

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1976 - 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21st June, 1977.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., LL.D.; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Hon. H. deB. FORDE, S.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Dr. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade, Industry and Tourism and Leader of the House); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture) and Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, (Acting Minister of Labour and Community Services).

Prayers were read.

His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, Deputy Speaker, entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. SANDIFORD entered the Chamber and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 31st May, 1977.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, these Minutes have been circulated, and subject to any comments from the other side, any errors or

alterations I beg to move that they be taken as read.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no objection, the Minutes stand confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to report that I have received copies of the results of the examination of the accounts of the island for the year ended 31st March, 1975, together with two sets of relevant statements of account as submitted by the Auditor General.

I have also received Accounts and Statements for the month of March, 1977 as prepared by the Accountant General.

MESSAGE FROM THE HONOURABLE THE SENATE

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received a Message from the Other Place. It is a Message in reply to our Message of the 18th January, 1977. The Other Place passed with amendments the Resolution concerning the Clerk of Parliament and now requests the concurrence of this Hon. House in the said Resolution as amended; and secondly, that the Hon. the Senate has passed the Waterworks Department (Amendment) Bill, 1977 with an amendment in which that House requests the concurrence of this Hon. House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SPEAKER: Since this Hon. House last sat the Clerk has received a letter from the hon. member for St. Michael South West requesting leave from this Hon. House as from the 19th June, 1977 until the 7th August, 1977.

If there is no objection to the application for leave, leave will be granted.
12.25 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Your Honour, I think that we would be more able to deal with this matter if we knew when last the hon. member attended a sitting of this House. Standing Order 72(2) says: "If, without leave of the House, any Member, shall be absent from sittings of the House continuously for not less than three calendar months, the seat of that Member shall be declared vacant."

I believe, that this is the reason why the member for St. John is here today and this letter has been received from the member for St. Michael South West. I think that the fact that they waited until the last possible moment and then asked for leave is a valid consideration that hon. members should bear in mind in dealing with this letter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Prime Minister objecting to leave being granted?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would like to know when last did the hon. member come to this House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, it was my impression that you said, "there being no objection leave is granted."

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not yet reached that stage. I am informed that the hon. member for St. Michael South West was absent from this Hon. House for the last two sittings. He was last present on the 17th May, 1977.

Now, there being no objection, leave is granted.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Report of the Commission of Enquiry, Parts I and II, on the Cubana aircraft accident of 6th October, 1976.

Also the agreement relating to the Government's participation in Caribbean Airways Ltd.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the following documents:—

Contract "D" for the construction of On-shore facilities re Expansion and Improvement of the Port of Bridgetown.

The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No. 3) Regulations, 1977.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:—

A Resolution to approve the vesting of land at Silver Sands, Christ Church in the National Housing Corporation.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Tichbourne, St. Michael, for purposes of road improvement.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Pie Corner, St. Lucy, for purposes of road improvement.

A Resolution to approve the vesting of certain lands at Wildey, St. Michael, in the Natural Gas Corporation.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$10,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Annexed Estimates, 1977–78, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1977–78, No. 2, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$3,266,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1977–78, Part II – Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1977–78, No. 3 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also a Resolution to grant the sum of \$47,500 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1977–78, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1977–78, No. 4 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I will also draw to the attention of hon. members that leave will be sought later to deal with a Resolution of which notice has been given under Standing Order 22(1) (b) by the Hon. Leader of the House.

It is a Resolution to approve the sale by the Crown to Space Research Corporation Vermont, United States of America, of the Motor Vessel known as the "North Point".

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael North Central — his Question respecting the policy of Government in relation to Federation.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker,

1. Will the Minister state the policy of Government in relation to federation of the Eastern Caribbean islands?
2. Will the Minister also state whether any exploratory talks on such a federation have taken place between the Government of Barbados and any other Government?
3. If the answer to (2) above is in the affirmative, will the Minister also state:
 - (a) which Caribbean Governments have participated in such talks, and
 - (b) whether the United States of America, the United Kingdom or Canada have participated in any such talks?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member — his Question concerning the post of Consul General in New York.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker,

1. Is the Minister aware that the post of Consul General, New York is still vacant?
2. Will the Minister please state the reasons for the delay in making a substantive appointment to the post?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member so desires I would be glad to answer that question today.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South — his question relating to Traffic lights.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker,

1. Is the Minister aware that traffic lights throughout St. Michael, including those which have recently been installed at the junctions of (1) Beckles Road and Bay Street and (2) Jemmotts Lane and Bay

Street, have been malfunctioning with increasing frequency?

2. Is the Minister aware that inefficient traffic lights (a) retard the flow of traffic and (b) cause accidents?
3. Will the Minister state what steps are being taken to ensure that the malfunctioning of those traffic lights is corrected?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, if the member so desires, that question can be answered today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Happily, time is on the side of the Ministers on this occasion.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Banking Act, Cap. 322, be now read a first time.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

STATEMENT BY MINISTERS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker,

Today, Parts I and II of the Report submitted by the Commission of Enquiry which was appointed to conduct an Enquiry into the Cubana aircraft accident which occurred off the coast of Barbados on 6th October, 1976, has been laid in this Honourable House.

2. The Report of the Commission has been prepared and submitted to His Excellency the Governor-General in three Parts. Part I deals with the technical aspects of the Enquiry and has been prepared in accordance with a form recommended by the International Civil Aviation Organization. Part II deals with a number of topics which arose out of the accident, e.g. the location of the crash; the case against two persons suspected of being involved in the cause of the accident; the position of the Barbados authorities. Part III is a confidential security survey which examines the security arrangements

at the airport generally but does not deal specifically with the aircraft accident of 6th October, 1976.

3. Because of the nature of Part III of the Report and inasmuch as it does not deal specifically with the particular accident, on grounds of national security, that Part of the Report has not been laid together with the other two Parts. Neither will that Part of the Report be released to the general public nor to other Governments.

4. It will be observed that whereas Part I of the Report is signed by all three Commissioners, Part II is signed by only two of them. Mr. William Howes of the Department of Transport in Canada, whose services as an experienced aircraft accident investigator were generously provided by the Government of Canada as one of the three Commissioners, did not sign Part II because of the reason given in the following statement which I have been authorised by the Government of Canada to make:

"The services of Mr. Howes were provided by the Canadian Government to the Barbados Government under an International Civil Aviation Organization arrangement whereby one country assists another when an aircraft disaster occurs. Mr. Howes was required to limit his participation in the aircraft accident investigation to technical aspects of the circumstances and causes of the crash. He therefore signed only Part I of the Report as a Commissioner."

5. Copies of Parts I and II of the Report have been made available to the Governments of Canada, Cuba, Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago, the United States of America and Venezuela — all of whom have some interest in the matter. And in accordance with the provisions of the relevant Annex to the Convention on International Civil Aviation copies of Parts I and II of the Report will also be submitted to the International Civil Aviation Organization in Montreal.

6. I should like to place on public record the Government's appreciation of the work done by the Commissioners in the conduct of the enquiry and in the preparation of their Report. I also wish to take this opportunity to record publicly the thanks of the Government of Barbados for the valuable assistance provided by the Canadian Government in making available

the services of Mr. Howes, one of its experienced aircraft accident investigators.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 8, asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy, is now ready.

Also the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 16 asked by the hon. member for St. Philip North, is now ready.

Also the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 31, asked by the hon. member for St. Philip South, is now ready.

Also the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 37, asked by the hon. member for St. Michael, is now ready.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 32, is now ready.

Also the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 39 is now ready.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 40, asked by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central is ready, and I am prepared to give the answer.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 for the balance of today's sitting.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BILLS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 be taken as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 is the instant Order of the Day. It is to move the House into

Committee on the Bill to amend and consolidate certain enactments concerning the imposition of duties and fees in relation to betting and gaming.

BETTING AND GAMING DUTIES ACT, 1977

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: 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 on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the word "This" be substituted for the word "The" in Clause 1. This is a formal matter, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. DeLISLE BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 2 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Clause 2 stand part, I beg to move that the word "include" in the definition "game of chance" be deleted and the word "includes" substituted, and I also beg to move that in the definition of "promoter" the word "persons" be deleted and the word "person" be substituted. These are again grammatical amendments arising from mistakes in printing.

I beg to move that Clause 2 as amended stand part.

Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 3 and 4 were called and passed.

Clause 5 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In Clause 5 subclause 3, I beg to move that the word "open" before the word "any" be deleted and the word "opened" substituted. This is purely a grammatical amendment.

I beg to move that Clause 5 as amended stand part.

Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 6 and 7 were called and passed.

Clause 8 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In moving Clause 8, I beg to move that the word "the" be deleted. I believe in the printed copy circulated to hon. members there are two "the"; there should only be one, and it should read "or negotiate any bet on any horse race held under the auspices of the Barbados Turf Club." So that the Clause will read: "The proprietor of, or any person employed at, any premises registered under section 10 shall not accept, or negotiate any bet on any horse race held under the auspices of the Barbados Turf Club."

I beg to move that Clause 8 as amended stand part.

Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 9 and 10 were called and passed.

Clause 11 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In Clause 11 there is an amendment of substance. We are not on this side in favour of arbitrary Government or the appearance of arbitrary Government, and therefore in Clause 11(2) we wish to add after "The Minister may by order vary the amount specified in Subsection (1)" the words "and any Order so made should be subject to negative Resolution".

I beg to move that Clause 11 as amended stand part.

Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 12, 13 and 14 were called and passed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, from here on I would like to take advantage of the Standing Orders and custom which allow Bills to be moved in parts because we are seeking to delete the whole of Part III and substitute a new Part III. This is an alteration of substance based upon representation which have been made relating to the matter of gaming machine licences and lottery licences. Under the Scheme as originally brought to the House, it was sought to apply the main control on the level of import of gaming machines, but it has been pointed out that there are already a considerable number of gaming machines, many of them legal, and that there is an application before the I.D.C., I believe, for permission to make the machines in Barbados. This to my mind has destroyed the basis of seeking to control these machines at importation level, and we feel that they must now be controlled at the level of use; so we are seeking to withdraw the original Parts III and IV which place the primary emphasis on importing and instead substitute provision which places the primary emphasis on the grant of gaming licences and at the same time imposing conditions relating to customs, so that you can have the machines here, but you must keep them in an approved place where they would be subject to inspection unless and until you get a gaming machine licence for them when of course they would be further subject to inspection, but in a different sense.

12.55 p.m.

This is the broad purpose of the amendment, although hon. members will observe that the functions of the Committee have been given an extended specification so that persons who have to do this business will be able to see exactly what the Committee will have to take into account in determining whether or not to give a Gambling licence. Thus the new Section 16 which we are seeking to introduce indicates that all lotteries for more than \$100 or tickets sold for more than \$500, which is the old Act, will have to be submitted to the Committee; the Committee will consider the question of import licenses and decide whether to authorize the Comptroller of Customs to grant a licence. It will also determine the suitability of premises for the purpose of declaring the premises under the Act the power to prescribe the number of machines in approved premises, — a new power

which will be quite important, the power to examine claims made by licence holders, and the Committee will be subjected to general directions laid down by the Minister of Finance.

I think I have explained the new shape of parts 3 and 4, and under the circumstances, I beg to move that part 3, sections 15 to 17 as amended, establishing and constituting the Betting and Gaming Committee, stand part.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Prime Minister would consider putting the Section by Clauses, because if we could in fact go through this section Clause by Clause it would give us a little more time to concentrate on any matters needing a little closer look. It might take a little longer time but I think it might be beneficial.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, hon. members should bear in mind that we are not adopting the ruling which applies to money Resolutions; but if the hon. member prefers it that way, I will move it section by section. I therefore beg leave to withdraw my previous motion and beg to move that Clause 15 stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 15 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg that Clause 16, as amended in the form circulated to hon. members, stand part.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I would like to inquire from the Hon. Prime Minister what happens to lotteries if the value is below \$100 or the value of tickets less than \$500? How do you take care of this? Would you shed some light on this.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: As far as I know I think this comes under the Gambling Act and I suppose that charities are allowed to hold small lotteries. I will have to take advice on this. If any other hon. member wishes to speak, he may do so otherwise I will have to postpone further consideration of this Section.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I wish the hon. Minister would take advice before coming to the House and not after. I think he is a legally

qualified practitioner. Anybody who has the slightest claim to knowledge of the Gambling Act of Barbados knows that the Committee which previously existed is a purely administrative body and there is no mention in the Act of the amount of money to be distributed exceeding or below \$100 or the value of chances of tickets to be sold to be over \$500. There is absolutely no mention in any Act of such conditions. This whole thrust means now that Barbados is entering into a new sphere altogether — a gambling sphere.

Now as regard to the question which was asked by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central — what is going to happen now if somebody wants to hold a lottery and the money to be distributed is under \$100. Would you have to go to a different Committee? And suppose somebody is selling tickets for a lottery and the value of the chances to be taken or the tickets to be sold does not exceed \$500, do you go to another Committee? What the Government is doing here, if they want to go like the United Kingdom and throw this whole country open to the Mafia and gambling, let them do it. They announced their intention of raising non-tax revenue, after giving back the mercantile community some \$11,000,000. So this is the way they are going to raise it. They set up a Committee of civil servants with a jurisdiction like a petty debt court — a jurisdiction in excess of \$100 in some cases and \$500 in others. Now, if there is a discrepancy between the previous gambling laws and the present Act I would expect the hon. member to inform himself so that he would be able to answer any questions. He is now working full time on the job and says he has a master copy of everything he comes in here with — a master plan, a master charge. So if he has this master copy, he should look at it and answer the question.

1.05 p.m.

I am in no position to quote everything out of my head on the laws of Barbados, but there was an administrative arrangement that the committee, whose functions seem to be as elastic as the imagination of the members of that committee from time to time — civil servants again — they tended to refuse some people's opportunities to play bingo games and grant leave to other institutions, groups and bodies. (*ASIDES*). If the hon. member wants to intervene I will take my seat and let him do so.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I did not get the hon. member correctly but I hope that I am not misrepresenting what he said. I understood him to say that under section 16 subsection 8 there is no such provision in the existing laws of Barbados, and I believe that I am quoting him correctly. The hon. member really has said that he has only just got his copy so I will excuse him. Section 16 subsection 8 repeats the existing laws of Barbados.

The hon. member was Minister of Finance who has had the benefit of money from gambling when he ran the Government and should have remembered this provision, and if he looks at Cap. 134, section 4 he will find that the then Gambling Committee had power to hear and determine all applications for licences to hold lotteries for a charitable object where the money or money's worth to be distributed or allotted exceeds one hundred dollars or the value of the chances to be taken or tickets to be sold exceeds five hundred dollars. That amendment, for the benefit of the hon. member, came in in 1960 (1960-30) and in the 1964 amendment and has been transcribed into the 1971 laws of Barbados. You will hear the hon. member all of a sudden becoming so pure that he forgets that it is under his Government that that disreputable Act, the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake Act, was passed and that he permitted Barbados to be used as a centre for abusing the laws of other persons for gambling, and that he was the architect of the Act, and that he defended stoutly even when people, the Church and everybody else, asked him to withdraw it. He forgets that he permitted the company to operate without paying taxes and in breach of the very law which he passed, and now he has the privilege, unfortunately, of getting up in this House in order to criticise this Government of bringing in the Mafia, he started the Mafia — if he wants to ask anybody — by bringing the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake Act.

The hon. member had better do his homework. I will give him the benefit because he says he has only just received his copy, but he must be very careful of what he says. The position is that that section only deals with allowing certain types of gambling by charitable bodies, so that charities which they permitted under their Government were allowed in order to carry out certain things like playing bingo and various other forms of gambling, and I think it is only in these instances it is being dealt with. As I understand it, other instances will come into common law and the Gambling Act.

That is the reply to the hon. member.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member said that I brought in the Mafia and I ask the hon. member to withdraw that. I have never brought in the Mafia into Barbados. I think that is a very unparliamentary and derogatory statement to make, and unworthy of even a member of that side. I am asking you to ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement and then I want to go on to make a comment. He said I brought the Mafia into Barbados. (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: What is wrong with that?)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am really very much obliged to the hon. member for St. Michael North Central for raising this point which is a novel one and one which has entirely been missed by a number of draughtsmen, I think, over a period of years. What originally happened....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am on a point of order. These proceedings have got to be conducted in a certain way and in accordance with the Standing Orders. If a member makes an objection you have to rule on that objection, it is a matter for you how you rule, but I have made an objection. The hon. member is out of order to get up and make a speech on another point altogether which has nothing to do with the objection which I have made. You will remember that I said that after you rule I will continue to reply to the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point of order you made is not a point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, but if you remember, I said that I was waiting until after you rule and then I will continue speaking. It is a point of order because it has to do with the order of debate, if you look at the Standing Orders. When a person makes an objection, first a ruling must be given one way or the other, but I specifically stated before I sat down that I was awaiting Your Honour's ruling and then I would continue. Your Honour has not ruled, so the hon. member must not speak now before you rule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already ruled on that, that the point of order you raised....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not think you understand. The point of order that I raised was that the Minister of Finance got up to speak. That is a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But you should continue your speech.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is a point of order, but I also drew it to Your Honour's attention that you have not ruled on my objection. The Standing Orders say that a member cannot impute improper motives to another member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point of order which you raised where you assumed that the interference of the Hon. Attorney General directed certain things at you, I ruled that it was not a point of order at all. You want to know now if you can continue your speech. Is that the question? I do not think anybody has any objection to your continuing your speech.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am completely confused. You have me confused, Sir. Of course this is a new House and you have new rules, maybe it will take me a little time to get accustomed to the new dispensation, the new way of dealing with things. After 25 years it takes a lot of readjustment, I do not really understand.

1.15 p.m.

The hon. member for Christ Church West said that I had allowed the West Indies Hospital Act to continue when the Church had asked me to withdraw it. I would ask the hon. member when did that happen because I have received no representation from any Church or Religious organisation about the West Indies Hospital Act which was passed in this House unanimously by both sides of the House, and which contributed considerable revenue to this island, and was a sweepstake in the same way as the Barbados Turf Club which has been functioning from time immemorial. The West Indies Sweep was a sweepstake which was not allowed to sell tickets in Barbados to Barbadians.

Now, I would like to ask the hon. member if the Church, as I am unaware of, had asked the Government of which I was a member, to withdraw the Act or repeal the Act — I challenge them to find any record of this, or any reference in any newspaper or any copy of any representation made by any religious body to that effect.

I would like to ask the hon. member what is the attitude of the Church now to one armed bandits being introduced into the island now. Have we received any representations about that? Or is the Church itself going to install one armed bandits in their recreational centres? Because if he is saying that the Church asked to

repeal the West Indies Sweepstake, then logically they should ask to repeal the Barbados Turf Club Act as well.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Can I speak, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other hon. member.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No, Sir. Other hon. members can speak. I am trying to explain something. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central, with the commonsense which he has been showing since he has gone into Opposition — may he long remain there — has made a point which really took me by surprise, and it has taken me a moment or two of research to discover the answer.

The answer goes back to 1917. In 1917 when the Gambling Act was passed the definition of "lottery" contained the words which are still there "and for which a licence has been obtained from the Commissioner of Police." The Act itself does not contain any other reference to the Commissioner of Police granting a licence. It might very reasonably be argued that this was bad drafting in 1917, since you have to draw the inference that the Commissioner of Police could give a licence for a lottery conducted for a charitable purpose. Now in 1960 a Committee was appointed, and this Committee was authorised to give a licence for all lotteries where the prize exceeded \$100 or the value of the tickets sold exceeded \$500.

