

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 25th July, 1978.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.20 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Mr. Rt. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Labour and Community Services); 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; Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.; Hon. Miss 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), (Leader of the House); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A.; Mr. B. M. TAITT, M.A.; Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; and Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B. Ch.B., M.R.C.P. (Edin.)

Prayers were read.

Mr. SANDIFORD entered the Chamber and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 30th May, 1978.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I understand that these Minutes have been re-printed and re-circulated, and subject to any observations by any hon. member as to the accuracy thereof, I beg to move that they be confirmed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there are observations on these Minutes?

There being no observations, those Minutes stand confirmed.

The Minutes of Tuesday, 27th June, 1978.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, these Minutes have been circulated and subject to any observations by any hon. member as to the accuracy thereof, I beg to move that they be confirmed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any observations?

There being no observations, those Minutes stand confirmed.

The Minutes of Tuesday, 11th July, 1978.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I want to draw your attention to an error in the Minutes. At page 5 the Minutes record that Mr. E. E. Greaves withdrew as required. "The Chairman called on Mr. E. E. Greaves to withdraw certain remarks and Mr. E. E. Greaves withdrew as required." I want to draw to attention that I did not.....

Mr. SPEAKER: At what page?

Mr. GREAVES: At the top of page 5. "After Mr. Forde spoke on a point of order, the Chairman required Mr. E. E. Greaves to withdraw certain remarks. Mr. E. E. Greaves withdrew as required."

In truth and in fact, I did not withdraw any remarks, and I think a check with the Clerk will indicate that.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the light of the observations made by the hon. member for St. Lucy, I find it necessary to check with the Clerk as to the accuracy thereof because it

might very well be determined that the hon. member disobeyed the authority of the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the Chamber and took his seat.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have received the Accounts and Statements for the month of April, 1978, as prepared by the Accountant General.

I am also to announce that I have received the Auditor General's Report on the results of the examination of the Accounts of the Island for the year ended 31st March, 1977, together with the relevant Statement of Accounts.

Mr. SIMMONS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Minister of Education and Culture, I beg to lay the following:—

The Government of the Christ Church Foundation School Scheme, 1978.

On my own behalf, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at St. Stephens, Black Rock, St. Michael, for the siting of a Reservoir and a pumping station.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land situated at Lodge Hill, St. Michael for the erection of a water storage tank.

On behalf of the Minister of Education and Culture, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to sanction the Government of the Christ Church Foundation School Scheme.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$121,968 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1978–79, Part II — Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1978–79, No. 4, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. L. R. TULL entered the Chamber and took his seat.
12.30 p.m.

On behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, a Bill to amend the Rum Duty Act.

On behalf of the Minister of Education and Culture, a Bill to provide for the integrity of the examinations held by the Caribbean Examinations Council.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Court Process Office and related matters.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael North Central.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:—

“WHEREAS in debate in Committee of Supply of this Hon. House on July 11, 1978 the hon. member for the constituency of St. James made statements directed against a section of our population in which he said *inter alia* —

‘anything with DLP, if you breathe, you cannot eat as far as I am concerned’;

AND WHEREAS our Constitution in Chapter III enshrines the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual, including protection of the right to life, protection of freedom of association and assembly, protection of freedom of expression and protection from discrimination on grounds of race or political opinions;

AND WHEREAS this Hon. House is conscious of our obligation to allay fears of our people and to promote their comfort, physical and mental;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House reaffirm our commitment and unswerving support for the protection of the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House dissociate itself from the statements of the hon. member for the constituency of St. James made in this Hon. House as aforesaid and deplore his conduct on that occasion.”

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South, his question relating to Piper's Avenue.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Communications and Works:

1. Is the Minister aware that Piper's Avenue, Bayville in the constituency of St. Michael South is in dire need of repair?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is in the affirmative, will the Minister state if he intends to carry out the necessary road repairs, and, if he does so intend, when?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member, his question relating to the breakdown of the staff complement in the Public Service.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, to ask the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning:

Would the Minister give a breakdown of the staff complement in the Public Service for the years 1976 and 1977 in terms of the members allocated to the Administrative, Executive, Clerical, Messengerial and other classes, or in terms of the departmental classes, the Administration group, and the Professional Scientific and Technical Classes, or in terms of any other more appropriate classification?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member, his question respecting recruitment into the Public Service.

Mr. SANDIFORD: To ask the appropriate Minister:

1. How many persons were recruited into the public service of Barbados, including the Statutory Boards which operate on government subventions, during the years 1975 and 1976, and during the period January – March 1977?
2. Would the Minister supply the information requested in terms of the following age categories: (1) Under 50, (2) 50–54, (3) 55–59 and (4) 60 and over?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member, his question regarding persons resigning or being dismissed from the Public Service.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, to ask the appropriate Minister:

1. How many persons resigned, were dismissed or retired from the public service of Barbados including the Statutory Boards which operate on government subventions, during the year 1976 and 1977, and during the period January to March 1978?
2. Would the Minister supply the information requested in terms of the age categories (1) 50–54, (2) 55–59 and (3) 60 and over?

