conscience in politics that is as cheap to them as buying a shirt because some people's consciences change. When you hear these pontifical remarks about 'conscience', 'morally', I would ask people who talk about these things to have a little introspection.

This Bill was given notice of a month ago and I objected to proceeding with the Bill at that time because members did not have enough time to study it.
5.20 p.m.

I say that hon. members have not done anything more than they did on the last occasion, and now the majority of them are working on the hypothesis that easy lessons are good for dunces. That is a deep-rooted aspect of the matter. Some hon. members have read this Bill only today because now they say in their remarks "from what I have heard". Are we elected to come in here and say what we have heard or are we elected in here to say what we have studied? The hon. junior member for the City made a good speech; but it was a speech, not for sending this Bill to a Select Committee, but it was a speech for the rejection of the Bill. In a speech on the Second Reading of a Bill which you are asking to be sent to a Select Committee you must make points as to why you want the Bill to be sent to Select Committee; you make points because you disagree with it in some fundamentals and if there is anything which is not aboveboard you want it referred to Select Committee.

The hon. junior member for the City asked this question: "Are you sure that these people are honest people? They were not allowed to operate in Jamaica!" But the hon. member did not say why these people were not allowed to operate in Jamaica. He said that there must be some reason why they were not allowed to operate there.

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order. I said the ultimate measure would have to be a result in a decrease in taxation.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I understand, Sir, that while I was out of the House, the hon. junior member for the City made a lot of smearing accusations against the promoters of this particular company. I should like to say, Sir, that speeches are not prejudiced, and the hon. member would be very susceptible to the payment of substantial damages in a court by virtue of the fact that I have said before that I had made a check with the Financial Secretary of Trinidad as to this matter. If I said that I offered to show the Reports of one of these Directors who owns a mining operation valued at \$172 million dollars, his own personal property, and then the hon. member is going to accuse him of not having any financial standing, I will go into the Court and give evidence against him. Indirectly, too, the hon. member has accused the Government of getting in with people of no good standing. The adviser to the Federal Government who is a very celebrated person, Mr. John Scarne sent me documentation of all the possible implications of a national lottery of this kind. If the hon. member says that he did not make any accusation of that kind, I am just warning him. I want him to vote against the Bill and say it is not a reputable undertaking; but do not let him throw out all kinds of slander and say that the Colonial Office is not prepared to do anything for this country and we have to persuade them to bring this company to Barbados and they have been refused in Jamaica.

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have no apologies to make, neither are damages recoverable from impecunious Headmasters. If he thinks that what I said are accusations, the speech can be sought, and whatever action he cares to take he can take and I am unperturbed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said that the hon. member made a good speech; but if I had made the speech which the hon. member made, I would be voting against this Bill because the hon. member said that these people were not allowed to operate in Jamaica, but he did not say why. A cursory glance at some of the speeches which I heard, even a cursory glance at some of those speeches would make you regard them as something which you can dismiss promptly from your mind. The hon. member purported to give reasons why we had to be very careful in this matter and I say that those reasons were reasons why the hon. member should object to the whole idea of sending this Bill to a Select Committee. I was against dealing with this Bill in a hurry, and I repeat that I am not one of those addicted to gambling because my own intelligence teaches me that that is not a field for me to look for any worthwhile livelihood. I find relaxation in other pursuits. It is not either a mental or a physical exercise and therefore I do not get any enjoyment from a pursuit of this sort. As I say, Sir, I must have a mental or physical exercise after which I feel better.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not enjoy pool betting. I have my own views about gambling in poor countries. I saw my colleague sweating it out one afternoon in Marhill Street (*Laughter*) and I said that he was not engaging himself at that stage in those personal pursuits in which he should engage himself, but, on the contrary, he is trying to get rich quickly. That is what he is trying to do. I have heard of all the glories about the Turf Club and of the sweepstakes, but lots of people who go in for buying racehorses do not have to pay any taxation on the winnings because a man can own a racehorse and he can make \$10,000 and that is not regarded as income.
5.30 p.m.