There was a further amendment saying Commissioner of Police or the Committee as the case may be, which indicated and now indicates to me that the Commissioner of Police is empowered to grant licences for lotteries for prizes of up to \$100 or up to chances of \$500. That is what I now deduce from reading the relevant statute. Unfortunately, it is not made clear, if you read Chapter 134 of the Laws of Barbados, because you will see about the Committee having the power to grant the licences, from \$100 to \$500; but it did not give a specific power to the Commissioner of Police to grant the licences for under those sums; and I take the ambit of the hon. member's query that the Commissioner of Police still has an inferential power derived from the old legislation to grant a Licence for up to a prize of \$100 and tickets to \$500; but under the Gambling Act at present, the Committee grants it above those sums; but we are repealing Part II of the Gambling Act. Therefore the power to grant the licence in expensive lotteries will now be found

in this Act and it will rest in the Betting and Gaming Committee.

I would like to think, Sir, that this is not a party matter. It does not involve the Mafia. It does not involve the Church's attitude towards either the West Indies Hospital Sweep or the one armed bandits; and for the record I would like to say that no representation has been received from any churches in respect of the gambling legislation which is now before this House.

Mr. SANDIFORD: If I may speak on another aspect of this matter, Mr. Chairman, I believe that what is happening is that the Government is attempting to regulate the practice of gambling in this country and to have more comprehensive arrangements to ensure that this — well, gambling is not a natural instinct. It is something that is acquired in the terms of the society in which one lives; but in order to ensure that the activities are carried out under certain conditions — and I believe that this is an aspect of the matter which has not been given much attention: and the fact is that we have this Committee proposed — the Betting and Gaming Committee; and it is given fairly extensive powers under Clause 16.

I believe that while the Government is looking at the income side which is supposed to redound from the regulation of gambling activities, there is also the side of how much all of this would cost. It appears to me that in order to carry out these functions there will have to be some kind of inspectorate to ensure that these duties and functions which fall upon the Betting and Gaming Committee are in fact carried out; because we are going into an area where it will be necessary — let me go back a little into history.

As I understand it, Nevada was the gambling capital of the U.S.A. I believe in the early years of this century, certainly in the first decade, first established legalised gambling; and soon after that abandoned legalised gambling because it brought wholesale corruption into that area. A little later on, after the other economic enterprises failed — I believe that the economy of the state came largely from mining — when these mines failed, they then turned to gambling, indeed legalised gambling, as a way of providing income for the state; and I believe that up to 20 per cent of the income came from legalised gambling.

What has happened is that they decided to attract tourism. Through gambling difficulties occurred because the tourist trade itself was killed and they had to look at this Act.

There is no doubt about it, especially when you get into the higher activities of gambling of which I know nothing, — I would play the football pools or buy a ticket — but I know nothing about gambling. What I do know is that other countries have tried through legalised gambling to gain income and revenue, and along with that has come corruption and a lot of problems; and the tourist trade has been adversely affected. One thing is certain, and this has been true of Nevada also; and in Las Vegas there are about two square miles of territory in which you can get a choice of one out of 17,000 gambles if you are interested in that type of activity.

1.25 p.m.

But there you must have a large inspectorate to go around to see that the regulations are adhered to, that the different rules concerning the premises and the people who should operate them are complied with, and that the types of benefits which might be obtained are correct. I think all of these things have to be taken care of. They have a very large inspectorate there. I believe that under Clause 16 we have heard nothing about this particular aspect of the matter that in order to carry out these functions here and to ensure that the person, who is taking the gamble, puts in what he is supposed to put in and no more, and that he gets back, if he is so lucky, what he is supposed to get back from the gamble. All of these things happen in other places, and these things will call for a pretty large inspectorate to carry out these functions.

Unless we want to make this an Act which is observed or noted more in the breach than the observance, I fear that we will have to get an inspectorate to ensure that these provisions are adhered to. I would like to draw that to the attention of the Government. As soon as we move into these areas, particularly in the area where you can have not only organised and legalised gambling, the organised criminals tend to follow afterwards. If we want to maintain or ensure that Barbados does not become the gambling capital of the Caribbean, then we have to ensure that the regulations or whatever legislation we pass will be adhered to. There are many dangers in this particular matter.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, I will just make a few remarks on this matter. As I listened to members of the Opposition, they seem to be under the impression that this Government imported these slot machines in Barbados. We are simply trying to make legal what has been existing in this country for some time. For the last 18 months I have seen slot machines in this

country. We did not import them; we came and found them. We are legalising something that was previously illegal.

Another point. Since this Government has brought this Bill to Parliament, I am surprised to see how many machines have suddenly appeared in this country. It is impossible for these machines to have been imported within the last three or four weeks, so they must have been here. How did they get here? It is quite obvious that the former administration were not doing their work and that these machines were allowed to enter this country. These are sophisticated machines at that. These are machines that must have cost thousands and thousands of dollars. We can see them now because the people are not hiding them any more. They are bringing them out. Why do we have this sudden moral approach to this matter? Why did they not exercise their authority when they were in office and seize these machines and destroy them? It is as simple as that.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I want to take up this matter of Part II and Part III in the old Act. I would like to know from the Hon. Attorney-General what is the advisability of repealing Part II of Chapter 134 and putting it into this new Act. What we are attempting to do here is to set up a Committee which appears to be having powers in respect of two activities: One is to deal with a pure lottery which all of us understand, and the new thing which we are now seeking to legalise and regulate and that is what is referred to as the gaming machine or the one-armed bandit.

When Part II of Chapter 134 is repealed — let us be more specific. Section 5 of Part II says:

“The granting of any licences under this Act shall be subject to such conditions as the Commissioner of Police or the Committee, as the case may be, may prescribe.”

All of that disappears, so we have to assume that, with the repeal of that Section, the Commissioner of Police will no longer have any authority.

Now I would like to ask the Attorney-General who, I believe, was responsible for this, whether he has considered the advisability of retaining Part II in the old Act and bringing in in the new Act a Section dealing specifically with the problem which he wants to regulate without trying to add on the problem of policing lotteries or regulating lotteries also. I would like to know from him if he would not consider it to be a tidier arrangement rather than

repealing Part II of Chapter 134 and then transposing it into the new Act and tying it on to the regulations for gaming machines. I would like to have his reaction to that.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I think I should refer members to the definition of lottery which will now occur in Chapter 134. Now under Chapter 134 a lottery included the Missing Ball Competition, but it did not include any game of chance which had been given permission to operate by the Commissioner of Police, or by the Gambling Committee, for a charitable object.

Now under the Third Schedule to this Act —

“lottery” includes any game, method or device whereby money or money’s worth is distributed or allotted in any manner depending upon, or to be determined, by chance or lot, held, drawn, exercised or managed in Barbados, but does not include any such game, method or device instituted for a charitable object and for which a licence has been obtained from the Betting and Gaming Committee established under the Betting and Gaming Duties Act, 1977, nor any such game, method or device instituted by a national organisation declared by the Minister responsible for Sport by order published in the Official Gazette to be an approved national organisation.”

In other words, you are permitting sporting organisations to be able to carry on lotteries. You are also permitting other organisations to be able to carry on lotteries for charitable objects, and you are saying under the amending Act that, in such cases, they must get the approval of the Gaming Committee.

Now the hon. member dealt with another set of circumstances. He says that because the Section is limited to \$100 and more than that, what happens in those cases where the charitable object wishes to carry on a lottery for a sum of money under \$100? My understanding of the legislation as it now stands is that that would come under gambling as a whole. The only question can be that if the hon. member wishes to permit raffles for prizes under \$100, whether or not the Section stops at the words “charitable object” or, indeed, the words occurring before “where”, or whether or not we leave those completely as infringing the particular legislation. If hon. members feel that the Gaming Committee should be able to deal with everything for charitable objects then, of course, it would be reasonable to take out the words occurring after

the words “charitable objects” from the words “where”. The former Act was constituted in such a way that they were only certain permitted activities which were exempted from the normal definition of a lottery and which attracted the mischief of the common law or, indeed, of statute.

1.35 p.m.

The hon. member has raised the point and as I pointed out, the Minister has indicated that he is quite willing to let the Betting and Gaming Committee have a say in relation to small raffles and to delete those words. If this is the wish of the House there is no objection. So far as the carrying on by the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake of the selling of tickets in Barbados is concerned, the hon. member for St. John probably does not remember that within his Prime Ministerial life time that body did sell tickets in Barbados and indeed it was in the last days of his regime that a lot of publicity was given to the same, and Miss Peta Greaves was allowed to go as one of the advertising people with her picture on the back of the ticket, and if the hon. member did not know that, he must have been getting very tired and that is why he lost the Government. I can only conclude so because these things appear all of a sudden to have gone over his head and we must be continually reminding him of things that happened in his regime.

Now this Act does not introduce anything new in respect of the number of recent machines which have come in here. I am sure the hon. member is also aware that under his regime Michael Parks who was helping him canvass for the party in Bridgetown operated these machines and brought in 49. If he is not so aware, I am asking him what did he do or his Minister to prevent breaches of the laws of Barbados from occurring, because I am only aware of one prosecution having taken place. The hon. member now finds himself in a position, as I said before, where he wants to recapture the Government willynilly and he is going to become self-righteous about everything that happens in this country all of a sudden, trying to give the impression that this Government is making such an innovation on the moral standard of the country, a moral standard which he knew had fallen during the time he was in Government. If you want to see abuses in this country involving integrity and every sort of thing, look at the last fifteen years he was in Government. So what is he talking about? We are trying to control things that happened during his Government. There will be rigidity of control in abuses that have occurred. I have to remind him because it is said that people

have short memories. He has proven that, and it may well be that there are some people who will listen to his speech and give him credence having regard to the fact that he was a former Prime Minister, although it has been proved in this House that his memory is not as good as the words he has written on the files, and I would like to remind him of this.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I have to speak about his speech in this manner, but he must realise that he is no longer talking down to Cabinet Ministers that are afraid to answer him. He must recognise that each one of us can think. He does not read and recall his speeches and know his action, but those that are subject to criticism will be criticised, and those that are worthy of praise he will get the praise for in due course; but he will be criticised nonetheless. He must not misrepresent the facts as they are when we go into debate in the House on matters.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to take up the hon. member for Christ Church North Central who said that the Government is legalising something which was illegal. When the Government became aware that there was a proliferation of the introduction of the devices which are commonly described as one-armed bandits in this country, I immediately raised the matter with the Crown Law Officers and specifically with the Attorney General of Barbados. I have correspondence from the Attorney General of Barbados in writing, a photostat copy of which I am prepared to send by tomorrow to the hon. member. The first reply that I got from the Attorney General was that the Crown Law Officers had done through research into the matter and had discovered one case in which a magistrate in Bridgetown had virtually ruled that one-armed bandits or the machines were not illegal. That was the substance of the ruling. The case was thrown out. The Minister of Finance and Prime Minister is aware of that case. The Attorney General's advice to me at that time was that any prosecution was unlikely to be successful. I informed the Attorney General, and he is still in this Island and I have in writing his opinion, that in my humble opinion the one-armed bandits was a game of chance and I did not agree with what the magistrate ruled. That was my personal opinion. This was some years ago; it is not a magistrate who is on the bench now. I am entitled to my legal opinion still that it was a game of chance and that these things were not in the best interest of the young people of the country, and could he look into the question of amending the law to make it abundantly clear so that something could be done.

The Attorney General then informed me that the Comptroller of Customs whoever he might be from time to time had nothing in the Customs Tariff Act which would enable him to prevent the importation, and that the only other way in which you could stop the importation would be for the Minister of Trade to prohibit the importation or put them under licence. Instructions were then given to the Minister of Trade that while pool tables on which you play snooker and that kind of thing and little machines where you play bagatelle and pinball machines could be brought into the country, they should be placed under licence, but as far as the one-armed bandits were concerned, they should be prohibited, and as far as I know no more were brought in. I could not tell whether the Comptroller of Customs could tell how many machines were brought in, because up to comparatively recently some of these machines — since this Government has been in office — were brought in here as personal effects. Ask the Minister of Finance if that is not so. (A VOICE: How do you know?) You ask me how I know? These machines were being brought in as personal effects and the Customs Officers had to be very careful and examine and open each and every package, and the Minister himself tried to stop it. I am aware of that. You cannot give instructions about people bringing in machines as personal effects, but what I want to tell the hon. member for Christ Church North Central is that a prosecution was brought, because the Attorney General supplied me with an opinion signed by him as Attorney General that these machines were illegal, and the police brought a prosecution overnight. Even before the prosecution was brought, there was some leakage at official level, and all the machines disappeared off the streets. When I say "off the streets" I do not mean they were on the pavement like a twatwa or an outside cafe or restaurant, but they disappeared the night before the police went to raid all the premises to bring cases against all the people who were operating the machines. When the hon. member said we did not allow something to be done, you cannot just go and pounce down on people, to use a Barbadian expression, because you might be exposing the members of the Barbados Police Force to malicious prosecution or wrongful arrest; so you had to do research, but what did the Government do? It was not a question of being self-righteous. What the Government did was to exercise the power vested in the Ministry of Trade to prohibit the importation and put the pool tables and other such games of amusement strictly under licence. I hope that satisfied the hon. member who is talking about illegality.

I do not feel very strongly about gambling. Some of my best friends are gamblers including the hon. member for Christ Church North Central; he is a good poker player. I have had gamblers on the Ministerial Benches when I was in Government, but I cannot afford to gamble. I play the only game which by law is not gambling. If the hon. member looks at the Gambling Act, the only game that is made abundantly clear is not gambling is the game of back gammon, and the laws of Barbados specifically say that back gammon is not a game of chance, it is a game of skill.

1.45 p.m.

I know nothing about gambling, and I am not self righteous about it; but there are socio-economic dangers. People who can afford to play poker and loose \$20,000 a night, that is a matter for them, provided they do not go and commit suicide or sell their house over the heads of their wife and children. So who wants to play poker can play poker; who wants to owe people money for gambling can owe people, but you can't sue anybody for a gambling debt here in Barbados; so that is a chance you take as well. But when you come to exposing young unemployed people to 25 cents games of chance where they hit a jackpot, this is what we have to be careful about.

The other thing which I want to bring to the attention to the hon. members for Christ Church West and Christ Church North Central, the one armed bandit, to use the expression — I do not know any other way in which to describe it — the one armed bandits disappeared from various places; some went upstairs, some went in back premises under lock and key, you had to have a special pass to get in, and that kind of thing; but they disappeared from public use. But soon after this present Government got in, they flourished again openly; so somebody must have had a clue that they would be legalized. This is what I am really concerned about; how did it get about that the Government was going to legalize these machines?

I heard a gasp of astonishment during the speech by the hon. member, the Minister of Finance, when he imposed a \$2,000 fee on these one armed bandits. That is a big joke. I have it on fairly reliable authority — and if he doubts me the hon. member can ask his personal assistant — these things can make \$30,000 a year; so that when you put on a \$2,000 fee you haven't done anything. If you said that the Government was going to control the coin box or whatever it is — as the hon. member for St. Michael

South has suggested — and take 50%, I would be with you. But you are not scaring anybody with \$2,000 fee for a one armed bandit. These things make an average of \$7,000 to \$8,000 a week.

There are certain people in this country who have not pushed a stroke of work in their lives, who are looking forward to being millionaires in about two years time out of one-armed bandits. You have a new elite in Barbados — a gambling elite, a class of people who neither toil nor spin, and Solomon in all his glory will not be arrayed like one of these for another thousand years, including the personal assistant of the Honourable Prime Minister. This is the situation we have reached; so don't let us be sanctimonious or self-righteous about it. We are throwing the country open, so let the Government get a fair share. I have always been in favour of people getting together in a friend's house, having a little game of poker, whist, bridge, for money or whatever they like; that's their business; but we are now putting gambling in the public domain, and that is a different matter. When people of the same economic stratum meet together — it is true some of them imagine they are of the same stratum but they are not really of the same stratum because they are always in debt and hope to get themselves out of debt by gambling, but at least the outward appearance is they are of the same stratum — when such people meet together for drinks or gambling until 2 o'clock in the morning, that is their business. One of the biggest poker games in recent months used to take place next door to me, as the Hon. Minister of Finance knows, but I did not object to that; right next door to me in Maxwell until one, two or three o'clock in the morning. But that is a matter of personal choice; that is a personal, private, social matter. I have never objected to that and I am not criticising anybody for that. A bank holiday comes, you play all night, play the whole bank holiday, among people of equal economic strength. But when you are going to open every little rum shop in Baxters Road and say that under the Democratic Labour Party these things were illegal but we are making them legal now, you are giving a licence to certain privileged persons to print their own money. I think that was the statement made by Lord Thompson when he was given the licence for Scottish television — a licence to print his own money.

Secondly, you are encouraging a lot of young, unemployed people to go and speculate and get money from whatever source they can, to do something which is now open and legal.

It is not a question of being sanctimonious and self-righteous, but I just want to get the record straight. I have promised the Honourable Attorney General a photostatic copy of an opinion written by the Attorney General, and shortly after that opinion was written the licences were imposed and the Police took action and all the machines virtually disappeared from the street. There was no way that a Government, even aware of the importation, or the Comptroller of Customs, or anybody at all, could stop the importation, because there was nothing in the Act which says these machines cannot be imported. Until the Minister of Trade takes action by putting them on embargo or licence, there is nothing that can be done. Of course, what the Comptroller could do is get people for false declaration, if they bring in some thing as personal effects and they then discover that it was a game of chance. But the Comptroller is not there himself at every port of entry for twenty four hours a day; so these things will happen. But I just want to get the record straight. And I hope the hon. member is now satisfied that it is not merely a question of legalizing something which we permitted to be done illegally, but something which we tried to stop and which was effectively stopped, but unfortunately, the word got around that everything will be all right with the new Government, and so the whole thing blossomed out again.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to look at Clause 16(d): "one of the functions of the Committee is to prescribe the number of machines that may be made available for gaming on approved premises". I have no means of knowing what is the genealogy of this Section; I do not know whether it is original work by the Minister giving instruction to the draftsman, or whether he is looking at one of those places which have legalized and regulated gambling; if you intend to have these machines, their use has got to be regulated. I believe in Britain — I am not certain about the recent legislation, but I believe it was 1960 — the Attorney General can correct me if I am wrong — I believe there was a provision that not more than two machines could be available for gaming on the approved premises — in Britain, in a pub or whatever the premises were — but I do hope that attention is given to this particular area so that you do not have this type of widespread operations going on in these premises.

1.55 p.m.

Dr. R. B. CADDLE: What are the criteria which will determine the suitability of these certain premises licensed under the Liquor

Licences Act for the purpose of a declaration under this Act? There are a lot of words here, but really vague, but I would like you to spell it out. I would like you to tell us the physical conditions that will have to be satisfied, the conditions in relation to employees, conditions in relation to people who go there. I am already aware that one of the conditions is that people should be more than 18 years old, but I would like to know if you intend to spell this out in regulations or under directions or announcements of some form. As it stands here it is quite vague, and I would like to know what are the criteria for determining the suitability of these premises. I believe there are other people who would like to know as well.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I propose to reply on clause 16 if all hon. members who wanted to speak have done so. I think it best to deal with the last two interventions before I deal with the intervention of the hon. member for St. John.