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Rum Duty Act be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to provide for the integrity of the examinations held by the Caribbean Examinations Council be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to provide for the establishment of a Court Process Office and related matters be read a first time.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. James, the Hon. Minister of Labour, is seeking to make a personal explanation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a personal explanation. During the last sitting of this Hon. House of Assembly on July 11, 1978 I made certain comments which have given rise to some controversy.
12.40 p.m.

I wish to state today that, contrary to the impression which might have been created by my comments, I remain fully committed to the observation and preservation of human rights, as completely dedicated to this Government's policy of equal opportunity for all citizens of Barbados as enshrined in this nation's Constitution, and fully support the policy of the Barbados Labour Party as enunciated by the Prime Minister at the 1978 Annual Conference of the Party when he said that he had no intention of perpetuating the spoils system in Barbados or carrying on discrimination against the Party's political opponents.

Mr. Speaker, I have always rigidly maintained an open policy towards all people. My personal approach to ministerial duties has all times been in total accordance

with my Government's policy of open government — a system which is admired, and even envied beyond our shores. Sir, open government is a system which many right-thinking Barbadians appreciate and support, but which, has on several occasions been grossly misrepresented.

It was against this background, Mr. Speaker, that I uttered certain ungracious remarks at our last sitting.

I am deeply conscious that my statement at that time brought some discomfort to you, Sir, as well as to my Parliamentary colleagues and the nation. Bearing in mind that my remarks in no way reflect either the concepts, policies or practices of the Government in which I have the honour to serve, I therefore wish, Sir, to express my profound regret and my sincere and unqualified apology to this Honourable Chamber and the people of Barbados.

It is my humble wish that this Honourable House accept this apology and further, Mr. Speaker, as I remain cognisant of my full responsibility to the people of Barbados, in all the circumstances I consider that I should place my Ministry, the Ministry of Labour and Community Services, at the disposal of the Prime Minister for whatever action he thinks fit, and I have informed him accordingly.

MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, before the business of the day begin, in my capacity as Leader of the House, consequent upon complaints made to me by hon. members from this Side in respect of a purported report of proceedings of this House on 11th July, 1978 as set out in the "Advocate-News" of Wednesday 12th July, 1978, and a further report on 14th July, 1978 on page 5, which said reports purport to state in writing the conduct of members of this side during the course of a speech by an honourable member from this side, which said reports in the opinion of hon. members on this side are grossly inaccurate and unfair, I beg to move that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in begging to second the motion I would like to add that the Press has an exceptional responsibility in any free society to maintain an orderly and truthful flow of information. I was not present in the House, so I cannot comment at this stage on the truth or falsity of the reports, but I do believe that the headlines using the word "starve" was a mischievous, unwarranted and wicked headline that has given rise to great public disquiet in the country and has divided our society. If the inaccuracy is proved, I would hope that the Committee of Privileges would deal with the matter with some force, because it is time that the

Advocate newspaper — and newspapers in general — be brought to a full sense of their responsibilities. The second report under the by-line of one Foster, of which the Leader of the House has also complained, if false is also mischievous in my humble submission, dangerous and a contribution to the courses which would divide our society and turn man's hand against man. I have great pleasure in seconding the motion of the Leader of the House to refer this matter to the Committee of Privileges.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, as a member of this Honourable House I recognise that where the Leader of the House is satisfied that there is an inaccuracy or gross misrepresentation of the proceedings of this House appropriate action should be taken. But I believe that in so doing it is our duty as members of this House to ensure that no steps which are proposed or words uttered inside this House or outside should lead any person or persons functioning in what is described as the Fourth Estate.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If I may refer to the Order Paper of the day at page 2, the last item, I see that the hon. member is a member of the Committee of Privileges which has got to adjudicate on this matter, and I find it irregular for the hon. member to begin debate at this time and then would have to adjudicate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to inform the hon. member who has just sat down that there is no debate at this time. The hon. member is entitled to be heard by the Chair.

Mr. TAITT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was merely making the point that throughout the history of the free world it is recognized or accepted that the Press has a responsible position in the hierarchy of democracy and that the Press must feel at all times that while it has a duty to report accurately and fairly it can do so without incurring the wrath of either the Government of the day or any other force in the society; and in seeing this matter go to the Committee of Privileges I merely wish to say that I feel very strongly that certain reports which I have read were in fact a reflection of what occurred in this House.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has made certain statements which would seem to suggest that in bringing this motion to my capacity as Leader of the House....