If I make \$1,000 however, that is regarded as income; so the solicitors and lawyers have shown people in Barbados when they reach a certain affluent position how to deprive the Treasury of money by different types of investment. You know that there are horses on plantations and the money that they make is regarded as normal operational expenses; so when a horse wins, all the money goes to the owner.

I feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if members are as strong as they are about this matter, then it is not a question of a second reading; it is a question of Select Committee. I say that if they pleaded on the last occasion for time to examine this and they had examined it, then they should be in a position now to put forward their objections, because it is not being referred to a Select Committee to get information from someone. We refer a Bill to Select Committee on the basis that we feel the public have not had an opportunity to express their views on it, and that could not be the situation when you examine the political construction of this House. The four members of the Opposition Party spoke on this matter. The Leader of the Party spoke and the Deputy Leader spoke, and the other Party members with the exception of the hon. junior member for St. James spoke for the amorphous organisation that they represent. Speaking on any matter now is a normal exercise for the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. I believe he hears his voice. He has a natural art which we do not possess in that we are the only people who do not know how our voices sound; but he is the only person who knows and it has a sweet sound. When you listen to his speech and that of his colleague, one was back in the days of "Man Born to be King" with the people in rags at the foot of the Cross, and therefore we went right back into Africa, and he came from a little lower down the coast as against those who come from higher up; and there was a vivid description by the Leader of the Opposition, but all of it was nothing to do with the Bill. Do you agree that there are Clauses you want to insert? What are these Clauses? We should know that rather than have this kind of pentecostal fulminations which you get from the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, which is very good for a fireside chat, but meaningless when it comes to a serious matter like this, because you cannot put any of these statements in a Clause that would make sense for the future.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we want to know what are the objections to this. All the members have said that if you can get this money, it is a good thing, but..... and that "but"

is as tall as the United Nations which they have not yet constructed. Do they feel that the people are likely to be frauds, and if they are, do they want to go into Select Committee to find out if they are frauds? I gather from the introduction of this Bill that some of the members were under the impression that this was something to crush the Barbados Turf Club. I have no love for the Barbados Turf Club. Gambling is gambling, and I had a very good joke of a person in Barbados. He went to the races one day and bought a ticket on which he won some money, but the priest told him he had to give back the money, because they did not believe in gambling, if he wanted to continue in the Church; and he gave it back. You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are some people who really believe it is impossible for people with a conviction to do something they feel is wrong. He felt it was wrong and he gave the money back. That is a question of conviction, and some people call it conscience; but some people do not have the courage of their convictions, and some people's conscience can easily be bought or sold. That man had a strong conviction and felt he had done something wrong; so he gave back the money as the priest had told him. However, he went into a raffle and won a cake, and he went to the priest and asked how it was that he objected when he won the money and was told to give it back, and now the church is running a cake raffle to get money and he has won the cake he cannot accept it. The result is that from that day the particular church, which I will leave unnamed, stopped raffling at fairs or bazaars.

This Bill, Sir, seeks to give the Company the right to operate a lottery, but I am of the opinion, as I have always said, that if people like gambling as the Premier has said, let the State run the gambling. If I were in the Premier's position, there would be nobody gambling in Barbados in a normal way by selling tickets, because I do not subscribe to these borderline decisions in human behaviour so far as their religious concepts are concerned. I do not regard them as the motivating elements that conduct things in a community like this. I do not object to gambling on religious grounds. I object to gambling on the basis that you are likely in a community to get people reaching the stage where they feel gambling is a way of life and they would not begin to look for work. That is why I said I was against gambling casinos, because you not only raffle money, but you import crooks, and in small communities where you do not have large areas of people to operate, the small communities become dangerous for you. I do not consider it wrong if the Government had to take over the Turf Club and run it, because the Turf Club raffles money in the same way. They sell 1,000 tickets and put them to a few horses running around the Garrison, which is only raffling money, but there is the additional fun of seeing the horses run which is not the important thing. If you remove the sale of sweepstakes from the Turf Club, all the horses would stop running, and all you would get is polo and gymkhana. The thing that keeps racehorses running is the fact that you are selling sweepstake tickets. People pay 50 cents for a piece of paper with a number on it and wait until the wheel is spun to see if they have won. People are not interested in bingo because the money is going to charity, because they are the least interested in charitable institutions; but they are playing bingo because the prize is \$2,000 or \$3,000 and they are likely to win. The community is not likely to give you thousands of dollars if you sent out and ask for money for charitable institutions or to send someone for an operation. Some of us would go to a race meeting and spend \$100. I will make this analysis that people who spend that amount at a race meeting would not give anything appreciable to charity. That is why I was so strong in my views with the Olympic Association.