In respect of the number of machines, it will be found that the old Part III tended to give the impression that once premises were licensed that any number of machines could be put on the premises. This section here is intended to give the committee the very powers which the hon. member for St. Michael South is suggesting are desirable, which is to limit the number of machines that can be used on the premises. As I understand it, in Britain in public houses you are only allowed to have a certain type of machine, and you can only have two. In casinos you can have more, it depends on the type of premises, but we do not want to classify types and then find a situation where a hotel in effect becomes a casino by putting in 40 machines or whatever.

This particular section indeed was introduced after application was made by a company which has been in touch with a large number of hotels and contracts were signed between this company, an amusement company, and a number of hotels, provided that if you could get a licence to have the machines on the premises at all, that some would have 20 and so on. We feel in the Ministry of Finance that this is altogether too many, and we are going to give the committee power to limit the number of machines in any given premises.

As far as the criteria are concerned, the criteria are now in the process of being worked out, and we are also in the process of deciding whether the criteria will be published. They will take the form of directions to the committee.

We have ideas which are related not only to the type of premises but related to the whole operation. We have a number of ideas but they have not been reduced to writing as yet. In due course some indication will be given in the public announcement which relates to it, I cannot at the moment give any indication except to say that premises which adjoin or are actively part of a grocery or a shop premise to which children habitually resort will not expect to get a gaming machine licence. There are many licensed premises where you have a rum shop on one side which can be barred off from the rest of the shop if necessary, but it is still all in the same building, but the main business being carried on is a grocery and parents send little children to the grocery to buy goods. It is very unlikely that the criteria given to the committee will be such as to permit the committee to give licences to put one arm bandits on premises where little children go to buy sweets and instead of buying the sweets they put 25 cents in the machine. We believe that this would be negating the purpose of the legislation in forbidding the use of the machines by children. That is one indication which I will give.

It may very well be too that there are other areas where streets that have their own attractions, streets which already have large numbers of juke boxes, large numbers of persons around, it may very well be that no need is felt to add to the attractions of these particular areas. This is the sort of thing about which we are thinking, but it would be premature at the present time to indicate the criteria in any depth.

The intervention of the hon. member for St. John contains, as far as I am able to ascertain, a completely accurate account of the dealings in a particular period with the one arm bandits, but I will say this. It is a pity really that he has not been in the House on earlier occasions when this Bill was being discussed, because he would have found that most of what he has said I have said already right down to the police raid, the tip off from the high official and the fact that they only caught one person because all the other bandits were out of commission, and it may have escaped his memory — and I think it would be unfortunate if it went abroad in the form in which it was presented, that all this was started by a question in the House asked by me when I was Leader of the Opposition. If he turns back he will find that all the letters he has got from George Moe and others and the whole matter is a result of its being raised in here by this

question. All this has been canvassed in here previously. I am very glad indeed for the support that it gives to the argument that has to be used to confound critics about these machines, that these machines were illegal and now they are being legalised.

The basis of these machines being illegal has never been fully determined, the assumption that they are illegal has never been satisfactorily tested in any courts of which I am aware, unless they are specifically forbidden in terms that obviously cover them, because the present law — and I am going to read it out for the benefit of a very large number of people who assume the one arm bandits are illegal. The present law says “Any person who exposes to sale any houses, lands, plate, jewels, ships, goods or other things, by any game, method or device whatsoever, depending upon or to be determined by any lot or drawing, whether it be out of a box or wheel or by cards or dice or by any machine, engine or device of chance of any kind whatsoever, shall upon being duly convicted...” and so on be duly punished.

The question has always been that this, which is the traditional form of gambling, which predates the invention of the one arm bandits, about which I spoke in here — I mean it is something that happened as recently as 1877 or 1878 — whether this section catches the one arm bandits because it deals with houses, lands, plate, jewels, ships, goods or other things, and any lawyer will tell you that goods or other things have to be construed *eiusdem sui generis* with houses, lands, plate, jewels or ships, and therefore would have to include chattels and lands but not money which is a fundable outside the class of houses, lands, plate, jewels, ships and so on, and it has always turned on that machines which only take money and give out money, are in fact illegal under that section, and some doubts have existed about this for a long time, and this is why one arm bandits have a semi tolerance in some places which have laws similar to ours, and in other places when it has really been sought to make them illegal, you had to make them illegal by changing legislation, by modernising the legislation, because there are other sections of the Act which deal with the use of money, which deal with gambling for money. For example, all games played with dice are illegal; all games played with dice for money are illegal except in so far as backgammon, I suppose, is playable with dice, but skill intervenes, and the Act has always been specific that cards and backgammon played in private houses in one act, or inferentially played in clubs, in

non-proprietary clubs not carried on for the purpose of gambling is legal. The people in Barbados, I do not know if they believe that the playing of poker in a Gentleman's Club in Bridgetown or in private houses is illegal, it is specifically not illegal unless the club is one formed for the purpose of playing poker. This is the law, but gambling has a certain reputation, people do not realise that the Turf Club carries on gambling, that Bingo is gambling and so on, it has a certain reputation and people categorise it all as gambling.

Mr. Chairman, I would not wish to deal with this at any greater length, as I have already spoken along these lines before. Sufficient to say that the hon. member for St. John is also quite right in inferring and speculating that the proprietors of the one arm bandits were aware that it was going to be legalised, or that the Government was considering it, because meetings were held — not with me — but meetings have been held as a result of a proposal put up by a number of persons who formed an Association, and they put up a proposal to Government last year by which the Association would be licensed as a operator of gaming machines and that no machines could be used in Barbados except by the Association. They offered to pay \$40,000 a year and they offered to pay some small amount — I cannot remember — \$100 per machine, of that order. This proposition, which was received in writing was dealt with by officials of my Ministry, the Director of Finance and Planning had a number of meetings with all concerned, and out of that was refined the present Act and the proposals which were contained in the Budget.

On the matter of \$2,000 per year the hon. member for St. John is as well informed as I am, I imagine, on what the machines may make. My information says that it is possible to make \$500, he says it is possible to make \$700 per week, but of course that is when the machines are in very short supply. When there were only 100 machines in Barbados they would make that. If everybody who wants a gambling machine had his way and we allowed a thousand machines in, I do not believe that they would make \$500 a week, I think there is only a given amount of money, but all the matters which he canvassed were canvassed with at least as much force by the Leader of the House, the hon. member for Christ Church South Central, who said you must take 75% of the gross.

2.05 p.m.

This was canvassed. The Government Electrical Inspector went around with the owners of some of these machines, the ones which were brought in legally, inspected the machines, and he advised us that even if you put a counter inside each machine and provided that each machine would be sealed and that only he could open it, that he still did not have confidence that we would get an absolutely accurate account. It was also felt that we would have to maintain an inspectorate to go around to these machines.

Representations were made to us that even if the Government sealed up the machines and took out the money itself — in other words, had enough inspectorate to go and draw the money and count it out itself that this would not work; because the machines go wrong from time to time and it may be necessary for a mechanic to get into a machine from time to time and fix it in the course of operations.

We had many, many meetings. I attended these meetings with the Government Electrical Inspector, the Director of Finance and Planning, and other officials as to whether we should not try to take a share of the gross, and it was rejected on the grounds of impracticability. We refused any system of licensing people to be gaming operators. We thought that was unwise; and we instead struck a figure which we feel is a reasonable amount for the licences. But hon. members have my assurance that the Commissioner of Inland Revenue will have passed on to him the figures which the hon. member for St. John has given as his understanding of what the machines may make for a week; and I have no doubt that when we come to assess the companies and the individuals who operate these machines that he will get from the Comptroller of Customs the number of machines that they operate and he will gross out their receipts on a basis which will not err in generosity to the machine owners.

Hon. members, however, must also be aware among the criteria that we are going to impose on the proprietors of machines must be to maintain an adequate staff to service the machines. He must have somebody at the machine to stop children playing and so on. I am happy to announce that I am now informed that it is estimated that a staff of two people to every three machines is the approximate number which the proprietors are estimating they will employ. One man now has a training programme for 32 people and he is planning to train 80 people if he is allowed the number of machines that he is asking for.

We feel that this will turn out to be not only a useful source of revenue but of employment. In the U.S.A. where these machines are carried on, all the machines have change girls next to them making change, and a certain number of mechanics have to be employed to go around these machines at night. I am satisfied that there will be some considerable economic benefit in this regard as well.

I can reveal that in fact the number of machines which was fixed on as a putative total that would be allowed when we considered the matter last year was 260. We did not then take into account applications which have come from a different area where these machines are played. Therefore we thought that we might well allow more than 260.

If hon. members will work out two employees to three machines, and there are 260 machines, that would give employment to 160 people. In this day and age we cannot afford to neglect even such relatively small numbers. An industry which comes in here and employs 160 people is an industry which the IDC would probably advertise in its literature. That is the sort of thing that we are envisaging in this area and which we hope will prove to be adequate.

In respect to the suggestion which was made about my Personal Aide, I would like to say that instructions have gone to all members of the Barbados Labour Party who are members of Parliament, who are close to members of Parliament, who are officials of Parliament that they are not to have any connection whatever with the operation of gaming machines.

We really do not believe that it is wise to introduce a class of amateurs into a business which, however casual it may seem, is in fact a business for professionals. The gaming machine business is eminently a professional business. Gambling throughout the world is well organised. In some countries by the Mafia, in Barbados we hope by people who — in one case to our knowledge by people who in one case could more properly be described as a refugee from the Mafia rather than an associate of the Mafia himself. I am happy to say that I do not count among the number of people who have gaming machines who are known to me, anybody who could be in any way regarded as a supporter of this party. I know a number of them, not only to be supporters, but to be canvassers and contributors to the party on the opposite side. As far as I am concerned, we are not going to discriminate against them on that account; and I

am very glad indeed to say that we are legalising a business which is in the hands of persons who can in no wise be considered our political supporters.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 16 as amended stand part. I am sorry Mr. Chairman. I do have further to amend, after bearing in mind what the hon. member for St. Michael North Central has said, the Attorney General has now taken advice, and we are advised to delete the words "where the money or money's worth to be distributed or allotted exceed \$100" and so on and I therefore further move, Mr. Chairman, that in Clause 16, Paragraph A the comma at the end of "charitable object" be deleted and a semi-colon substituted, and that the remaining words of that paragraph be deleted.

I beg to move that the clause as further amended stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

2.15 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. DeLISLE BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3 p.m.

Hon. DeLISLE BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

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

On resumption -

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 8, asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy. I observe that the hon. member is not in his place, and I direct that the Reply be laid.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the member for St. Lucy is not in his place, I beg to lay the answer to Question No. 8.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering if it would be in order for the answer to be held over. The member is out on official business, and I am wondering if there would be any objection to the reply being not given today but held over until the member is present.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are quite willing, I believe, to accommodate the hon. member, but I think he is moving a little too late in a matter of this sort. If there are any other questions standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Lucy, we will see to it that they are held over pending his return.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much whether they can be held over. According to the Rules when an answer is ready to a question and the member is not in his place, then the answer must be laid. If they did not want the answers to come up, I thought they would have told us before hand that they were not ready for the answers on a particular date and we would not have brought them down. I believe that, as long as they have been announced in the previous part of the sitting that certain answers were ready, they will have to follow the normal course as set out in the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Philip South. Question No. 31.

REQUEST FOR PUBLIC CONVENIENCES AND OTHER AMENITIES AT BEACHES

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 31:

To ask the appropriate Minister: Is the Minister aware that there is a dire need for public conveniences and other amenities at

several beaches throughout the Island? Will the Minister give favourable consideration to placing such amenities at the disposal of the community at Crane Beach, Foul Bay and Bottom Bay in the parish of St. Philip?

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, yes, Sir. It is proposed that the provision of such facilities at Rockley, Folkeston, Brandons, East Coast, Six Men's , Cove Bay and Crane Beach will be given priority.
3.10 p.m.

Mr. WEEKES: As a supplementary, is the Minister aware that lack of such facilities at other beaches can cause embarrassment to Barbadians and tourists alike?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I have already said "Yes, Sir."

QUESTION RE BARBADIANS EMPLOYED IN HOTELS

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 16 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Philip North.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the hon. member for St. Philip North is not in his place, I beg to lay the answer to the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Reply be laid.

QUESTION RE DUNLOW LANE

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question 32 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:

To ask the Minister of Communications and Works: 1. Inasmuch as phase one of the Dunlow Lane road project has been completed for some time now, will the Minister indicate when it is proposed to commence the final phase of this project? 2. Will the Minister set out the details for this final phase of the project?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 32 is as follows:

"The Ministry has completed a design of improvement for a section of Dunlow Lane to

join Henry's Lane and acquisition of the land required has been completed.

This phase of the project consists of the construction of a 16-foot wide road with the provision of 5-foot wide footpaths along the main road of Dunlow Lane from Woodside Tenantry to Henry's Lane."

QUESTION RE SALE OF LAND TO TENANTS AT BAYVILLE

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 37 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:

To ask the Minister of Housing and Lands:
1. Does the National Housing Corporation propose to sell to their tenants at Bayville in the constituency of St. Michael South housespots which those tenants rent from the Corporation? 2. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative will the Minister state: (a) what terms and conditions will apply to those sales, and (b) when will the housespots be conveyed to the tenants?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 37 is as follows:

"1. Yes, Sir.

2. A minimum deposit of 10% of the purchase price is payable. The balance of the purchase price bears interest at 6 per cent per annum and is payable over a period of ten years. House spots will be conveyed after the balance of the purchase price has been paid in full and permission to subdivide the land has been received from the Chief Town Planner."

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister state whether plans have been submitted to the Chief Town Planner seeking permission to subdivide?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Land surveyors have been commissioned to do the survey work. I believe the Land Surveyors Association as a whole has undertaken to do the job. There are a number of difficulties in respect of particular parts in that the area in fact to be divided by the tenants is less than the minimum standards that are now required by the Town Planner. The actual filing of the application for permission has not been completed because

negotiations are going along to see whether there can be a special departure in view of the historical development of the land. Most of the land has been surveyed but there are problems in relation to a number of plots, but my understanding is that if these difficulties can be resolved, application will be put in for sections of the development which can comply with the existing standards, but work is proceeding full pace on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: With regard to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 39 and 40, if it is the wish of the House, replies to these questions will be given today.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are in great difficulty here because we do not know which is 39 and which is 40, and that is the problem. I certainly have no objection if a Minister has the information to a question and can give the reply immediately, because if I framed the Question I do not need time to prepare supplementaries, so I am prepared to receive the reply to the question if the Minister is ready.

QUESTION RE TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 39 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:

1. Is the Minister aware that traffic lights throughout St. Michael, including those which have been recently installed at the junctions of (1) Beckles Road and Bay Street and (2) Jemmotts Lane and Bay Street, have been malfunctioning with increasing frequency?

2. Is the Minister aware that inefficient traffic lights (a) retard the flow of traffic and (b) cause accidents?

3. Will the Minister state what steps are being taken to ensure that the malfunctioning of those traffic lights is corrected?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 39 is as follows;

"1. Yes, Sir.

2. No, Sir.

3. The functioning of the traffic lights is the subject of constant review by all the relevant authorities."

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I heard "Yes, Sir" and "No, Sir" but there are three parts to the question. Part 2 of the question reads:

"Is the Minister aware that inefficient traffic lights (a) retard the flow of traffic and (b) cause accidents?"

Is he saying "no" to that?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: "No, Sir" is what I said to that. I said (1) Yes, Sir; (2) No, Sir.

Mr. SANDIFORD: What the Minister is telling us is that if you have inefficient traffic lights this will not retard the flow of traffic and they may not cause accidents?

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that a supplementary?

Mr. SANDIFORD: It is to find out what the Minister is saying.

QUESTION RE POST OF CONSUL GENERAL, NEW YORK

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 40 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael North Central.
3.20 p.m.

QUESTION RE APPOINTMENT OF CONSUL GENERAL FOR NEW YORK

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 40 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael North West.

Dr. R. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of External Affairs:

1. Is the Minister aware that the post of Consul General, New York is still vacant?

2. Will the Minister please state the reasons for the delay in making a substantive appointment to the post?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The answer to (1) is yes, Sir. The answer to (2): I do not accept there is any delay. As soon as the necessary formalities have been cleared by the appropriate Government, the usual announcement will be made.

Dr. R. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to enquire whether a candidate has been selected for a post.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: As the member would be aware, various communications would have been considered by the Minister concerned.

Dr. R. CADDLE: Who is the lucky person?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: As the appropriate Minister would be the Prime Minister who make recommendations under the terms of the Constitution, insofar as the lucky person is concerned the hon. member of course will be aware that, having regard to diplomatic protocol, it would be inappropriate for me to make an announcement until certain communications have been received from the United States Government.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that in these appointments there is consultation between the Minister responsible for External Affairs and the Prime Minister, and the question is whether these consultations have been concluded harmoniously so that we can get an appointment to the post of Consul General in New York.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please direct yourself to your supplementary.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Sir, the supplementary is whether there is concern over the need of a Consul General to be appointed in New York?

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to please take his seat; he is not asking a supplementary.

Dr. R. CADDLE: Is the Hon. Minister in a position to deny that Mr. Clyde Griffith has been selected for the post?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a supplementary.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Will the Minister state whether a name has been submitted to the proper authorities in the United States for an appointment to the Post of Consul General for Barbados in New York?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: As far as I am aware, I have issued instructions in the matter to the administrative arm in my Ministry to deal with the matter.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Will the person be holding a joint appointment, not only in New York but also in Orlando, Florida?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The answer to that is no, Sir. Honourable members seem concerned with what after all is a Senior Assistant Secretary post; I don't know why.

Mr. SPEAKER: This brings us to the end of Question Time. It is now Private Members' Business, and as there is no Private Members' Business on the Order Paper we automatically revert to Government Business. When the Sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee; to that it now reverts.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

BETTING AND GAMING DUTIES ACT, 1977

Clauses 17, 18 and 19 were called and passed.

Clause 20 was called.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I would like to enquire of the Hon. Minister in relation to Clause 20: concerning the number of machines to be imported under licence, would a person have to import all the machines at one time? What machinery are you going to put into operation to keep track of the various quantities that would be imported?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I would have to ask the Comptroller of Customs or the Minister of Trade what procedures they would use if they did not get in all the machines approved under a licence at one time to make sure that people did not bring in more. But I am sure there will be a procedure. I am not familiar enough with Trade to know whether you issue licences for machines to come in by just one shipment or not, but I would take sub-Clause 4 to indicate that the Comptroller is going to keep a check on each licence, and I would take it that the fact that the Committee will have power to prescribe that each machine be identified, I would take it that the Committee would therefore have power and the Comptroller and his agents would have power to ensure, whether by endorsements on the back of the import licence or by some other way, that each machine imported under licence is recorded and assigned to that licence. I would assume that any proper import licence system would have officers who would be able to deal with that matter of checking. But the Honourable Minister

for Consumer Affairs, his officials and the Comptroller of Customs would know more exactly how you track down these things; but I am sure there is no difficulty. I think sub-Clause 4 really gives an answer to the hon. member's query.
3.30 p.m.