Mr. SPEAKER: I will deal with that aspect of the matter.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I was attempting by reason of the fact that because this matter was drawn to my attention to present it in a manner which would not make the Press feel that they had incurred my wrath.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker....

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no necessity. As I have informed the Leader of the House I propose to deal with the matter. In my view the item does not offend any hon. member of this House as such; it is against the dignity of the House.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I just want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that I am a strong believer in the freedom of the Press. But let us not forget that all freedom carries responsibility, and that the Rules of this House, as in all free democracies, do carry procedures and sanctions to ensure that freedom is not unbridled licence.
12.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has a copy of the offending matter been laid before this House?

A copy was handed over as a Document of the House.

Orders of the Day were called.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with Orders of the Day I would like to make it known that I have ruled that a *prima facie* case has been made out, and that this matter will be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken and that Item 3 be the first Order of the Day.

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

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

Order No. 3 was called – A second reading of a Bill to amend the Storage of Petroleum Act, Cap. 172.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the budgetary measures for which we are seeking formal legislative approval. The amendment sought to increase the charges which those who store petroleum have to pay to the Government, and this is a means by which petroleum generally, gasoline and diesel and so on are taxed in Barbados. Well of course, hon. members may have taken note that in dealing with petroleum tax for this year, we have sought to metricate it – metricating storage tanks at 29 cents per litre. I must mention that the Government has received no complaints about the new system. Apparently motorists have very readily adjusted to thinking in terms of buying gasoline by the litre rather than by the gallon. Indeed, sir, I think that the truth is that they bought it by the dollar before we

metricated the charges and that they will continue to buy it by the dollar in future.

I would also like to thank the public for their ready acceptance of the necessity for an increase in the petroleum tax in this country. As it is known, the cost of petroleum products is rising all over the world. We did not suffer fully that increase in petroleum prices this year when the last OPEC Conference began, but we suffered some increase and this is the fundamental reason for having this introduction of an increase storage charge; but in so far as it represents additional revenue to the Government, I may mention that this is not an area where the Government has received or even discerned any complaint. Motorists in the country appreciate that Government services have to be paid for, and that the petroleum tax is one of the means of paying for them. For what it is worth, I may also mention that in some other CARICOM countries the price is very nearly as much as the equivalent to US as it is in Barbados equivalent to our own dollars.

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

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

On separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE Clauses 1 and 2 inclusive of the Bill were called and agreed to.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
1 p.m.

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Bill was read a third time.

*On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS
seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, the Bill was passed.*

THE WILD BIRDS PROTECTION (AMENDMENT)
ACT, 1978

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, for some time now we have been receiving complaints from the National Trust and other persons who are interested in the wild life of this country that the Bill dealing with protection of wild birds in this country should be amended and that we should increase the number of birds falling under this schedule. Particularly, Mr. Speaker, we have noticed the migration of the Cattle Egret to Barbados.

There are other birds which have been appearing in Barbados for the first time. The Cattle Egret has set up a nesting colony in Graeme Hall Swamp, and quite recently we have observed the Pelican off Carlisle Bay, and we consider it necessary at this time to amend the Act.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, in seconding this Bill, I wish to say that in Committee it is intended to increase the penalties which will accrue to any person who contravenes the provision of the Act. The original Act, Mr. Speaker, was passed in 1907, and since that time the penalties have not been substantially increased, and obviously there has been a fall in the value of money, but in addition to this the penalties no longer act as a deterrent as they were intended to do under this Act.

The Wild Birds Protection Act when passed in 1907 was passed essentially to enable us to become a party to certain conventions. Since then these conventions have been improved and I think it will be necessary for the Government to give very serious consideration to the manner in which it will seek to accede to the convention dealing with the fauna of this country. I think it is important in an Island the size of Barbados with very little wild life, and I am using the words "wild life" I hope in their correct terms, Mr. Speaker, to be able to protect what wild life we have in this country and to conserve it; and indeed I think it is a bit of a tragedy that we have partly depleted some of the well recognised species of birds and of fauna particularly in Barbados.

I am heartened to see that such a distinguished scientist as Dr. Graham Gooding has paid attention to the local flora of Barbados and I trust that the outstanding biologists and ornithologists and others who are concerned with wild life and the preservation of the species of fauna in these territories will make sure that the legislation is up to date, because it will act as a very necessary pressure group in Barbados, and also make sure

that they themselves participate in establishing certain standards.

Mr. Speaker, we do have some swamps in Barbados including Graeme Hall Swamp, and I think it is a tragedy that some of the best birds in Barbados have been destroyed by people operating at the swamp and shooting the birds for practical pleasure. In some countries it is necessary to pass legislation restricting those persons who indulge in sporting activities, dealing with the destruction of the fauna of their country. I think, Mr. Speaker, you will be conscious of the damage done to the great Continent of Africa and the sort of wild life that existed in that Continent. Even on the recognised Reserves today one has found it necessary in a country like Tanzania to have a closed season for the shooting of animals and hunting.