5.40 p.m.

Some people will not give a penny to the Barbados Olympic Association to send a Barbadian to Tokyo but will say "Let the Government send the person to Tokyo." But the same person would go to the races and spend \$10.00 on gambling, and when you analyse all the money spent on gambling, it would send all the athletes whom we have to Tokyo. Those same people would take a chance at losing \$25 hoping that they would win. I would say that people have got so accustomed to playing these easy games of chance that everybody is now doing it.

There are all sorts of drives. Political parties have political dinners for which, may be, you pay \$100 or anything down to \$25 for a plate. You have people in the United States of America doing these things; but in the United States of America, gathering money for charity is on a completely different basis from the concept that is activating people in Barbados. The American people give money but they do not give money on their winning money. Millions of dollars are collected every year from the March of Dimes. They have different techniques by which they collect a lot of money.

The concept here is gambling. I am not a believer in utilising gambling as such as a means of raising funds, but it is now so deep-rooted in the life of Barbadians that it seems to be the easiest way to get Barbadians to give. Apparently, the Government is utilising the same thing as a means of raising revenue.

I would say that if hon. members are truly in favour of the principle of the Bill, then it should either be that they agree to the Bill, and what objections they have they should be able to write them in as amendments or ask for these things to be clarified. You hear all these stupid arguments. You hear this. Do you believe that everybody would give \$1/2 million so easily? The whole idea of it is that it is a business for the people who are running this company, and it is a business where chances are involved and these people must have known what the market is before they offered to pay a fee of \$1/2 million. Their income must have been known before they entered it. Have you any idea of what the Barbados Turf Club earns on the number of tickets which they sell? Have you asked yourself what is the value of that annually to them when they operate in little Barbados with only 240,000 people? If it means something to them, can you imagine what it means to somebody who is exposed to a wider population! We have this conception that the world is rotating around us.

I am no expert on international law, but I hear people say you cannot do this or we cannot sell this in the United States or Canada. I know that Sir Frank Worrel's mother won money on the Irish Sweepstake. What I do know is that if you win money in the United States on a sweepstake ticket, it is different from Barbados because that money is taxable and it is not like here where it is regarded as capital. When you win money at the Garrison or anywhere else, that is capital. When you win something on the Irish sweepstake, that is taxable. I do not know where people have got my name from or who have sent my name to these sellers of sweepstakes, but I see at my home every now and then, a bunch of sweepstake tickets from Malta and I just throw them in the wastepaper basket.

I hear today all these objections to doing it. You say that you want this Bill sent to Select Committee. As a matter of fact, the best speech which I have heard has come from the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown, but that was not a speech pertaining to why it should be sent to a Select Committee; it was more a speech that you should throw out the Bill. If I were as strong in my condemnation over the person operating from here or over his *bona fides*, I would not vote for it either; but when members say that the Bill meets their approval, I do not see why they should be saying that it should be sent to Select Committee. You hear all this sort of wishy-washy arguments which are not worthy; and I feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you should not be talking about conscience in a matter like this. Where is conscience involved in this matter unless somebody's conscience is perpetually involved in anything they do? I would say quite plainly that I have been in the House of Assembly long enough to have classic and perfect examples of Members of Parliament who have consciences and character and some who have none at all. Therefore, I never bring things like this in debates at all.

If you are going to pass a Bill setting up the running of sweepstakes, pass the Bill. You also have heard today some hon. members talking about "buy local". That is the sort of talk you hear outside on the street. Do you mean in your buying sweepstake tickets that you should "buy local"?