I would assume that any proper import licence system would have officers who would be able to keep that kind of track. I do not see the Hon. Minister for Consumer Affairs, I imagine it is more directed towards him because his officials and the Comptroller of Customs would more know exactly how you would track down these things, but I am sure there would be no difficulty, Mr. Chairman, I think subclause (4) really gives an indication of what the answer to the hon. member's query is.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Two matters I would like to raise here. These relate to the grant of this licence. Clause 20(1) says "No person shall import any machine except under a licence," and a previous clause did indicate that the committee must satisfy itself that the applicant is a fit and proper person. You cannot get a licence, presumably, until the committee becomes satisfied that the person applying is a fit and proper person.

In view of the statements made by the Prime Minister earlier today, that gambling is not a game for amateurs, it is a highly organised thing, and he has told his amateurs to keep out of the game if they are in it. (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Not to get in it). Not to get in it, none would be in it at this time, but the question I am really asking, the point I wish to make, in view of that particular statement, and in view of the other statement that, I think he said, at least one person could more properly be termed as a refugee from the Mafia, in view of these possible connections and potential dangers perhaps the Prime Minister could tell us how or try to satisfy us in some way or other that proper procedures would be laid down for enquiry into the characters of these applicants to determine that they are fit and proper persons. I know sometimes you get these phrases in laws, but exactly how they are carried out or if they are not carried out at all, this sometimes remains a mystery and we have had persons, albeit a long time ago, who claimed that they held certain qualifications and in fact it turned out that they did not hold these qualifications, so there are possibilities here, and I am really wondering if there will be some definite procedure set out for determining that the persons who are applying may in fact

be fit and proper persons to hold these licences in view of these possible connections and the highly organised nature of the gambling business.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Directions will be given in due course and regulations will be made. There is already somebody of expertise quite apart from politicians who are familiar with some of these persons. I dare say that even the hon. member who has just spoken might be able to tell me whether one or two of the applicants are fit and proper persons to hold gaming licences, but there is a body of expertise in the persons of the Commissioner of Police and the Solicitor General, just to mention two names, who are already experienced in the issue of lottery licences. I imagine that although they are guided by the considerations of whether the lotteries are being held for a charitable purpose, that they have also come across a sufficient number of persons with bad character to be well familiar with how to investigate people's characters. I think the committee will have the assistance of the Commissioner of Police who would probably be a member, if I may say so, in determining the characters of these people. He has the resources which can make enquiries in Barbados and overseas on persons' characters.

There are means of estimating whether someone is a person of good character for this purpose, or whether he is not a person of good character, for this purpose. Matters of good character even though they may have thought to be absolute, I think when you really consider it you may feel that they are relative. What might be good character for the purpose of becoming a Priest might not be good character for the purpose of obtaining a gaming machine licence, and what I am sure is that the matter of character is going to be one of the primary considerations of the committee, because we on this side are as alive as anybody else to the dangers of allowing organised crime to penetrate any aspect of our national or public life.

I am not aware that any investigations were made of the characters of the people who promoted the West Indies Hospital Sweep and we do not intend to follow that same mistake and fall into the kind of error where we will be embarrassed as all Barbadians were, not the previous Government as a Government alone, all Barbadians were when the promoter of the West Indies Sweep found himself arrested in Canada and fined \$100,000 for carrying on an illegal lottery. We will also not put ourselves in the way of being embarrassed as the Government of

Grenada would be if it still retains that capacity for embarrassment which the Government of Barbados certainly had by discovering it is sheltering one of the principal refugees from the Federal Bureau of Investigation in that territory. We are familiar with all these things, we just have to say that we will try not to allow things to get out of hand. I myself believe that everybody who is going to be in the gaming machine business is already here present in Barbados and mostly in it already. This is my general impression.

I may mention, Mr. Chairman, that when I was in London recently virtually every day a gentleman telephoned my hotel to make an appointment which he said had been arranged for him from Barbados relevant to the maintenance of these gaming machines. He wanted to send down some mechanics to give us advice on maintaining these gaming machines, and in parenthesis he said that he had a lot of machines himself and he knew people who were interested in the machines.
3.40 p.m.

It just shows how things spread. He was totally rejected. He was seen by the Director of Finance and Planning who told him that we are not going to accept any applications from anybody else outside Barbados now. Perhaps that was going a little outside the immediate brief; but certainly I do not think anybody knew this was going to come in to deal with the gambling machines. So we are dealing with people who have lived in Barbados for some time, or indeed all their lives, and I think that it may be easier to investigate the connections of people that we have been seeing around for many years than the hon. member perhaps is envisaging, and certainly easier than it would be if people were to come in from outside now and run the gaming machines. We are not thinking in terms of that at all.

The question that Clause 20 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 21 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 21 stand part.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 22 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We have amended Clause 22, Sir, and it will take cognisance of the very point made earlier in the debate that we think that the number of machines that can be made available for gambling on any premises should be specified in the Gazette; and I therefore beg to move that Clause 22 as amended stand part.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 23 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Clause 23 has also been amended. This is the executive section, so to speak, Sir, and I beg to move that Clause 23 as amended stand part.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 24 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Clause 24, Sir, indicates the urgency of the passage of this Bill, as I believe some persons would like to take out their licences from the 1st July to legalise so as to give full legality to what has been observed to be going on. I would say this as a commentary on what the hon. member for St. John has said earlier. I, of course, nor do I think that any member of this House can be sure that machines have not been running all the time since the police raid last year. Indeed all observations would suggest that there has always been a certain number of machines sub rosa. I indeed have seen machines in private premises in Maxwell which it is obvious were there for amusement only, since the owners of the premises on which these machines were used to give you \$5. \$10 — indeed I have seen them give somebody \$25 in quarters just to play the machines for their amusement; and people who wanted to play the machines were supplied not only with the machine, but even with the means of playing it.

I do not know if that would amount to an offence under this Act, but it does seem to me that if there has been any new outbreak of the

machines, that it has come since this Act was first introduced. It is my impression that the machines were under cover for a long time, and that after April 15th and after various announcements were made, there was a little build up so that when the licences can be taken out, there will probably be a number of machines waiting for the committee to issue the appropriate documentation for.

Be that as it may, Sir, I beg to move that Clause 24 stand part.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to enquire of the Minister in relation to the gaming machine licences, would any provision be made whereby it would be necessary for the person having the machine to display the licence on the machine or in a conspicuous place where the public would be able to see that these machine have a licence? Do you consider it necessary that these licences be displayed?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The machines will all have to have identification marks; and it is envisaged that Regulations in due course will provide for inspection. I will take the hon. member's query into consideration when we draft the Regulations in case we decide that the licences will have to be put up in the same way as the liquor licences. It will have to be gazetted, and I imagine that this will be given a nod when the Regulations are considered - to put up a sign saying that no children should play the machines. Indeed, the proprietors themselves have submitted that that should be part of the law - the requirement to put up a sign - because some people will have machines on premises, but they will not be in control of the premises; and the machines owners are very anxious that the premises themselves have warning notices; and I dare say that if this is to be done, there will be no great difficulty about also directing that a licence or a copy thereof be displayed to the public as well. I will consider the matter. I think that it is a very sound point that there should be some indication that what is being done is done legally.

The question that Clause 24 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 25 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Clause 25 has a number of amendments, Sir. I do not

know if hon. members want an explanation of Clause 25. Clause 25 is a concession to the English theory that machines played for small amounts of money are less harmful than machines that give out larger prizes. I will confess to some misgivings about this. I have read legislation from other countries like Kenya. I have taken counsel in Britain itself as to how this works; and I have been told that the machines which pay out less money still take in just as much. In other words, where you may only get out two coins, where in a British casino you would get out 20 with the same combination, yet just as many people play the machines where you only get out two coins because the machines are amusement machines. They will be played whether they pay or not. That is one of the things about one armed bandits that I think we must understand - that they are amusing in themselves. They are nice things to play. They are like table tennis machines and pin ball machines. They are attractive to people because of the mechanical element involved. There is something that apparently appeals to human nature in this.

We have the clause to cover the cheap machines and the pin ball machines and the machines where really there is some element of skill; but I am not entirely persuaded that the types of machine referred to under Sub-clause 2, paragraph (b) really will be all that beneficial to the public in due course; but I think it is important if you are going to have amusement machines in a country at all, even though no element of gambling is concerned, it is quite important, I think, to control them. There are various consequences that ensue. The arcade type of mentality can be created where youths just want to go and stand up in an arcade. This does not always provide the best type of atmosphere. There is nothing essentially or intrinsically harmful in it, just as I think that there is nothing harmful in pool tables. I think that they are a positive force for good, in some ways that you are playing a game of an internationally recognised sport; but company is sometimes attracted to pool tables that is not the most desirable, therefore some powers of control, I think should exist. Anyhow, I beg to move that Clause 25 as amended stand part.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Just one question, Sir. I may be missing it in the actual legislation, but will there be any means of determining or ensuring that a certain percentage of the takings of the coins that these machines, absorb or imbibe or

whatever word is used about these bandits - that a certain amount of this money goes back out in prize money or prize tokens or whatever other prize would be available; because we are aware - and I think that the Prime Minister did indicate in his opening address, that they can be arranged to disgorge a varying percentage of the takings.

3.50 p.m.

I am wondering if the public, who may resort to these machines, would be able to be reasonably certain that a percentage is going back out in prize money or tokens. As I understand it, they can be fixed and arranged to give back out a certain percentage of the takings.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Now, this is one of the difficult questions that was examined at length in the Ministry of Finance. We obtained a lot of literature on the subject. Investigations have been made about machines which are in Barbados and which came here legally and, in the end, we have had to follow that well-known authority, Scarney, on gambling and leave it to competition. It is said that the machines that do not pay out rapidly become known to the public, and that the machines that do pay out equally rapidly become known and the people turn to the ones that do pay out.

Scarney says that the casinos in Nevada long ago discovered that, as long as you have Change Girls and attendants around the machines, it is useless to try to produce one or two machines in every 50 that pay out well and hope that people will go to all the machines in the hope of getting the same pay out from the one or two loss leaders, because the Change Girls, without exception, for \$20 will direct the attention of punters to the machines that pay out well and divert them away from the machines that do not pay out, and people talk about these machines.

There is some possibility of control at import level, and we are now pursuing this. I will explain why this possibility exists. The machines cannot easily, once they are in Barbados, be tampered with so as to alter the pay out. The altering of the pay out is a matter of stripping down the machine. Even the mechanical ones, as long as they have the electrical circuits - in fact, even the modern mechanical ones have electrical circuits. The handle is mechanical, but the pay out is controlled electrically. To change the odds you have to take off a whole reel.

Now the traditional machine has 20 symbols on its face and I believe that this is the standard in Nevada where it is well organised. There are

three spools in the traditional machine, each has 20 symbols, there are 8,000 different combinations, and a certain number of these combinations are winning combinations and they pay out a certain number of coins for each different type of win. The machines that have come to Barbados, apparently, have 25 symbols on each face and the number of combinations is over 30,000 and the number of winning combinations is rather less, but to change this is a day's work or more for a skilled mechanic because he has to change the whole reel, and he then has to change the electric circuits to alter the pay outs. If he just changes the reel without changing the circuit you will get non-winning combinations showing up, but money still being paid out. This, apparently, is a very skilled operation. We wondered whether it is possible to enforce a condition. It is a toss up whether we could enforce it in respect of the machines which are here. You have to order the machine at a given pay out, and we are thinking that when we issue the import licences we may be able to call for the documentation which will indicate what pay out is being offered by the machine sought to be imported. You order a machine with 25 symbols on each reel doubling and trebling a jackpot of X hundred dollars with a general pay out of 70%, or you can get them, indeed, with a low pay out in the region of about half, 56% or something like that. You can get them with high pay outs over 90%. We are hoping that the Committee will be able to see the documentation so that it will know what type of machine is being imported.

As far now as tampering with the machines in more limited ways is concerned, we have also investigated this. The Ministry of Finance has one or two little documents which have been obtained from the Gamblers' Research Centre of Las Vegas and, apparently, there are little ways of putting on a piece of metal on the spools so that you can ensure that the jackpot never falls. A mechanic, who is concerned with these things, told me that in his experience in Jamaica somebody fixed a machine so that the jackpot would never be paid, the three jackpot things would never come together, but what he did not realise was that he was excluding the most difficult pay out to get and increasing the odds that other pay outs would be easier to get. When he excluded the jackpot, he in fact caused the machine to pay out more rather than less. All that happened is that he did not pay out any jackpot, but it paid out more small prizes. This is the sort of thing that happens when people, who are not familiar with the workings of the machine, tamper with them. We have just decided that it must be left to an examination by the Committee of the documentation of the machines

sought to be imported and to the machine-playing public who, we believe, in a small place like Barbados, will get to hear that a particular hotel has in machines that never pay out any money and another hotel has machines that pay out. I think that information of this sort is already running around Bridgetown that there are certain places you can go where the machines do not pay out, and there are certain places you can go where they pay out.

Mr. Springer, the former hon. member for St. Michael South East, and I were once together in an establishment and we observed many people come and put in money — not that his or mine went in I must say. We observed this, and I believe that the word was out from then that there is a certain man that is trying to rob the public and so on with machines that do not pay out money. I just mention this as an example of something which will go around. Does that satisfy the hon. member? We have tried our best to deal with it, but there are considerations we think that make it unwise to try to tamper too much in that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, if I may just make an observation, I am really amazed at the detailed knowledge that the Prime Minister displays in these matters. I wonder, in terms of preparing for conferences like the Heads of Governments Conferences and all the other weighty matters of State, how he has found the time to amass all of this information. It is really remarkable, as I have said already, and it is a tribute to his encyclopaedic mind that he can master these details, but I do think that this is something which should be watched. I believe that, from the operations and whatever information will go around, you will get to know whether those persons who are so misguided enough to believe that they can go and gain an income by just remaining at these mechanical monsters will also know that there will be some type of percentage going back.

I believe you are quite right. I am not familiar with your authority on the subject. I believe that there are only a limited number of persons or companies actually making these machines and probably in the whole of the United States not more than two. A number of others who may make them may do so under licence. It is a highly specialised business. Most of them probably have about eight thousand combinations of whom only about twelve pay back, or only 12 winning combinations.

4 p.m.

There are approximately 8,000 combinations of which only about 12 are winning combinations, and I think this is an area where it should be watched, because if it is not watched and controlled, this can be one of the biggest rip-offs you get in this country, and it will be rip-offs from people who can least afford to be ripped off.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I accept the tribute from the hon. member in the spirit in which I am sure it is intended. I agree that it is a potential rip off, but I really can add nothing except to say that people who think that a machine is dishonest in even what it sets out to be — in other words it promises to pay, but perhaps somebody has really tampered with the circuits and it cannot pay or it could only pay petty amounts. I believe such machines would be the subject of complaint to the Committee and the Committee is given power by this Act to their complaints in the most general way, and I imagine that members of the public will be quite vociferous if they think the machine has had some really serious tampering to deal with it by way of complaint.

On the question of the 8,000 combinations and only 12 can pay, I hold no brief for gambling machines but the hon. member should be aware that the 12 winning combinations can be obtained in more than one way. In other words, it is not exactly 12. Those 12 winning combinations maybe obtained in a couple of hundred ways. For example the traditional machine has a cherry and a cherry will always give you back two coins. This is true throughout the world wherever they have these machines, but you can put more than one cherry in the first reel, and therefore although a cherry is only one winning combination, if you have four cherries in the first reading, all four of these represent one of those combinations; so it would mean it would not only be 12, that would mean it would be 15, and there would be an exponential factor for two cherries and two cherries and a bar and so on. So there may only be 12 winning lines, but those 12 winning lines can be obtained mathematically in many more than 12 ways. Nonetheless nobody should think that the machines are a way of doing anything else but making money for their proprietors and I hope the Government.

The question that Clause 25 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 26 was called and passed.

Clause 27 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in Clause 27 which we are seeking to amend, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central will notice that we have actually put in the Act that "there is exhibited at all times in a conspicuous place on the machine a notice to the effect that the use of the machine by minors is prohibited."

I beg to move that Clause 27 as amended stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I think this is the clause which seems to put restrictions on the use of the machines. "There may be exhibited at all times in a conspicuous place on the machine a notice to the effect that the use of the machine by minors is prohibited."

So it is in the Act that minors, I believe this would be persons under eighteen in our laws, would be prohibited, but I think in this Bill we should not get into the feeling that while they may be called amusement machines that these are something necessary to play around with. Many people have been known out of gambling to come to grief and people get various types of pleasures and benefits from them. It is not limited only to those of low intelligence. I believe the Russian man of letters Dostoevsky was an inveterate gambler and he got his pleasures from losing. I believe he even wrote to his wife to the effect that he experienced orgasm when he was not winning, but losing, and I think a general warning should be issued from the experiences that we have had. We hope that these notices are displayed conspicuously so that the dangers that can be experienced from these machines would be known to the public.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, during a general debate on this Bill I raised this problem in relation to minors being excluded from playing these machines, and I do recall the Hon. Prime Minister drawing the illustration of rape or carnal knowledge of a girl under the age of consent and stressing the point that even if you did not know the age of the girl and you committed an offence, you can go in court and use this as an excuse. While there may seem to be some similarity, the point I want to stress is that even although the law is there, doctors will tell you, and there is an abundance of evidence at the hospital, that a lot of girls under 16 do

indulge in intercourse and become pregnant and nothing comes of it legally in anyway. What I want to stress here again, and I think we have expressed a lot of concern previously about this particular aspect, is what type of machinery will be set in operation to ensure that these young people do not play the one arm bandits. Right now in Baxters Road and in other places a lot of children go and play them. We may hide behind the excuse that there is no law regulating that and we will have to wait until this Act is passed, but the mere fact that you are saying that minors should be excluded is no guarantee that minors are going to be excluded. Laws are made and laws are broken, and I think we have to be a lot more serious than just making this type of remark that we should put some type of notice to the effect that the use of the machines by minors is prohibited and feel that all is going to be well once that is put in a building or attached to one of these machines. I have every reason to believe that all will not be well and you will find a lot of persons under 18 going to play these machines.

One of the reasons why I feel that way is because today you do find children under the age of 18 who are so physically well-developed as to confuse any person seeking to determine their age by a glance at their physique. This is a reality right now in Barbados and in many other countries, but we are dealing with Barbados and just putting a sign in a place or on a machine to the effect that the use of the machine by minors is prohibited is not going far enough.

4.10 p.m.

And just by putting up a sign in a place to the effect that you want to establish whose responsibility it will be to satisfy themselves or the relevant authority that the person is under 18 years of age is not going to be of much help. Do you tell by just looking at the person that he is over 18 or do you get testimony from some authority that the person is over 18 years of age? I do not think we want to have this type of exercise.

But the point I want to stress is that we have all expressed concern in this Chamber about protecting young people; but as it stands now, we cannot be convinced that these people will be protected to the extent we would like in spite of subsection (d) of section 27; a lot of people under the age of 18 are going to take pleasure in playing these machines and people who are directly responsible for these machines will have people playing whether they are under

18 or not and we will have to exercise ourselves a lot to make sure that the law is observed.

Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I sat here and listened to the hon. member for St. Michael North Central and I wonder what sort of argument he was advancing for the protection of the young people of this country.

My colleagues on this side have brought this Bill. We are aware of the problems that can arise as far as the young people of this country are concerned. We are aware that young people of this country under the age of 18 may be tempted to have a shot at the one armed bandits. But what I cannot understand is this, that during the Democratic Labour Party's period of time they allowed the pools to be operated, and I have visited the betting shops on a number of occasions and I have seen signs in these betting shops to the effect that persons under the age of 18 should not be allowed to play the pools. Under their administration that was the only means of publicity given and the hon. member did not get up and voice his dissension about it at that time; how can he come here today to express concern on this measure. He should have got up at the time when the betting Act was brought into being and the betting places brought into operation; he should have advanced his arguments then. Why come today because the Honourable Prime Minister has come before this Chamber with an Act to legalise various aspects of gambling? And I would say this, that the last Government when in power saw the coming into the Island of these one armed bandits and no one got up and objected. I cannot understand the double standards we have got. And it is time that hon. members on that side be told that they cannot come in here with double standards on any legislation just because they want to criticise the Government.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I take objection to the remarks of the hon. member about double standards. I would ask him to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I don't really find any imputation on character in remarks about double standards.

Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, what I want to bring home most forcibly is this; the hon. members from that side have got a contribution to make on this Bill but it is not fair for any of them to get up and call on the Government as to what protection Government will provide that young people will not play

these machines. When they were in power they were signs in the betting shops that there was to be no betting by persons under 18. No certificates were asked for then; what kind of certificates are they asking about now? It is true that some young people will place a bet even though they are under 18 years of age. But the situation with this Bill is that the onus will now be on the proprietors to see that suspected under age youths are not allowed to play the one armed bandits. This is nothing new; this has been going on ever since and there was no hullabaloo. Today we are setting the record straight; we just want to make sure that all these things are made legal.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, we were getting along quite well until the intervention of the hon. member from St. Michael South East but I would like to say to the acting Minister that this Opposition sees its responsibility in terms of pointing out any dangers it notices in legislation coming before this House and all we are doing is pointing out this danger. The hon. member is presently on the front bench holding on for the Minister, but he does not have to be a wind bag like the Minister. But I think, Mr. Chairman, it is recognized that there are dangers involved in legislation of this sort; and some countries, like Afghanistan, have gone to the extent of banning all forms of gambling. But if you want to legalize gambling activities, you have to take special care.

4.20 p.m.

I am certain that the Prime Minister is aware of these dangers, that is why he has been giving especial attention to the comments and observations being made from over here. I would like to point out a case that in Las Vegas, the gambling capital of the U.S.A., that for a State of that size Nevada, they have one of the bigger police forces, because they know there are dangers involved. They have a special inspectorate to visit the premises in order to ensure that the provisions of their laws are carried out and as far as possible to contain any swindles and so on. What I think my colleague, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, is pointing out is that there are dangers and we have got to take precautions if necessary, and I would like to repeat the call which I made, that it might be necessary to appoint and set up some type of inspectorate to ensure that the provisions of this Act are adhered to, whether it is in terms of the protection of minors or in other areas, I am certain that this is going to become possible if we are going to contain any excesses in legislation of this nature.

The question that clause 27 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 28 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that clause 28 as amended stand part.

The amendment is quite a small amendment. This is obviously something in the interest of the proprietors of the machines. This prevents anybody from taking money out of the machines unless they won it. This is what is intended, Sir. It might very well be thought that the law of larceny would cover it, but this is a common form that is found in most of these Gambling Acts and I have spent a second on it in the light of what the hon. member for St. Michael South said on clause 27 about the size of the Police Force in Las Vegas.

The State authorities in Las Vegas, I believe, Sir, employ a very large police force to protect the casinos from the public, not to protect the public from the casinos. I think that the police are used to stop people overturning the tables and picking up the money, and quarrelling with the dealer and drawing guns in the course of argument over the craps and so on, and I do not think that the one arm bandits should attract the same amount of police protection as may be thought necessary in Vegas. I do not think the Royal Barbados Police Force will envisage its role under this new Act as being to protect the one arm bandits from the public, and therefore I do not see that the comparison is apt. Nevada has a large police force because gambling is a business and it must protect the business of gambling, and indeed I am told that Nevada and the immediate surroundings of the casinos are very law abiding. If one reads the book one reads that the Mafia has a general pact that wherever a Mafiosi is to be wasted he must not be wasted in Las Vegas. They would drive him over the border into Arizona or California and deal with him there if they have difficulties, but it is a very law abiding place, because the credit of a gambling operation depends in part of whether the public can be sure they would not come to any harm, but I really do not think that it is fair to draw a comparison between the conditions likely to be met in Barbados and the conditions in Las Vegas. There is no type of casino gambling that I know of in Barbados, not that I know of. I do not know whether hon. members may be able to assist me, but I have never heard of professional dice, professional roulette or professional black jack — they are the three biggest casino games, I imagine — I have never heard of them anywhere in Barbados.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I really do not understand if the hon. member, the Minister of Finance, is saying that the law in Las Vegas is there to protect the casinos, why in the light of our Offences against the Property Act, the Larceny Act and all the other criminal penalties which we have in Barbados it is necessary to put in a clause making it an offence to take money from a machine. It is an offence to take money from any place any part of Barbados, whether it is in a machine or in the street. There is such an offence in Barbados as larceny by finding. If you see a wallet in the street and you pick it up and you keep it and the owner of that wallet can be identified, your duty is to take the wallet to the police station. It could be on the street or anywhere, down the wharf or in the carenage. Here you have to put in a provision that it is an offence to take money from a machine.

I could understand if the Government had an interest to protect, that is, if the Government was getting a percentage from the machine, 50% or 60% or as the hon. Leader of the House has been arguing for 75%, I could understand the Government making a specific offence even for the proprietor to take money from the machine before, let us say, the Government Inspector came around to collect what was due and owing to the Treasury of Barbados, but here you have a Government protecting up to the hilt the owners of these devices, as I call them. It is completely unnecessary to insert a provision like this unless you have an interest to protect over and above what the criminal law of this country already makes provision for, so I do not really understand the argument of the Hon. Minister of Finance when he says that in Las Vegas the large police force is really protecting the entrepreneurs, the owners of the casinos and so on, because this is precisely what this clause 28 is purporting to do.

I had an original problem which was not in relation to this section, the previous section when the member for St. Michael South East spoke. As a schoolmaster I was going to ask him if, having read *Animal Farm*, he was representing Snowball, Napoleon or the dog Squealer in the role which he was playing here today, because I could not understand the contribution which the hon. member was making, and perhaps he would turn to the hon. member for Christ Church West, because he might enlighten me as to what role the hon. member has been assigned in Mr. George Orwell's famous book, *The Animal Farm*. I really could not understand his intervention.

But to be a little more serious, I would like the hon. member, the Hon. Minister of Finance, to explain why does he find it necessary, it seems to me like an over kill to take money from any place at all, in or outside the machines, is an offence in Barbados. Why do we have to protect these people more than that?

Dr. CADDLE: Before the Hon. Minister replies, I would just like to enquire this of him. This is very simple. This particular section, are we not copying this section from the British legislation where in Britain the British Government participates in the earnings of these machines, and we have gone and copied this without being conscious of the fact that the situation here is different and the Barbados Government is not participating, or in other words, getting a percentage of the earnings that way? Because if the Barbados Government was getting a percentage of the earnings, then this particular section would be necessary to protect its own interest, but since we are just levying a fee per year per machine, it is not necessary.

4.30 p.m.

And sometimes from my own experience, draftsmen when they are copying legislation from other countries very often forget the peculiar circumstances and conditions for which they are drafting, and they make mistakes which could easily be avoided if they took into account the circumstances and conditions in Barbados; and this seems to be one example.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I think a great deal of what the hon. member has said; and if I was on that side I would have been pressing it just as hard as they are pressing it. I think that the question is what could amount to an offence under this section that does not amount to larceny. I do not know if any assistance can be derived from the fact that this section is taken from a section which became law in Britain in 1968 — Section 36 of the 1968 Betting and Gaming Act — and this came at a time when the law of larceny had been changed in England to eliminate the difficult doctrine of asportation and *animus furandi* both of which have been suggested to me — at least asportation has been suggested to me by the Crown Counsel who is present — is one of the difficulties which Section 28 would get over.

I also see that *animus furandi* might be at stake — *animus furandi* means the intention to steal — because I suppose that if a man puts a coin on a piece of wire, and repeatedly puts it into the machine and pulls it out and drops it back in, or indeed even if he just manages to get a coin out of the machine, and drops it back in,

could it be said that he had any *animus furandi*? I think that he would; but I can see that it might cause a jury trouble; because the man may argue that he did not mean to steal the money; that if he had lost it he would have left it where it was. He just meant to get another chance to play in the machine.

All of these, I think, sophistical distinctions can be taken, and while I think that this section may be over kill, yet I think that it is very simple and it deals with some of the most complicated doctrines of Common Law in a very simple way; because there is no question of *animus furandi*, asportation, *invito domino* and all of those things; and I suspect that that is a situation which is by no means impossible; but in all the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, although I think that the Opposition has made a good point about the over kill, I give way.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I do not have the detailed knowledge of the functioning of these machines that the hon. member has. I never had to do research. I have never been interested. I do not think that it is necessary for us as legislators that we should know the mechanics of them unless we want to beat them. I do not want to try. The Minister has talked about putting something on a string which I do not think would ever work.

What I am concerned about is this: suppose I went to a machine — I carry various coins in my change purse, small coins, 25 cent pieces, American sometimes, Canadian and Barbados, roughly the same size. Suppose I put in a Canadian coin by mistake. The machine rejects the coin. Read the section. The section says that you cannot take anything from the machine unless it is a prize.

Now my coin has been rejected. The sections says that where a machine is made available for gaming on approved premises no person who is not an authorised person shall remove from the machine any money or token other than that delivered by the machine as a prize. Now that machine is delivering to me something which it has rejected. It is not a prize. It is my own money which the machine has given me back. I can be prosecuted. (*Aside*) Is the hon. member saying that I cannot be prosecuted? It says that you cannot remove anything that has not been given to you as a prize. Is the 25 cents (Canadian) that I put in a prize? Look at it carefully.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I think that we can take all points. I think that the answer

that Defence Counsel would make in that is that you are not removing it from the machine, because the machine never had it. If you put it, and the machine rejects it, you are not removing it from the machine.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like to ask the hon. member — he has gone into a telephone call box and put in money and the money comes straight back out from the call box. Where are you taking it from if you are not taking it from the machine? You are not plucking it out of the ether. It brings it back out probably through the same place that the prize comes out. It is not a prize. I think that the section is unnecessary. I do not want to give other illustrations; but it seems to me that having imported this from the English legislation, the same situation does not apply here in Barbados where this is necessary for us to follow.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member's comments about the telephone reminds me of a very good friend of mine — a member of the Democratic Labour Party, for many years a legislator who once found himself in Waterloo Station without sufficient coins to pay the train to get home. He went around to the telephone booths and pressed Button B on ever telephone and I believe collected the sum of seven or eight shillings; and this was at a time when a telephone call cost tuppence.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member would give way. This was something told during the war by Arthur Askey, a British comedian, who used to go to telephone booths, press Button B and then take out the two pennies and put them back in. Now which member of the Democratic Labour Party went into Waterloo Station and collected seven or eight shillings? That is pure, unadulterated nonsense.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well, I regret that the hon. member for St. John has destroyed one of my cherished memories; because when the member of the Democratic Labour Party told me this I admired his enterprise. I was not aware that he was an Arthur Askey fan or even at that stage a listener at the feet of the hon. member for St. John; but certainly he told me how he went around and pressed Button B and obtained a sufficiency to pay his fare home.

I draw the illustration because there is a difference. It is well known that the distinction between stealing from a telephone machine in places that have them and not stealing from it, is whether you do anything to cause the money to fall in the cup which rejects improper coins, and

at the same time returns coins which were not needed for the purpose for which they were put into the machine. And I believe that it is considered to be larceny to press Button B — and I dare say it would be larceny to pick up coins which you find in the cup too; but it is not obviously larceny to pick up money which comes back out by reason of its being an improper coin.

We could argue over this for a long time, Mr. Chairman, but I believe that the point about the Canadian coin being taken is best taken by indicating that the machine never had that coin. At the time when you removed it, the machine did not have it. That that coin came from the same place where the prize is paid is not really material. I suppose that that is the only answer. I will give hon. members an undertaking that if I hear that anybody has been prosecuted for recovering his Canadian coin, or suppose that it was a Guinea — suppose it was a gold coin that was dropped in by mistake from a one armed bandit — I will take the initiative at the Privy Council to see that he gets a free pardon should there be any conviction therefor.

The question that Clause 28 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

4.40 p.m.

Clause 29 was called and passed.

Clause 30 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 30 be amended, as follows, in terms of the circulated amendment:

“In clause 30(2)—(a) delete the words “in accordance with Section 2 of the Gambling Act: Cap. 134.” appearing at the end of paragraph (b) and substitute therefor the words “under this Act.”,

Now, paragraph (c) preserves the Transport Board Lottery although the Transport Board Lottery has not been run for some years.

“(b) Substitute the word “and” for the word “or” appearing in the second line of paragraph (c).”

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 31 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 31 stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, on Clause 31 I would like to enquire from the Minister when a certificate for a betting machine has been revoked or not given and the machine is already in the Island, what happens to that machine? Are those machines going to be wrecked, or are they going to be exported to other places that may be interested in such machines?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member looks at Clause 39(1)(c) he will observe that Regulations can be made for the disposition, storage and maintenance of machines, and if he looks at Clause 42(1)(d) he will see that the prospective Regulations envisaged in the Comptroller will establish storage places. All that will happen is, as I understand it, if the licence in respect of a machine is revoked, that the machine will then have to be stored in an authorised storage place otherwise it will be liable to forfeiture under Section 42, if we pass it, in due course. (*Asides.*) There is nothing to prevent anybody from disposing of machines outside of the Island. I believe that some machines went outside the Island to a Caricom territory and then came back in from that Caricom territory as if they had originally been lawfully imported into the Caribbean area.

The question that Clause 31 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 32 and 33 were called and passed.

Clause 34 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 34 stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that. Mr. Chairman, I wished to reply a while ago, unfortunately I was not in my place, to the query raised by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central as to whether there were any provisions which would help ensure that minors were not allowed to use the machines or to be on premises where the machines are being used. In the construction of the Act the scheme

which we adopted was not to make an act by a minor, assuming that a minor is capable of criminal liability, an offence, but rather to place the onus on the occupier of the premises or persons who allowed the machines to be used in contravention of the Act, or allowed the machines to be used with minors being on the premises, and without a proper notice. As a result we looked at this question as lawyers to see in what way we could strengthen this provision, and Section 34 is one of the Sections which we put in purposely so that the Police Force or a public officer authorised by the Minister may at all reasonable times enter the premises to ascertain whether there is a contravention. Once they can satisfy the Magistrate on reasonable grounds that an offence is being committed or is about to be committed they can obtain a warrant to go on the premises.

I think that beyond this sort of power it would be virtually impossible for anybody to provide by law for these eventualities. What will have to happen is what the hon. member for St. Michael South spoke about. It is that it is envisaged that there will be administratively as well some form of inspectorate under this Act where we shall have the duty to ensure that there are no abuses or that the abuses are kept to a minimum. I hope that that answers the question, but we did take the matter into account and the Deputy Parliamentary Counsel, who was responsible for the scheme of the Act, bore this point in mind. We discussed how we would answer it, and this seems to be one of the most capable ways that we could deal with it.

The question that Clause 34 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 35 to 43 inclusive were called and passed.
4.50 p.m.

Clauses 44 and 45 were called and passed.

Clause 46 was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 46 be amended in the terms of the circulated amendments to Clause 46, and that it stand part.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 47 was called and passed.

The First Schedule was called and passed.

The Second Schedule was called and passed.

The Third Schedule was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Third Schedule be amended in the terms of the circulated amendments and that it stand part.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE seconded by Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee with amendments, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. H. deB. FORDE seconded by Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the next Item of Government Business is a Resolution to approve the sale of the Motor Vessel North Point.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE SALE OF THE MOTOR VESSEL NORTH POINT

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Item of Government Business stands in the name of the Minister of Finance, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the sale by the Crown to Space Research Corporation of the Motor Vessel known as the North Point, and that the Senate be invited to concur therein.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be long over this matter of the North Point. I am glad indeed that what we on this side saw as certain infelicities have been more or less resolved by the sale of the North Point under such conditions as leaves the Government only very slightly out of pocket.

There are one or two matters which relate to the North Point that I am not particularly anxious to canvass at the present time, and are likely to be canvassed in another forum. I

would content myself with saying that the ostensible purchase price is \$US866,994. Of this \$US124,994 has never been paid by the Government and is included in the purchase price only at the request of the purchasers who want an acknowledgment that it was due. Although it will be paid, it will be returned to the purchaser so that they may pay it over to the primary creditors of the North Point. The sale and terms are set out in the Schedule. We are getting \$US100,000 from Space Research Corporation on delivery of the vessel. \$US441,833 is going to be paid not in cash but as a concomitant of separate operations which consisted of a review of the contract for servicing of certain Government equipment in use at the Airport. It is what the Government would have to have paid the Space Research Corporation for the work it is doing under the Airport Maintenance Contract for servicing of certain equipment at the Airport between 1st May, 1977, and 31st March, 1978, less an amount which reflects the fact that in the opinion of members on this side of the House expressed both when in Opposition and maintained when we achieved Government that the original contract amount was too much. The Space Research Corporation agreed that the original contract was too generous and agreed to reduce it by \$US51,000; that is \$100,000 savings to the taxpayers over a nine month period.

5.00 p.m.

This has been subtracted from what the Government would pay and they have agreed to maintain the equipment up to March 31, 1978 and pay the reduced sum into North Point's account, on account of the purchase price balance of US\$200,000 to be paid by Space Research Corporation on or before March 31, 1978, with interest at the rate of 10% per annum from the time we deliver the vessel. We hope to deliver the vessel very shortly.

We have secured the unpaid balance of US\$200,000 by an equitable mortgage on a parcel of land of 91 acres at Oldbury which belong to Space Research Corporation. We have also called upon Space Research Corporation not to employ the vessel in any illicit trade and not to carry military cargo, and we have enjoined them not to carry on any activity that will breach the security of Barbados or interfere with the international relations of the State. The purchasers are also required to keep the vessel in good repair and fully insured against loss or damage to the value of the purchase price.

The Addendum indicates that we want to sell it; and in respect of some of the Items recited in the Addendum, hon. members may care to refresh their memories on recent reports from Guyana indicating that Guyana is offering ships specially built for bunker operations. Anyone familiar with the cement and bauxite industries will agree that the requirements for carrying bauxite clinker or cement clinker are similar, but it would seem the Government of Guyana never took North Point very seriously as a potential carrier of clinker.

A lot has been said about this over a period of time, and I do not want to pursue every little avenue that is outstanding in respect of this vessel and its history. But it became a matter of controversy between the political parties in Barbados even before the elections. Upon the change of Government, the new Ministers had access to documents which persuaded us even more fully than before the election that the purchase was a error, and that in any case so much work remained to be done in connection with the cement plant that the North Point could not seriously be considered a viable proposition for the purpose for which it was ostensibly bought. We were fortified in this conclusion by the files which we were to see; and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I was an extremely surprised man when the Space Research Corporation offered to pay so much for the vessel. We had offered it around, we had obtained technical advice from shippers in Bridgetown, we had offered it to people from abroad, and I think the best offer we got was US\$120,000. One firm offered to charter it, and the amount they were paying for charter would not have covered the actual expenses that would have accrued to the Government without even taking into consideration depreciation and major maintenance. We were at our wits end, and Space Research Corporation have, I understand, in the interest of good relations with the new Government agreed to take North Point off our hand under conditions which meant the Government suffered no financial loss, and they also agreed to reduce the maintenance contract at the Airport. The two things together now mean that the Government shows a profit over the whole deal with Space Research Corporation. I myself have never had the privilege of meeting with Dr. Jerry Bull. I have met Mr. Carlton Brathwaite. I remember a few years ago before an election he asked me to indicate to my colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister, that if we got in, his relation with us would be every bit as good as they were with the other Government, but I had no talk with Mr. Brathwaite over this particular operation.