People from here buy Trinidad sweepstake tickets also. It is not a question of "buy local". This is a foreign company which proposes to operate from here. Who is going to be the staff? I have spoken today about people coming to Barbados to operate businesses and I consider that they should employ local people. If hon. members were willing to study their various objections to the Clauses of the Bill which they consider are not operative, just like saying that Clause 4 cannot operate as it is or that it cannot function as it is, I could have very well understand that. But if we are dealing with *bona fides*, and you are not satisfied about that, I do not see any reason why this Bill should be sent to a Select Committee. Hon. members have had enough time to consider it. They could have considered it in their political party and then if they wished further advice, they should have been able to get their own expert advisers to come to their own rooms and see where the objections are to the operation of this company. If the Opposition Party did not wish this Bill to come into operation, they could have well hammered it out Clause by Clause in their party room and come here and say so. Surely, you would not have had a hundred per cent speeches from the members of one Party and a hundred per cent speeches from the members of the other Party.

5.50 p.m.

You can do a sort of subtraction; one from three leaves two, both of them spoke, and that is one hundred per cent. You can have all of these members on the Opposition side speaking on a matter on which they feel so strongly but there is no united front, I believe that the hon. junior member for St. George made a greater contribution when he attempted to do something else because he entered into a field which would add some cultural life to the community rather than just debating something for the sake of debating it. Those hon. members were not like me at the beginning. I would say that if everybody feels that this is a means of getting money, well, okay, let us pass it. If you want a good hospital and you are not prepared to tax the people, I will say that the Hon. Premier will soon run into trouble with the concept of making people believe that they can avoid taxation.

If you want good services, then you must be taxed in order to pay for them. No community can rise above the level of its own economy. If you want to live in a nice home, then you must pay for it. If you go on with these things, soon and very soon a man will want to marry a woman and he will come and ask the Government to supply him with the ring. Somebody else will then come along with a new gimmick and say that you should give people rings if they want to marry. You know, Sir, we have had some examples of that; that is to say, a man says: "If you want me to get married, you will have to give me the ring." I want to say, Sir, that responsibility in life is something which you cannot avoid. We have not yet come to the end of taxation because we have not yet come to the end of living. A man who is running a business is not going on with that business and is not making a profit. (*ASIDES*). Nobody would suggest that you should go on with any business without making a profit, because you would not be able to do that. The aims and achievements of people are only the demonstration of progress.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to whom are you going to pay taxation? You cannot tell people that you have come to the end of taxation. Somebody wants to borrow a hundred pounds by means of which he wants to do business; well, in order to make that loan to that man you must have more taxation. You cannot just get money by going to the apple tree and shaking it and all the money will drop down. I want to say, Sir, that some people will vote for you because you do not tax them, but if you do not tax them you will have an impoverished society; you will have a barefooted society just as if you are living in slavery. The opponents of this Bill have not given any alternative to it. They refer to sending this Bill to a Select Committee, but I not see them putting forward any views which would warrant this Bill being sent to any Select Committee. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph got his colleagues in this Party to join him, but they should have come here today armed with their points for sending this Bill to a Select Committee. I feel, Sir, that

the time has come when hon. members should seriously consider all the aspects of this matter and go from one Section to another with the conscientious conviction that they do not agree with this or that. If I were some of those hon. members, if I saw something on which I thought this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, I would say that I must have the opportunity of discussing this matter with somebody before I agree with it. However, Sir, hon. members have today made up their minds that this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee and they have not given any reason why they are asking that that should be done. You cannot ask for information on points which you have not raised. One of the Councils has passed a Resolution to bring forward something in this House for a Town Hall, and apart from the administration of the Hospital, I would like to see that we do something like that.

I am very pleased to see the kind of hospital which we are erecting at present. It is a very beautiful building. I am not an expert on hospital matters, but I understand that it is a matter of eight million dollars. (A MEMBER: Eight and a half million dollars). Well, an hon. member says \$8 1/2 million being spent. I want to say, Sir, that we have to be very careful in our thinking in Barbados, but in a country which has an annual Budget of \$30 million approximately, one hospital for the expenditure of \$8 1/2 million is a big thing which we have taken on. I am always in favour of having good standards, but, Sir, do not let us get this idea in our heads that with an economy of \$30 million and with an area of 166 square miles, we can go beyond our means. With our limited economy we want to see in this island that we have what is the best we can afford.