Subject only to that, I would like to say that the Government has been treated with the utmost courtesy by the negotiators from Space Research Corporation in this matter, and we think that this chapter can be closed when this Resolution is passed, and the deal completed with much greater credit to the Government of Barbados than a number of us had ever thought likely when the original adventures were first pursued.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before us is for the disposal of a vessel which the Government of Barbados acquired - and let me mention the name of the source of acquisition for the first time in debate in here - from the United States Government Agency for International Development, at a time when the Government of Barbados was on the verge of establishing a cement plant in the northern part of the Island, in conjunction and cooperation with the Government of Guyana. I have a lot to say on this matter; you will hear everything.
5.10 p.m.

The only previous programme which this Government ever had with the United States Government since Independence, we had none before, was a programme for housing for \$3.5 million which the Government of Barbados eventually turned down some years ago, about five, six or seven years ago. The Government of Barbados has received actually no financial assistance from the Government of the United States, neither has the Government of Barbados solicited from the Government of the United States any financial assistance prior to the 2nd September, 1976 other than the acquisition of the USS - I cannot remember the name, I think it was the Kepler - which was changed to satisfy the requirement of the American Bureau of Shipping, since it was the naval name for the North Point.

The North Point that the people in the Government Party have made so much fuss about was bought from the Government of the United States, the State Department Agency for

International Development. It was bought after examination by the experts who were advising us at the time, and I will mention now the name of the firm, Birchstrom International, who are the engineering advisers to GUYBAU, the Guyana Bauxite Company which is a State owned corporation. Mr. Carl Birchstrom is responsible for the construction of all the major works and he was placed at our disposal. The then Government of Barbados during its negotiations, the Democratic Labour Party Government, had the advice of at least three different international firms on the question of the establishment of a cement plant here in Barbados. They were Birchstrom International, who were recommended to us by the Guyana Bauxite Company as being their special consultants situated in Montreal, Process Service of Milwaukee who have been advisers to the Jamaica Cement Company and another firm under Mr. Allister Fraser, working in close conjunction with the German firm of Loesche, one of the major manufacturers of equipment for cement plants in Germany, and Mr. Fraser who one of the earlier negotiators with the Government of Barbados for this cement plant.

All of the people who were advising the Government of Barbados suggested that since a cement kiln is something like 400 feet long, nearly a quarter of a mile, Sir, I think a mile is 1,760 yards, maybe not a quarter of a mile, but 400 feet is the length of the average kiln, that the cost of transporting a kiln, even in sections, to Barbados would be a tremendous expense, and since an essential part of the arrangements which we had entered into with the Government of Guyana was the export of a major part, more than two-thirds, of our production to Guyana in the form of clinker which it was proposed to grind in Guyana itself into cement in a clinker grinding circuit, that it would be highly desirable at a very early stage to have our own transportation, not only in anticipation of moving the clinker from the site of the cement plant to Georgetown and probably up the river, but also for the purpose before the plant was established of bringing the very cumbersome and heavy machinery here to Barbados in order to get the plant established.

That is fundamental to the whole exercise. This was advice given to us as a Government by the engineers, not by one engineer, but more than one engineer, and for that purpose Mr. Birchstrom who is still the adviser to the Guyana Government, went throughout the length and breadth of the United States looking at suitable equipment. One of the specifications is that you should have a vessel which is

capable of negotiation, coming close to shore and also negotiating the shallow waters which lie off the coast of Guyana, and therefore an LST was considered the most desirable form of equipment for two reasons. First, because an LST, such as the North Point — the name of which formerly, Mr. Speaker, was the Kepner County, I just remembered, as far as I remember the Kepner County was the name of the ship when it belonged to the United States Navy, and it was out in California — but one of the essential specifications is that the vessel should be a shallow draught vessel, and also an LST, since I myself took over 60 units from the place where they land the sugar — Tilbury to Calais — landed 60 units on the beach at Calais, in charge of an LST, I have some nodding acquaintance of their capabilities in shallow water, but I was going on the recommendations of the engineers.

The landing ship tank has a double door in the bow which opens and therefore allows vehicles and heavy equipment to be driven out on to a beach in a draught of water probably about only four or five feet at the bow, tapering off to about 16 or 18 feet at the stern, so it was essential that a vessel of the type of the North Point or the Kepner Country should be acquired as soon as possible. In addition to that, the volumetric capacity of the vessel which was finally selected by the engineers who are still advising the Government of Guyana was a vessel with a 50 foot width internally and an uninterrupted length of 200 feet inside, with probably a height of over 10 to 12 feet in the whole, one continuous whole with accommodation on the port and starboard side for over 150 persons, fully equipped in the galley with all the necessary facilities, equipped with radar and all the other facilities that none of the vessels cruising in the Caribbean are equipped with today. After negotiations through the United States Ambassador, not with any private person making any deals, the Ambassador himself going up with one of the Ministers on more than one occasion, and the engineers who were the consultants to the Government of Guyana and had been taken on as consultants for this purpose, photographs being sent down, the agreement was negotiated with the United States Agency for International Development through the State Department of the United States. It was not bought from Space Research Corporation or any other private person.

5.20 p.m.

I am going to deal with Space Research in a moment. The Government of Barbados for

years in the development of what is now referred to as Grantley Adams International Airport up to the standard which I think even the people on the other side, on the Government side, agree is one of the best in the Caribbean, with the sophisticated kinds of navigational aids and so on, have had to call in expert advice from time to time; and most of the electronic work at the airport started, I believe, just before I came into office, and has been carried out part of the time by International Air Radio in so far as meteorological broadcasting is concerned, but particularly by Space Research Corporation to the entire satisfaction of the Government of Barbados.

The original negotiations for the establishment of the activities of Space Research Corporation at Seawell International Airport were carried out by D. Mordell, Chief Of Engineering at McGill's University and my predecessor in office, Dr. Hugh Sylvester Gordon Cummins, Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George.

These were carried out by my predecessor in office; and contrary to the practice of this Government repudiating everything that had been done before. I was more than obligated to continue any understandings which were entered into by the Government which preceded mine with any organisation or private organisation so that the work of the people of Barbados could continue uninterrupted. I want to get that on the record.

Now, when the Government was satisfied, therefore, that with the recommendations of the engineers — not by anybody trying to sell us anything — that this was the type of vessel which would be suitable for the purposes of (a) bringing down the equipment to the north of the island, (b) transporting the clinker. The question of the immediate usage of the vessel arose, and we were assured, and I am still satisfied, that there is an abundance of work for a vessel of the capabilities of the North Point which has capabilities beyond the capability of any other vessel coming into the port of Barbados today, with the exception of those which are specially assigned by the United States Navy from time to time — may be once or twice a year — to bring equipment down for the facility which the U.S. Government has been occupying in this island since 1955–56.

It is the only vessel of its kind capable of moving extremely heavy equipment and landing it at any point of the island without the

necessity of a deep water harbour, going up the river in Georgetown, going up the river at McKenzie and taking up heavy logs of wood. During my visits to Guyana during the last six to eight months, I have been assured that they would have been more than willing — they now have to go and build vessels. That was not the object of the exercise at all. They now have to go and build because there is no communication between the Government of Barbados and the Government of Guyana either on the North Point or any other matter relating to the construction of the cement plant. Let us get the record straight.

Therefore, the Government of Guyana themselves — and I am sure the Corporation themselves would have had ample utilisation for a vessel like that now that the Government of Barbados, now in office is dragging its feet on the question of the construction of a cement plant in the north of this island to service two independent countries in the Caribbean instead of having to rely on the whimsicalities of the Governments and manufacturers in Columbia or wherever it is — Trinidad, Haiti, Cuba and those other places. We are completely now at the mercy of foreign manufacturers for cement, and if I had had my way, the cement plant would have been producing by now; but the World Bank then came down and got into the act, without being invited.

They sent down a lady called Miss Howe. I do not want to say anything against the lady because I do not know where she got her expertise from; but the first thing that Miss Howe did when we went to a meeting in Guyana at which she was the main speaker and everything was to present the representative of the Government of Barbados and the representative of the Government of Guyana with a patronage list of six firms, and six firms alone that she said must build the cement plant, and escalated the cost of the cement plant from something like \$25 million (Barbados) to \$40 million. (U.S.) and that is why we have not got a cement plant here today.

So on the record, Dr. George Reid will be able to enlighten the Minister and even the members on that side because he attended the meeting, along with Mr. Webster, a member of the Ministry of Finance and Planning; and it was Miss Howe who put the **brakes** on the construction of a cement plant in Barbados; but the very first plant that we were going to construct here was a vertical kiln manufactured in the Federal Republic of Germany at a cost of \$13 or \$14 million. I cannot remember at

this stage whether those dollars were United States dollars or Jamaican dollars; but I remember the figure of \$13 or \$14 million.

The capacity of that plant was to be 90,000 tons a year. The consumption in Barbados is 60,000 tons a year. So we would have had at that stage a surplus of 30,000 tons of cement which we could have exported to the Windward and Leeward Islands; but it was at that stage that the Government of Guyana came in, sent Mr. Bergstron here looking for a site to take all the material over to Guyana to put up a plant in Guyana. I said that was nonsense. We could not allow our raw material to be taken away like that since we were building the plant, we would go in with the Government of Barbados on this plant, but we need 100,000 tons.

Therefore the requirements of the two countries at that stage were 100,000 tons for Guyana and 60,000 for Barbados. Now the economics of a vertical kiln is such that over 90,000 tons is in fact impracticable; and the very people who had done all the specifications for the Government of Barbados. Mr. Frazier said we do not advise you now to use a vertical kiln. You had better go to the horizontal kiln with something between 200,000 and 250,000 tons because world experience has shown that as soon as you put up a plant the demand for the utilisation of cement increases; and the vertical kiln had a maximum capacity of 90,000 tons. That is the stage at which we had to go back to the drawing board and think about a 400 foot kiln to produce approximately 200,000 to 250,000 tons — a plant of that capacity.

So the estimate of cost went up, I think to \$20 million or \$25 million. This was before the lady from the World Bank decided to intervene and bring down her list of persons. These are estimates that were produced by Processeur in Milwaukee, by Mr. Bergstron, by the people in planning in Barbados; and when they all got together, they even increased — put in a very large contingency so that we were satisfied that we could have built the plant....

Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We have listened for quite a while on a dissertation on cement. The Resolution before the House is one for the sale of the North Point. I would be certainly happy, and I am sure that you would be, Sir, if we can get back to the sale of North Point.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member for St. John is merely debating what

the Addendum leads him to debate. He is well within his rights.

5.30 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, last year during the election campaign, the people and the newspapers of this Island were talking about the *North Point* deal. The people in Barbados did not understand what *North Point* was about. They did not realise that it was a result of our decision to build a Cement Plant; that it was brought from the United States Government. They were being told that it was some old boat bought from friends and members of the Government and that people influentially in the Government and friends of the Government made money out of the *North Point*. All you could hear is the *North Point* in the *Nation*, which is the organ of the Government Party over there. The *Nation* was splashing stories.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not mind the *Nation* now. Let us get on with the debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, but this was put in the public domain. They were publishing pictures of this boat, and they said that friends of the Government had been paid for the boat and that sort of nonsense. I do not understand what their sensitivity is at all over there, because whenever we try to put the record straight — we do not get on political platforms abusing people and accusing them of this, that and the other. I think the place to accuse people is in the law courts. If you have something against somebody, then you should go to the law courts. Whenever we try to put the record straight they get very sensitive and very hurt, and I am putting the record straight. It was at that stage that the *North Point*.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please proceed with the debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It was on the advice of the Engineers. The Engineers went and sent photographs to my Ministry outlining why the boat was a suitable boat. I was pointing out, Sir, that Space Research Corporation had been here from about 1961, and that they had been carrying out work at Seawell, which could not be carried out by any Barbados firm, because the technical know-how for things like facsimile or automatic picture transmission from satellites, which I do not think the hon. member, until he made his tour up there, realise that we had that operating up there for over ten years. The automatic pictures and the weather pictures that you see — all of that equipment was put in by Space Research. There is a little van out there in

the field; the satellite passes over four times a day and automatically sends a picture, but nobody in Barbados knew about those things. I refer to instrument-landing systems, visual omni-directional radio range that all the aircrafts use for us to be the category kind of airport that we have. We have the instrument-landing equipment, the distance measuring equipment and radar, which I will come to in a moment. We are the only Airport in the whole of the Caribbean that has all of these things, and all of these systems were supervised and kept up to standard required by the International Civil Aviation Organisation by Space Research Corporation even slightly to my coming into office.

Now, when we were a Colony and even now, I believe, we did not have Embassies. Even now that we have Embassies we do not have the kind of Departments in our Overseas Offices who can deal with purchasing of equipment and that kind of thing for various Government Departments. All of the Overseas territories in the Commonwealth relied upon an organisation known as the Crown Agents for the Colonies. To a very large extent the Government of Barbados did this. We had to rely on them for these services such as the acquisition of various things and even buses, equipment for the Hospital, and the services were provided by a Statutory Corporation now called the Agents for Overseas Governments or something like that. They have changed the name from Crown Agents for the Colonies because, obviously, the Governments that have become independent would not wish to use the services of any organisation called Agents for the Colonies because we are no longer Colonies. They are called the Crown Agents for Overseas Governments or something like that in order not to be confused with the Commonwealth Development Corporation. But they still do all the issues for the Barbados Government if they ever go on the Stock Market raising loans through a brokers firm called Scringers, which is one of their subsidiaries. They still buy all of the equipment, whether it is a road roller or a caterpillar tractor, or anything like that, which we may want to order from England.

Similarly in the United States and Canada, since the Space Research Corporation was already working for the Government of Barbados — we did not have any Crown Agents over there, so it was the practice of the Government, which I had the honour to be the Chairman of the Cabinet, when we needed any advice to acquire anything in the United States of America, or to get any technical or engineering advice, to call on the services of Space Research Corporation which had

offices out in California where the then *Kepler County* was in moth-balls at the time when we decided to purchase it from the United States Agency for International Development. The State Department recommended that we appoint some Engineering firm who would be able to supervise the renovation of the *North Point* so that it would be rendered seaworthy, having been in moth-balls as most of those LSD's and a large section of the United States Navy had been immobilized and put in moth-balls so that they could be put back into service when necessary, but they take a certain amount of reconditioning, otherwise we could not have got it for \$52,000. The reconditioning is really the most important part. It was a question of painting, checking on generators, scraping the bottom, and that was the major part of the cost.

Now, Space Research, then having Engineers out in California already doing work for the Government of Barbados to our entire satisfaction, were asked to look into the suitability of the sub-contractors who were recommended by the State Department, or one of its agencies, to carry out this work as we had no knowledge of these American contractors. They supervised the work at various stages. The United States Ambassador, Mr. Ted Britton, Captain George Fergusson, who has some knowledge, not like the hon. member for St. Michael North East, but a little more detailed knowledge about shipping than the hon. member, went out from time to time with the U.S. Ambassador to check on the work which was being done. Eventually, we had to carry out certain renovations to satisfy the America Bureau of Shipping Standards. We have no Bureau of Shipping in Barbados, but in order to make this vessel of an International acceptability that it could go into any port and be allowed to depart from the port, we had to do certain things to the ship. That is the important thing. Any vessel can go into a port, but to be allowed to depart as being seaworthy, they required certain reinforcements which they said the Navy would not insist upon, but, as far as they were concerned as a Bureau of Shipping, with heavy cargo, they would like certain reinforcements and that was the major part of the work done.

The *North Point* was brought here. The Press were invited on board. They were told all about the Ship, and the American Captain of the Ship, when he was asked by the Press what in his opinion the value of the vessel was, he said as the vessel stood there — and he was one of the experienced LSD Captains — it was worth at least \$7 million. According to the Addendum to the Resolution, we purchased that vessel for the sum

of \$814,994. The Government now proposes to sell the vessel, or to give it away for \$866,994 thereby showing a profit of some \$52,000. This is what the vessel originally cost from the AID, so they are making a clear net profit and no loss at all. I am going to read out what the introducer of the Resolution said, the Hon. Minister of Finance, and I am going to examine what he said in detail, because there are certain things that he has not disclosed in this House which I think he ought to have disclosed in the course of his introduction, and I intend to tell the House what those matters are.

5.40 p.m.

I intend to tell the House what these matters are. Now nowhere have we been told that the vessel has been appraised by independent valuers, say, from the Canadian Government, the British Government or by Lloyds Bureau of Shipping or anybody of that calibre. All that we have been told is that the Government had some offers from some people, one was an offer of \$US120,000. I want to say this: if you start a campaign for over a year trying to discredit a ship and saying the ship is no good, your shipping expert, whoever he is or whatever qualifications he has comes into the House of Assembly and gets on public platforms and says this ship is no good, do you expect anybody to offer you any decent price for it? The Captain in his interview on landing in Barbados, not knowing me or anybody at all in Barbados said the ship was worth \$7 million. Remember that figure because I want to quote from something here. They did not go to the United Kingdom, Canada or to the United States and advertise in any reputable shipping magazine, but somehow or other they got offers, but with the kind of propaganda which was being disseminated throughout the Caribbean, would they expect anybody to offer them anything for the ship after they said that the D.L.P. Government was corrupt in buying the ship, that it was only bought because somebody was making money? I ask them who was making money out of it. If they could name me any individual which this ship was purchased from other than the United States Government or anybody who made any illegal money other than the contractors, they would have something there. I do not know what margin of profit the contractors made, but they were supervised and all the bills and every document is in the possession of the Ministry of Finance in relation to all the repairs and every coat of paint. The documents which arrived with this ship when I went aboard occupied eleven filing

cabinets. There were eleven filing cabinets on the weather deck; go and check them out before you open your mouth and talk. Before they saw the ship they were talking, but there was an election on so the Government was making money out of this and making money out of that. When I say the Government I do not mean the people of Barbados, I mean people in the Government were making money. If they can find that a single person has made any illegal money out of the North Point, they should lock him up including me or anybody else. This was a Cabinet decision taken on the advice of experts brought from another friendly Government at the time. But I will tell what they did first.

They planted an article in the Financial Times and I propose to read it. When they have access they will get the history of the cement plant and so on, but I think that the Government having created that atmosphere and having made such a hullabaloo over the North Point and Seafoods — they did not tell the people about the \$20 million, that the Trinidad Government was re-financing the whole shrimping operation or that over 400 or 500 people many of whom you know are currently employed.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The North Point was not in the shrimping operation. Let us get on with the North Point.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: They talked about the shrimping industry this, that and the other and the North Point, but they did not explain to the people what the North Point was all about. They come here today and are only selling the North Point and they had it laid up there riding on anchor because they were too ashamed to use it, and because they wanted to prove that it was no good. How do they expect therefore to get a better offer than \$US120,000 when they did not go to the market where you sell ships, Amsterdam, London, New York, New Orleans or Baton Rouge. Those are the places where you sell ships; but you sit down here and you run a campaign against your own property and expect people to come and offer you a princely sum or anything like its true value for it.

On the 30th November, Independence Day for Barbados, they planted an article in the Financial Times after an interview with the Minister of Finance in which the North Point was mentioned, and this is what they said:

"Barbados has coped better than most developing nations with the problems of the world recession and looks capable of continuing

to organise its internal affairs on a stable and orderly basis."

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it you are making that a document of the House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am willing to, because it has some very interesting statement which I am sure posterity would like to read. In this article is stated:

"Another feature of the election campaign was the allegation of corruption among members of the Government and their associates. These included the purchase of an old U.S. Navy barge at an initial estimate of \$BDS 1 million and a final total of \$BDS 7 million;...."

This is an article as a result of an interview apparently given by the Leader of the Government to one Mr. Peter Sabine. The only Sabine I know is a man who wrote "A History of Political Thought". (*Asides*) But he says here in a recent interview, new Prime Minister Tom Adams claims so and so, so he must have had the interview with you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member is addressing the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would be glad to read that old article, but for what it is worth I cannot ever recall having met anybody by that name far less given him an interview.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You meet a lot of people every day and sometimes you are not aware of whom you are talking to. I find it difficult to believe that you do not know about this article because it was part of the propaganda thrust of the new Government... stability reflected in new leaders. Your name is quoted here about a recent interview with Prime Minister Tom Adams. This is the Financial Times significantly coming out on Independence Day in 1976. Look it here, and this is what they say; listen to the figures quoted.

"Another feature of the election campaign was the allegation of corruption among members of the Government and their associates. These included the purchase of an old U.S. NAVY barge at an initial estimate of \$BDS 1 million and a final total of \$BDS 7 million."

Now if you go back and check from all the statements made by them on the other side, they were telling people here in Barbados that we paid

\$7 million for the vessel, but the Resolution here today says that the vessel cost \$US814,000, but at that time the propaganda was still hot and they were telling the people in Barbados and the people who read the Financial Times in England and me because I read the Financial Times that we had taken up \$7 million of the Barbados taxpayers' money to give to some of our associates and friends to buy an old barge. A barge is something without an engine. (*Asides*) Why didn't you tell Mr. Sabine it was a motorised barge? This is not a motorised barge; this is a Landing Ship Tank, the circumstances of whose acquisition I have already outlined, but here it is the figure of \$7 million is cropping up again after being disseminated throughout the length and breadth of this Island by the people on the other side, and then repeated to the Financial Times.

I would not worry to read the rest because this deals with the Leader of the Government's aversion to any form of political federation in the Caribbean. This is another story. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central has tabled questions about that and he did not even know about this article. Anyhow I am dealing with the North Point.

Let me deal specifically with the introduction made by the hon. member. The Hon. Minister of Finance introducing the Resolution said that the Government was only slightly out. I do not know how he figures out that the Government is going to be slightly out when later on he said that the Government suffers no financial loss, and he does not understand how Space Research offered so much money. I am saying that the L.S.T's captain said on arrival here in Barbados in the presence of the press that there was nothing clandestine about it and Mr. Ted Britton, the ex- U.S. Ambassador said the vessel was worth \$7 million. Are we giving it away now just for the sake of politics? That is what I am concerned about, because having taken this stand on corruption and all that, they have to prove that the vessel is no use to the Government of Barbados and the Government of Guyana.

5.50 p.m.

The Government is slightly out. Then he went on to say that Space Research Corporation agreed that we were too generous to them in the sum of US\$51,000 and that they have reduced their contract by \$51,000. Why did the hon. member not tell the House this simple fact? Mr. Ron Edgar was sent down here, as far as I can remember by the Canadian Department of Transportation to train our radar personnel. But according to the arrangement, we had to pay

Space Research Corporation to look after his accommodation, as well as salary, and everything was fixed, as far as I can remember, by either CIDA or the department of Transportation. Mr. Ron Edgar is the person who went to our conferences with Mr. Leric Hunte, our acting Director of Civil Aviation, and trained all our radar people when the radar was installed at Seawell International Airport. The contract was reduced by \$51,000 primarily because Mr. Edgar is no longer employed — I am making a categorical statement — on behalf of the Government of Barbados, neither is he paid for by Space Research for the Government of Barbados. Space Research Corporation has taken over the payment of Mr. Ron Edgar and that is why the contract is reduced by \$51,000. What the hon. member is saying is that we were too generous; we were over paying them by \$51,000, and that they re-negotiated the contract. But what has happened is that they have not been able to pay the people over \$400,000 but still could take up money and put into the Barbados Telephone Company, probably for services rendered during the election and afterwards.

The hon. member went on to say that the Guyana Government is having ships built. No wonder, because relationships have completely broken down. Only last year I had discussions with the manager and engineers of Guyana on the acquisition of this vessel and we were unanimous in our approach to this problem.

The hon. member went on to say that the documents they had seen made them feel that the purchase was an error and a mistake. The purchase was no error and no mistake in the context of what we wanted to achieve. The Trinidad Government owns the sugar industry in Trinidad. You will receive today, Sir, a copy of the report of the Caribbean Development Bank, and in that report you will see that the Government of Trinidad and Tobago now owns 100% of the sugar industry. The Government of Guyana owns the bauxite industry and the sugar industry. Barbados has not yet begun to socialize the economy of this country. We have not done this before because we never had the money to pay out the industries — I mean, not in the context of Trinidad and Guyana; because we have never had the money to buy out the sugar industry; Trinidad has oil money. When I say we have not begun, I mean on the scale of Trinidad and Jamaica which has taken over the bauxite industry — which I do not entirely agree with because they are in a more impoverished position than we are. I admit that we have not had the wherewithal to socialize the economy; if not, do you think people like Parky (?) Seale could be

going around the place like this if we had the money to socialize Roebuck Street and other operations in this country? But Guyana has taken the bull by the horns.

Now here is a joint venture — the shrimp industry — socialization with the Trinidad and Tobago Government. Jamaica industry — socialization with the Government of Guyana. We are moving in the direction towards — to use the jargon of the socialists — the commanding heights of the economy. We are moving into vital sectors where we will not be at the whims and fancies of capitalist producers overseas. But for political reasons now, everything that the Democratic Labour Party has done has got, since this election, to be sacrificed on the altar of capitalist enterprise. That is what is happening in this country; do not let us fool ourselves about it. But we have no tickets to redeem to anybody in any election, and we have never had, therefore we could move in an unerring path towards our objectives. But they have compromised away everything for the mere sake of winning an election; and therefore they have to redeem certain coupons. Who controls the shipping in this country? It is completely disorganized; they didn't want the North Point to be operated. The Schooner Pool is a fiasco. Barbados Shipping and Trading — they control all the agencies and everything. Jamaica is buying ships, Guyana is building ships; the Federal boats are a joke, although we agreed to purchase four ships with the assistance of the Caribbean Development Bank over a period of time. I have gone on record and said that is only a sort of original window dressing because it can never do the service that a properly organized shipping service operating out of each Island can perform. But the hon. member says that the Government of Guyana has never taken the North Point very seriously. When did the Government of Guyana tell the hon. member that? That is directly contrary to all the conversations, discussions and negotiations that I personally held with the Government officers of Guyana. They now can't even hear from the Government of Barbados — at least up to a few months ago they could not get any dialogue going on the construction of the cement plant, which I consider to be about the only natural resource in Barbados that we can exploit. We have no gold or diamonds, like Guyana; no bauxite. Rock stones are our basic raw material here. And here we had a Government willing to take 100,000 tons; the wherewithal to convey it; and for political reasons they have sabotaged the whole experiment.

6.00 p.m.

The international inter-colonial tariff rate for cement is \$30. That was last year, at 100,000 tons a year one way, the revenue which the North Point could have earned was \$3 million a year for a vessel that cost U.S. \$814,000. Those are the economics of the operation.

The hon. member went on to say that so much work remained to be done on the cement plant that the North Point could not be considered viable. I challenge that statement, because I do not accept their shipping expert, I have to go by the people who have experience in these things other than as deck hands and as greasers. I do not consider that a competent authority to advise any Government, this Government or the last Government or the Guyana Government on the viability of any kind of thing that goes to sea, and then the hon. member went on to say that he was extremely surprised when Space Research offered to take over the vessel. Well, if I had that kind of money and the Government was willing to sell me for what they are selling to Space Research, I could see a way to get back my money maybe in a year or 18 months, so I do not know why the hon. member should be surprised, but all this is political talk, because the hon. member has not told us that he had a valuation from Lloyds or from any competent shipyard in Holland or in New Orleans or in any of the recognised shipping ports where ship brokers deal in these things day after day to tell us what the true value of the North Point is. I can only go by the valuation that the senior LST Captain on the day he arrived, not in answer to me, but in answer to the member of the Press who asked what was the value of the ship. He said he did not know how much it cost the Government of Barbados, but in his estimation the vessel was valued at \$7 million.

So now the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance is surprised. I am not surprised that he is surprised, because a Minister of Finance who did not know that the trade tax was 20% after he had introduced a big budget obviously is surprised that he wakes up in a morning and sees the same face in the mirror. I cannot imagine that anybody who is a Minister of Finance, after all these years of trade tax imposed by the Vestry which he now relieved the mercantile community of paying.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you have to pay trade tax on the North Point?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: We do not have to pay it any more. I never had to pay it, Sir, I am just dealing with his element of surprise.

Anyhow after starting off, Sir, by saying that the Government is only slightly out of pocket he ended up by saying that the Government will now show a profit on the whole transaction, and he went on to say how he had been treated with courtesy. I will tell you this. He certainly did not treat Dr. Bull or the members of Space Research with any kind of courtesy when they were putting out their propaganda during the election campaign. I do not expect as a politician to be treated with any courtesy by anybody on the other side of the House. I have been in politics too long, but I think that if we are to keep up the image of Barbados no matter what side of the political fence we may happen to be on, we should not go about spreading propaganda which, although it is aimed specifically at individuals who are not of our own political persuasion, but may in the long run in the overall picture be detrimental to the island as a whole, no matter how you turn around and say afterwards now we are competent, we are the fair haired, blue eyed boys, we like the capitalists and all that kind of thing, you have already done the damage, and when you go about and spread this kind of propaganda about North Point deals and that kind of thing, somebody putting money in their pockets, you give people the impression that this is a place like Grenada or Uganda or one of those kinds of places.

I am being very brutal. I know that the Hon. Minister is a colleague of the gentleman down there and I expect the Hon. Minister to get his knighthood any time too, all you have got to do is to ask, you know, and it shall be given, but if you like that kind of thing, but do not let us get down into that kind of thing. The people in the Opposition in Grenada have good reason, but do not say that Barbados is a place that does not expect human rights. I never even heard the Attorney General once in all his fulminations — and he can get very warm sometimes — suggest that there was a denial of human rights in Barbados, at the same time do not make out that Barbados is the most corrupt place in the world and then expect that people are going to say well you are different, you did not go to those kinds of schools.

Mr. SPEAKER: And there would never be a human rights problem at the North Point.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I hope not, Sir. I am only saying that when you are doing all of this you are causing damage to your own country, and when you yourself try then you are surprised then that people treat you with courtesy. It is only that people treat you with courtesy because they have better manners and that they are tolerant and that they know better. All I am saying, Sir, is that we have come full circle. They now have to get rid of the boat because they made a lot of propaganda about it. At first the Minister starts off by saying that the Government is only going to be slightly out, and he ends up fifteen minutes later by saying that the Government is making a profit. I suppose he expects me to say that I am glad that due to his perspicacity and acumen that the Government is making a profit, and that he cannot say that the DLP caused him to lose money, but my contention is that the boat was acquired for a good and proper purpose and should never be sold.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the occasion pass without categorically setting out the Government's position and refuting much of the nonsense that has emanated from the last speaker's mouth.

This purchase illustrates in no uncertain terms the total lack of understanding of proper business practices by the previous Government. In addition, it illustrates the total contempt with which the previous Government held Parliament in this country. The hon. member would have us today believe that he acted with the highest motives, with good reasons, with proper business methods in acquiring this boat. At no time in the last Parliament did the hon. member, before he acquired the boat or when he was in the course of acquiring the boat, ever saw fit to come to this House and explain those good reasons which according to him he had. The truth of the matter is that this was an old condemned, moth balled ship in some moth ball yard in the United States which was purchased by the Government of Barbados without any feasibility study, pre-feasibility study, without any proper appraisal as to the cost of putting it in proper or anything of that kind.
6.10 p.m.

We have looked from the front to the back of this file, and seen nowhere that before the Government purchased this vessel that they got an appraisal study as to the cost of putting it into operation. What is more, having got it from

the U.S., from a moth ball yard, the Government itself had no idea as to how much it would cost to put it into order. So they hired one of the services of the Space Research Corporation. They put in a proposal, and the cost of that proposal was over run; and we came and found on the file that disputes were going along between the Government and the services as to the cost, the initial cost of the service. The truth is that when they were finished with it they were unable to get a classification certificate from any of the recognised classification societies. I challenge the hon. member to deny that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation. I do not know what the hon. member means by classification societies; but the vessel had a certificate from the American Bureau of Shipping, who specified what had been done to the vessel. So I do not know what he is talking about classification societies.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: With the greatest respect, the hon. member knows that no America Bureau of Shipping ever gave a certificate saying that it was fit and proper for service all over the world. Take that. It was given a temporary certificate on certain conditions that it was fit to sail to Barbados and on the condition that more work would be done on the vessel before it could be reclassified. That is what I am talking about.

Now, let us go ahead, Sir. During the course of the debate the hon. member had not yet said or disclosed who did a feasibility study of the boat even for the purpose for which the hon. member said he had in mind for the use of the boat. We have searched and searched and never found one. We could never find one because none was done. The unsophisticated manner in which the hon. member dished out and doled out the taxpayers' money in this country is exemplified and identified by his manner in dealing with this issue. Let us now examine his talk that it was bought for transporting cement. At the time it was bought the Government of Barbados did not have any clear financing for any cement plant at all. The hon. member said that the Government of Guyana and the Government of Barbados.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like to correct the hon. member of that point. The Government of Barbados not only had financing, but if he checks the record he will see that while we were delayed in the concept of the plant, that we had to pay a considerable fee, as far as I remember, to the Bank of

London; and he will find if he checks with the Director of Finance and Planning, the Government actually had to pay off the bank because they would not hold that money for the construction of a cement plant. We actually had to pay them a fee.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I have said, and I repeat, that I am examining the hon. member's statement that this was bought for the purpose of carrying cargo of cement in conjunction with the joint cement plant of Guyana and Barbados. I categorically state that when he bought it he did not have any money to build a cement plant.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Again I say that that is not true. We had the money, but we had to pay the bank for holding the money so that the money would be available any time we were ready to go ahead. We could not go on paying the bank for holding the money indefinitely. After Miss Howe from the World Bank came down with all her fancy figures and fancy terms, we could not go on playing the bank for holding the money. We did have the money for the operation.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I repeat that there had never been any arrangement with the Government of Barbados and the Government of Guyana to get finance from any institution committed to the building of a cement plant. It is easy to understand why. People who deal with money do not operate as the hon. member operates. Before you can get money, you have to get a feasibility study, a marketing study and all the detailed studies to show that the project is feasible so that you will get enough revenue to pay back the money; and those studies are only now being completed. (ASIDES: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: We had about three studies.) I know that the hon. member had a group willing to provide a turn key operation to build a cement plant with a capacity of 90,000 tons which the Government of Barbados and a number of private investors from Jamaica and abroad were willing to back. But as soon as the hon. member said that Guyana was interested, they said that they would have no dealings with Guyana, and the Government of Barbados paid them back all their expenses that they had incurred and all of the cost of the study.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that it is not true that the people who were negotiating about the cement plant in Barbados said that they would not have anything to do with Guyana. As I pointed out — I do not know if the hon. member was here

— they themselves volunteered that the vertical kiln would not be suitable for the production of 250,000 tons because the maximum production of a vertical kiln was a 90,000 ton plant; and it was because the Government of Guyana insisted on 100,000 tons for Guyana, leaving only 50,000 tons, that it was no longer feasible to build a 90,000 ton plant. Now he is making a slanderous comment by saying that those people said that they would have nothing to do with Guyana.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Slandering the Government of Guyana for what? I am saying that he had an operation for the 90,000 ton plant, but the people who were participating in that plant refused to have any dealing with the Government of Guyana. That is on the record. So that when he bought the North Point, he could not have been buying the North Point, according to his own reasons, to transport 90,000 tons of cement because that is approximately the anticipated consumption of Barbados. So when you took out the Barbados consumption, the North Point would only be transporting the residue.

The motive for buying North Point has nothing to do with the original plan. The motive for buying North Point was when the Government of Guyana came into the deal when they were to have a larger plant; and this is where I challenge the hon. member with a lack of proper business practices; because he committed himself to buying a boat before he was sure that he would have a cargo for that boat to carry out.

Now he has made a lot of statements about lack of communication and co-operation with the Government of Guyana. The hon. member is always trying to hold a brief for people who do not want to brief him. For his information, the Government of Guyana understands very well the Government of Barbados. They understand that if they parade and make wild statements that this Government is not afraid to tell them publicly that we disagree with them; but unlike the hon. member, we do not hold malice; and the fact that we had to disagree with them does not prevent us from enjoying very good relations; and I know that Ministers from Guyana and Ministers from Barbados are in very constant communications on matters of mutual interest.

6.20 p.m.

There is another point that I would like to deal with specifically. The hon. member talks about the Space Research Corporation bringing

equipment here and Barbados being the most sophisticated Airport. That is true. Barbados is a sophisticated Airport, but what I can legitimately charge the hon. member with is saddling us with additional cost far and above an amount which, if proper business procedures and proper governmental procedures were established, we would have had the same standard and it would have cost the taxpayers far less.

I am going to deal now with the Space Research Corporation contract. In the 1975-76 Estimates over \$1 million came down here, and the Opposition raised the question of the terms of the contract between the Government of Barbados and the Space Research Corporation. That contract was never negotiated upon any competitive basis at all. As a matter of fact, the relationship at the Airport was such that Carlton Brathwaite and others, friends of the Prime Minister, used to bring down all kinds of condemned equipment and sold-out equipment from the United States, put it in on a trial basis and then charge the Government for it. Let the hon. member deny that. (*Asides*) Of course, he will deny it, but the facts will prove it.

What is more. We went into the Ministry, and I found that no contract was ever signed for the operation and maintenance and the terms and conditions of Harp's contract because every civil servant that was dealing with that contract said that Harp was ripping off the Government of Barbados. Let the hon. member deny that, too. The hon. member was the Minister of Civil Aviation, and so little interest did he pay to the Financial Rules and Regulations of the Government that he did not even call upon them to see that a contract was executed.

One of the first things that we did was to institute an investigation into the cost of operating that contract. We sent to Martinique and to Curacao and this is what we found. That in Curacao with a sophisticated system, better than ours because it is new, it cost \$300,000 a year to maintain it while ours cost over \$1,500,000 a year to operate. What is more, the cost of maintenance of our equipment means that every five years you will buy a new set of equipment. That happened under the administration of the Hon. Minister of Finance, and now he has the gall to get up in here and talk about people making political capital. In other countries of the world, in Amin's country and other countries, the hon. member would have been dealt with in the appropriate fashion.