6.00 p.m.

I hope the Premier will not fall into this habit that I used to hear, each time we got an expert, of saying that he is the best in the world; so that you give the impression that all the experts in the world are waiting to come to Barbados. We may boast of having some of the best cricketers in the world, but do not let us in spending money begin to tell somebody that we want the best Parliament Building in the world. I saw a Parliament building in Northern Nigeria which was one of the best I have seen in the world. We cannot compete, and I say that because of the school buildings going up. I think Barbadians are very house conscious and building conscious, and they have been set patterns by people who have had better advantages and opportunities. There seems to be a tendency now that whenever they are constructing a building, they try to see if they can get all the embellishments in the building, so that somebody will say that Barbados has the best hospital in the whole Caribbean. That sort of pride, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is all right when you have money in your pocket, but you must sometimes be prepared not to have the best, but to have good standards within your economy, because I am a little bit worried that the cost of a building that was estimated at \$4 million is now going to be \$8 1/2 million. The net effect of that is that it must impinge on some of the other things that would have occurred, because \$4 1/2 million more in our economy must have an adverse effect on some of your other projections.

I feel, Sir, that, so far as this measure is concerned, I would be in favour of members' request if they gave me good reasons for sending this to Select Committee, but I am satisfied that they have not given any reasons for sending it to Select Committee, and they should be in here today raising points and putting any objections to the Bill. I will vote for the second reading of the Bill.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now sent to Select Committee.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill be sent to Select Committee. Hon. members in favour, please say "Aye"; Hon. Members against, please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Divide!

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I imagine that the "noes" sounded more vociferous to you than the "ayes"; therefore you were quite justified in calling the "noes" have it; but the Government does not propose to resist the proposal for sending the Bill to Select Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A division has been called, and there is no alternative in my opinion than to take that.

AYES: Mr. BATSON, Honourables E. W. BARROW, W. A. CRAWFORD, C. E. TALMA, G. G. FERGUSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, J. C. TUDOR, Messrs. LOWE, CORBIN, WEEKES, YEARWOOD, BOXILL HUSBANDS, COWARD, HOLDER, SMITH, MILLER, LYNCH, GODDARD, SEALEY and Mr. MOTTLEY - 21.

NOES: Mr. WALCOTT - 1.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, 21 hon. members voting "aye" and one hon. member voting "no". I now declare the "ayes" have it.
6.10 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to nominate the following members to serve on this Select Committee.

The hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown (Mr. Mottley); the hon. junior member for Christ Church, (Mr. Goddard); the hon. junior member for St. James, (Mr. Holder); the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, (Mr. Edwards); the hon. senior member for St. Philip, (Mr. Crawford); the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, (Mr. Batson); and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, (Mr. Boxill).

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have to inform the Honourable House that today being Tuesday and there are sittings of the High Court, both the Hon. Speaker and myself were engaged in different Courts and it was evident that both of us could not be here at the usual time; therefore, there was an undertaking by the Hon. Speaker that had I been late, he would grant permission that the two questions standing in my name be tabled at any time during the sitting. With the

leave of the House, those two questions would be put now by the hon. junior member for St. James.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to give notice of two questions standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James, who was absent during Question Time.

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

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of yourself, I now give notice of these questions:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware of the hardships being caused to the residents of Rock Dundo and Sion Hill because of the absence of water supply between 9.00 p.m. and 6.00 a.m. daily?

2. Is this absence of water due to the closing off of the main or tanks which pump the water from Black Best through Haymans and the districts of Rock Dundo and Sion Hill?

3. Will the Minister have this matter fully investigated immediately with a view to remedying the same?

Also,

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware of the acute shortage of water supply in the Thorpes Housing Area in the parish of St. James?

2. Is the Minister aware that the residents of this area frequently experience hardships because of the absence of water between six o'clock and nine o'clock on morning?

3. Will the Minister make inquiry into the system of water supply in this area with a view of remedying the same?

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 28th January, 1964, at 4.30 p.m. in the afternoon.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.20 p.m.