Now, if the hon. member were in the habit of bringing these important matters to the House of Assembly like we are doing, the public would know the facts. Just as the hon. member had his say today the Opposition would have had its say. I want to say further that it is only because this Government was willing to be in a compromising mood that that contract was not reduced further. (*Asides.*) I am glad the hon. member mentioned Edgar. Let me tell the House about Mr. Edgar. Mr. Edgar came here under a CIDA or Canadian Government Grant, an alleged gift from Canada to us, but the hon. member's friends and associates managed somehow or the other to get Mr. Edgar's services and then charged the Government of Barbados for Mr. Edgar's services. Let the hon. member deny that. In the contract price in this financial year Mr. Edgar's services were charged to the Government of Barbados. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He always was.) Well, I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member has said that he always was. The Government of Canada gave his services to us free, but the hon. member was prepared to let FRC charge us for it, so he gets two sets of pay.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is not correct that Mr. Edgar's services were given to us.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the hon. member rise?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. On a point of explanation. Mr. Edgar was recruited for us by CIDA, but Mr. Edgar's services were in the Agreement always to be paid for by the Government of Barbados. How can he make statements like that? Why does he not go and ask the people at CIDA about the matter?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I repeat that Harp charged the Government of Barbados for the use of Mr. Edgar's services. I will tell you how I found it out. The Accountants said that I played a low ball on them. The first thing I did after making inquiries was to write to FRC and ask them to give us the name of each and every employee who was employed in the maintenance, his salary and his terms and conditions of service. They sent back a list and 99% were Barbadians and they sent me their salaries. I then asked about Mr. Edgar. They said: "No, he belongs to the organisation in Canada." From there on the row started. When we took the total disbursements that they paid out in salaries and

pension contributions we found that they were charging us like Consulting Engineers abroad as usual in other countries a factor of 2.5 above the total wage disbursements — 250%, and it was at that point I said: Stop the payments to Harp, they are robbing the people of Barbados. That is why the hon. member can come in here and say that we did not pay Harp. It is true we did not pay Harp. I said to stop the payments to Harp because it was a rip off, and I make no apologies for saying it. I told every member of Harp who came down here that they were hiring Barbadian labour; they were paying out X dollars, and for supervision they were charging us a factor of 250%, and I said that was glorified robbery. That is what the hon. member as Minister of Finance and Minister of Aviation paid out to FRC Corporation. If he does not know that, it only shows how he ran his Ministry.

Mr. Speaker, Harp is lucky, because the Minister of Finance will tell you that he had to beg me to ease the situation because I wanted a bigger reduction. In view of the fact that the contract expires next year, it only has this financial year to run. We got \$51,000 over a nine-month period, and we have served them notice that we can hire Barbadians like they hired them, bring them into the Civil Service, and we can hire consultants to do purchasing and anything of that kind. As far as the negotiations and the contract between Harp and the Airport is concerned, the hon. member should hang his head in shame instead of coming here to talk the foolishness that he talked today.

Now, Sir, there were a number of other things he said about socialisation. That is so hollow that I would not want to deal with it, Sir. The hon. member has been in the Government for 15 years. He had plenty of opportunity to show initiative, if he really believed what he said he believed. He had plenty of legal power, plenty of financial power, there were institutions in existence which he could have used, shaped, and adapted in that 15 years which would be in consonance with such a philosophy, but the truth of the matter is that that is for the platform, and that is for the Press but not for reality.

I was on one of the Committees that deal with this ship. This ship was advertised. We consulted and contacted the Hughes Brothers in the United States of America who deal in this class of ship. In addition to that we got comparative cost of newer vessels.
6.30 p.m.

In addition to that we got comparative costs of newer vessels to do this, and what is more, at one of the meetings a representative of the Ministry of Finance and Planning made it positively clear that one of the points the Government of Guyana was taking was that they were buying bauxite ships and their ships could carry the clinker from Barbados and they had no interest in the North Point. That is what the Government of Guyana was saying, that they were buying bauxite ships for the carriage of their bauxite and that their ships could bring the clinker, because on the way back down they would be empty and could pass through here and go to Guyana. So all this is only the imagination of the hon. member. I am sure it is only the imagination because the hon. member has found himself in a spot where he has to defend and with no defence, in the usual nature he clutches at straws and uses the imagination.

Now, Sir, in addition to that we put the vessel out to tender and a number of tenders came in. On each occasion the tender price was such that with the fuel consumption and maintenance cost of the vessel, it would have resulted in a loss. A number of shipping lines quoted. Harriman quoted about cement, but when you took into account the stevedoring charges and other charges that you had to pay, it was uneconomic. I would accept if the hon. member could show me a feasibility study done which shows it was an economic proposition, but other than that it is only the hon. member's opinion and I have a low respect of that opinion.

Without more ado I would urge hon. members to join with us in getting rid of this moth-ball, condemned, useless boat for the purposes of Barbados and let us not forget that our aspirations in shipping can well be satisfied by participating in a venture with the other West Indies territories in the purchase of new ships, serviceable ships, ships designed for the particular type of trade we have, and what is more, for the hon. member's information, WISCO has got a number of new boats and at the last Trade Ministers' Conference in Guyana it was agreed that as part of the regional projects to be financed by the European Development Fund would be a sum for the purchase of new vessels to deal with inter-island trade between Trinidad, the Eastern Caribbean and the smaller Islands. For the hon. member's benefit, that programme has been accepted by the E.D.F. and that money is available so that WISCO can be expanded, not with junk like the North Point, but with modern container ships

and vessels suitable, with a long life, with certificates that they are insurable, not condemned foolishness.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, after the speech by the Deputy Prime Minister, really it is very little for me to add in winding up this debate. I am sure that all hon. members would be anxious to deal with this by way of a vote. It is unfortunate when someone finds himself in a position to have to defend the indefensible for all his strictures against capitalism, it is obvious from the speeches made recently by the hon. member for St. John that he wants to be in the real estate business, the shipping business, any other business, and that he is prepared to tell you that the Government was doing a good thing in buying this house or the next house, this ship or the next ship, because if he had it he could make money from it. He must go and find people to back him to buy the North Point or another L.S.T.

I want to take him up on one or two points which the hon. member for Christ Church South Central has omitted. We have heard this figure of \$7 million over and over again. I was once warned more than twenty years ago that "Dipper is a nice fellow but any time he mentions the figure "7", you have to listen very carefully to what he says." First of all I have never heard and I do not believe until I read the Financial Times today, I have ever seen anywhere a suggestion about \$7 million for the North Point. I know when we were in Opposition that somebody who was concerned with these negotiations indicated a figure of \$4 million BDS in respect of the North Point, and I gathered that this had to do with the insurance value of the ship. We have always maintained that the ship was a ship of little value and we are told here today that we must take the word of a Landing Ship Tank captain with a personal interest in the matter, but the same captain gave me very different figures when I went abroad the ship as to the value of the ship when it first arrived in Barbados.

We went to the trouble of putting ourselves on the market not only as sellers but as buyers, indicating there was a need for the ship to a firm of shipping brokers, but this ship did not suit and we got some quotations for the sale of L.S.Ts. We also got a list of the L.S.Ts that had been sold or known to this firm of brokers for a number of years up to end of 1975. This is last year when we got it. These are ships that are moving. One in Japan was sold to the Maritime Co. Ltd. of Iran for \$US191,650. The Poison Industrial Corporation

of Taiwan in 1973 bought four of them for \$US730,000; The Maritime Co. Ltd. of Iran again bought a L.S.T at Orange, Texas in 1974 for \$US261,000; a Steel Mill in Korea later that year bought one in Japan for \$US121,000; Max Wender of Detroit, Michigan bought one in Washington for \$US150,000. In 1975, at the time when we got this information, the seller had refused to sell. He had seven L.S.Ts and sold one. Somebody paid just over \$US1 million for six of them.

In November, 1975, L.P. Callinikos of Greece bought two of the ships at \$US250,000 each. A New York company bought one for \$US280,000. These are the prices for which viable L.S.Ts have been sold recently. These are ships with certificates and insurance. We believe we are doing well in selling one for \$800,000, where people have been buying them four and six for that price.

Now where it comes to the other ships, because we made a double check indicating that we might be interested in buying a ship suitable for this same cement plant, remember the North Point was built in the Second World War, we were offered a whole range of ships, a number at \$1 million, bigger ships than the North Point with three holds, three hatches, deck crane, crane and bale, 3,300 Mitsubishi engine, steel winches, 10 knots, built in 1967. For a ship built in Taiwan, a much better ship again than the North Point — these are real ships — \$1.7 million. We have a whole series of ships of all prices between \$1 million and \$1.7 million which are presently trading.

6.40 p.m.

A whole series of ships, Sir, all at prices between \$1 million and \$1.7 million, which are presently trading, all immeasurably better vessels than the North Point, vessels presently operating in the freight business. So we came to the conclusion that for US\$866,000, if we wanted a ship, we could get a ship many times better than the North Point. And since US\$866,000 is at least three times more than we have been able to find for any LST in working order sold for in the last few years, we feel this is a good deal. It seems to have escaped the hon. member's attention that a part of the burden of the Opposition's attack on the purchase of the North Point was that Space Research Corporation must have derived enormous profits from refitting the North Point for more money than the North Point would be worth at the end of it. Our files are full, as the Hon. Minister has said, of analyses of the earning capacity of the North Point. We went

out of our way to get cargo but all we could hear was that the North Point is a good ship for carrying lumber. We had specific advice that it is not good for carrying bulk cargoes; it is a good ship for carrying lumber. It came down here with a cargo of lumber consigned to the Barbados Lumber Company. We have had the utmost trouble getting the money for carrying that lumber; I do not believe the Government has been able to get it yet. Mr. Jack Dear says he has it in his client's account but I do not believe that the amounts correspond. And again, who is Barbados Lumber Company? The Chairman is Carlton Brathwaite, or was at that time. So these are the facts upon which the public of Barbados felt genuine concern over the North Point. Virtually every fact alleged by the hon. member for St. John in here today is an untrue. He has said that the Guyana people was prepared to deal with this. But we have on the file to the contrary. One of the very people whom the hon. member said we should ask about the operation is the first one who is on file to the effect that the Guyanese have indicated that their participation is geared to the use of their bauxite ships. One of the very names of public officers that he has called in here today relates to that; and we have heard a defence of the indefensible.

I must confess that the hon. member has been unusually moderate in the way he has presented his case, and I appreciate that fact in all the circumstances, because the Government has no scruples about the North Point; it should never have been bought. This is one of those old-boy net work operations that got out of control. The cement plant was nowhere near completion; yet he is accusing this Government of Capitalism by abandoning the cement plant. We have not abandoned the idea of a cement plant; but we are trying to find out whether Barbados can afford to build a cement plant for US\$80 million under the conditions which are being offered to us. There was never any stage at which a cement plant could have been built for the \$13 million or \$14 million, because the Government did not then have the resources. As soon as the Government sought to get the money to build something, that type of cement plant was no longer within reach; and the North Point is something which relates to employment in connection with the cement plant in three or four years from the time you start to build it. But you do not buy your transportation before you have something to transport. One thing that has been missing from the hon. member's dissertation is what he would have done with the North Point during the three or four years he was waiting for the cement plant to go on

stream; that has been totally missing from anything he has said. As far as I know, we are part of WISCO; we are viewing shipping as a regional matter; we are not going into the ship business; I have had to say so in here already. This Government also has no intention of going into the real estate business. We have no intention of going into the ship business, not as we are presently constituted. The shipping business has been gone into for us by WISCO, the Government to Government scheme for the benefit of the people. The North Point should never have been bought, and we are doing extremely well to get cash dollars in our hand in this regard.

The hon. member said at one stage that I said we were nearly going to clear off our money and that another stage I said we were going to do more. I carefully said we have nearly covered all. The difference, Mr. Speaker is the seamen's wages, because every week the North Point is out there we have to pay money for people to be on board the ship to look after it, and that represents a loss for the Government. We had to supplement the vote in the last financial year in order to pay the seamen on board. On the other hand, we have been able to get a reduction of \$51,000 in the airport contract. So over the two contracts together, which was what I said, we are showing a slight profit. If the hon. member cannot analyse a speech made by somebody whose speeches he has been listening to for many years, then I am sorry for him. I hope that the public will analyse it better.

The hon. member said something about my not knowing the trade tax is 20%. I expect that from an idiot like Frank DeSilva or the hon. member for St. Michael South West; I did not expect it from the hon. member for St. John. Having gone on television and said that I do not accept the phony arithmetic of those who say the corporation tax was 40% and the trade tax 12 or 12½%, added up to 52% and say that I have reduced the burden on the merchants by only charging 45%, — having described the whole thing as phony arithmetic, I happen to see a long letter by a confirmed idiot who is all the more ignorant because he does not understand the depth of ignorance in which his mind habitually wallows— having said that to say the trade tax is 12 or 12½% is phony arithmetic, I am then accused of thinking that it was 12 or 12½%. I did not expect that from the hon. member for St. John, and I will deal with it in another place.

I do not want to dwell at length on this. But I recommend this Resolution to hon.

members. We will get the North Point out of the way and if we build a cement plant we will have a sufficient time to give mature consideration to the problem of whether we are going to send clinker to Guyana to be ground, whether we are going to sell cement overseas and what transportation will be appropriate to deal with such problems. That requires a feasibility study which is being done. The feasibility study will tell us within the parameters set by those to whom we are looking for financing, what type of cement plant we should have, what type of markets we can expect. We will then be in a position to examine all sorts of possibilities for marketing the cement and we will then know the type of vessel which will be appropriate to have or the arrangements which will be appropriate to make within the general context of our marketing plans. And we do not have three months or six months to do this; we have a couple of years, because a cement plant is not going to arrive over night. And getting back to basics, must we have a cement plant simply because we have rock stones?

6.50 p.m.

I do not believe the hon. member for St. John thinks that we are either, I know the hon. members for St. Michael South and North Central certainly do not think that we are idiots, and in a way I regret that this debate has had to carry even such heat as it has had to carry. I think in all the circumstances it would have been more decent to do what we did in London in respect to the sporting contracts with Australia and so on, draw a curtain over the past, draw a curtain over the past of the North Point. Thank God the North Point turned out as well as it did and the taxpayers of Barbados will not have to carry that overload, and I would have expected that this is how all hon. members would have approached the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that it do now pass.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. R. TULL, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. WARD, His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SISNETT and Mr. ODLE — 13.

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Dr. CADDLE, Mr. SANDIFORD and Mr. WEEKES — 4.

THE WATER WORKS (AMENDMENT) ACT,
1977

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the Waterworks Bill was returned from the Senate. We will deal with that now.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am moving that this Message be considered forthwith and the Bill be accepted as amended by the Senate.

In dealing with this I think we ought to make some explanation. I want to make the explanation for the benefit of the Legal Department, because hon. members will recall that when this Bill came down to this House the hon. member for St. Michael South took the point that the wrong section was mentioned in the Bill, and I think he was supported in this by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central who had some scathing remarks to make about the legal expertise of the Attorney General's Department.

I remember that in answering the criticism I said that I had checked with the officer who had attended to this Bill and that he had told me that because of the revision of the laws he considered it correct and he had checked it. The problem why I went ahead and indeed accepted and recommended the amendment at the time was that in checking the law books in this House, they have not been brought up to date or annotated, and therefore all hon. members were under the impression that the section which had to be amended was section 37 of the principal Act, because the principal Act had been amended by the Act of 1973 and therefore nowhere did any hon. member at the time from the law books available to this House see the necessity for an amendment to section 27.

I have a legal explanation of why the Attorney General's Department was correct and the House was wrong. In actual fact, an amending Act is spent when it is a textual amendment, so that the amending Act of 1973 became spent and we could not amend an amending Act. That is the first legal point. The second point was that in the 1971 laws the law Revision Commissioner is given certain powers like changing the numbering of sections or changing titles. In this case they had exercised that power to transcribe section 37 from the 1895 Act and renumber it 27, so that the effect of the 1973 laws on the main 1895 Act was impliedly to make that section 27, and

when the legal draughtsmen in my Department came to deal with the matter, both Messrs. Chase and Cox had carefully checked through this matter and I regret that in the speed to get matters done I did not ask them to come down to the House on that occasion.
7.00 p.m.

When the Bill had been passed here, however, I still entertained some doubts about it, and I drew it to the attention of the Chief Parliamentary Counsel. I took personal responsibility. As a result we again checked this matter, and we are now more than satisfied that the draftsmen were right and the Attorney General's Chambers were right and we were wrong; and we therefore recommended to the Senate that the amendment should be done in the Senate.

It points out one thing, Mr. Speaker. It is very necessary that the law revision exercises should be completed, and that in any event the laws that are made available to hon. members be brought up to date in so far as the laws passed between 1971 and 1976 are concerned. We have a complete set of the updated laws in the Attorney General's Chambers, and I believe that an officer of the House should be prepared to come up and show them the omissions, so as to make this an easier exercise.

I think that hon. members are entitled to an up to date set of the laws. Now the delay in bringing the revision up to date is due to the fact that it was expected that certain printing machinery would have been here. I understand that that machinery is now here after four or five years; but there is now further delay. I would like publicly to commend the officers in the Department who have been proven right. I am sorry that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is not here, because he did make some remarks that obviously reflected on the Department and for which, I, as a politician, said I would take the blame. If we have made mistakes, we have made mistakes, and as the political Head of the Department I must also take the blame. I think that now that he has heard the explanation that the Department was right, it is but fair that we should commend the officers concerned and say that they were right and the legislators were wrong.

I wish to say in no uncertain terms that the art of legislative drafting is a very selective one; and many of us with several years of practice at the Bar do not have the same sort of expertise that is called for. I am fortunate to

have people in the Department who are interested in this; and I must admit that they are much better in this sphere than we can ever hope to be.

With that I ask that the amendment from the Senate be accepted without amendment.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I believe that I did speak on this matter when it came before the House, and I thank the Attorney General for the explanation that he has given. As regards criticisms of the draftsmen, I would like to assure the House on behalf of my colleague the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, that no such unfounded criticisms were really intended in the circumstances. He of all people would know that there are some very competent officers in that Department.

I would like to underline the point made by the Attorney General as to the necessity to have full updated copies of all the legislation passed in this hon. Chamber and by Parliament generally, because if you look at the copies of the Laws that are available — two sets on this side — I cannot speak for that side — but I am aware that there are published volumes that came out. They were the laws up to 1974, and I believe perhaps 1975. These have been collated and have been published; but I certainly do not see on this side of this Chamber copies of these additional volumes. Maybe in the future if all such legislation is readily available to this hon. Chamber, to both sides of the House, it would speed up the work of the Chamber and avoid some of the infelicities that are caused in the exercise of our functions as lawmakers.

The question that the amendment as amended by the Senate be agreed to was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, there was a Message from the Hon. Senate. I beg to move that we do now agree to the amendment to the Resolution as suggested by the Senate, and that the House do now approve the said Resolution as amended.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect. This is a matter that was circulated to us today.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it was circulated today, I ask that we do not proceed with this matter, and that it be put on the Order Paper for the next meeting. I was under the impression that it had been circulated like other matters.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 28th May, 1977, at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

7.10 p.m.