Now only a few days ago in the Times Newspaper there was an article dealing with the destruction of fauna in Tanzania and the measures which that Government had to take in order to preserve the species of various animals. We are not fortunate in having many animals of birds here. I have said that before. I know that from the time of the settlement we had probably done ourselves harm by almost indiscriminately treating with what sort of wild life we have here. I would hate to see that we go on a wholesale destruction, for instance, of the monkey. I know that they of themselves are harmful, but I believe we should recognise their value as well. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that there are still a few racoons remaining in Barbados, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to preserve some of the species of birds which are native to Barbados or which make here their regular habitat. I am marvelled by the fact that the Egret has started to come back to our shores, and indeed it is a good sign that I believe our vegetation is bringing them here. I hope that we can keep them without contributing to their destruction.

This is a measure that should meet with the full support of members on both sides of the House, I would hope, who are interested in conservation and who feel an interest of course in environment balance in this country. I consider the flora and fauna of Barbados very much part of the environment. I recall particularly when I was a lad at Harrison College and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was there, the great interest which he used to have in some of the flora and fauna. He was a scientist of some considerable note in those days doing biology, and for a term or two I spent some time listening to him. In fact, I think he used to do some of the actual supervision under Miss Weston in those days and I have come over from the Modern Sixth taking an interest in these things, and the lengths to which we went in those days. We tried to make sure that although we needed to use the fauna of this country for our

experiments, that we did not use it wantonly or destructively.

I happen to be a strong nature lover, and that is one of the reasons I have taken up the time of the House in speaking on this Bill. I know it is not a measure with any political attraction; it is not the sort of measure that brings you votes, but it is a measure that those of us who believe in everything our country stands for, environmentally and otherwise, ought to appreciate is necessary, and I look forward indeed for submission from the Ministry of Agriculture and the Minister on ways and means in which we can strengthen the legislation to enable us to become party to the existing international convention dealing with this matter.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I too want to say a few words. I am heartened as other environmentalists in Barbados are heartened to hear that pelicans and other birds are returning to Barbados. This says something about the environment in Barbados, Mr. Speaker.
1.10 p.m.

If our environment is so polluted and so poisoned they will not return. It says something about steps which every Barbadian must take to clean our environment. As soon as our environment becomes too dirty for birds and animals it is swiftly becoming too dirty for human beings, and I think that the establishment of a Department of the Environment is timely, Mr. Speaker, it cannot be too soon that we take special care to continue to make our environment habitable and healthy.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I will agree with the Hon. Attorney General that this Bill will find support on both sides of the House, but I would like to point out that while the Bill is welcome we must recognise that the machinery for the enforcement of the provisions of this Act has been inadequate for a very long time and due to its inadequacy many of the birds who we now deplore their loss have died as a result.

I think it will be of interest to the Hon. Attorney General who is also responsible for planning matters that the development of Barbados over the years has contributed greatly to a severe change in the topography, the flora and fauna and the vegetation of this place which has resulted in having a tremendous effect on birds. Going a step further, one would like to stress that the abundance of cane fires over the years — and I am not blaming anybody particularly for it — has also contributed to a change topography in this country, and therefore if we are to preserve birds and other forms of wild life in Barbados we must go a lot further than just amending a Bill or bringing in new legislation. I think we have to look seriously at the way development has taken

place in this country, and I would like to point out that if you go around Barbados you will find that some of the streams and ponds that have been prevalent around here have become polluted. I just have to point out an area in Brighton where the new building for the Barbados Light and Power Company has gone up. There used to be a big stream there ending up in a big pond just before it entered the sea and that has been polluted.

Around that area there used to be a lot of birds and a lot of fish in that stream or pond, and due to changes taking place as a result of the development of the Barbados Light and Power Company you find now that what little water has been left is more or less polluted, and I do not think you will find any fish in it any longer, and you will not find many birds gathered around there any longer either, and in other areas of Barbados we notice a collection of water and ponds have all been filled in, and a result of that, changes have occurred in the vicinity of those areas, so we have to look very seriously at the question of how the country is being developed, because while we recognise that the people would require land for housing, for buildings and factories and for other purposes, we have at the same time to bear in mind that if we want to preserve life that we should ensure that when giving planning permission or permitting certain areas in this country to be filled in that we may not be changing the conditions which are favourable to the existence of these animals.

At the same time we have to make it well known to the Barbadian people the importance of some of these animals to this country. They all play an important part and we have to bear in mind that when we find that a certain equilibrium has been disturbed in nature we may permit certain types of animals to multiply or increase in such numbers that they become pests. Some of the birds may be useful in keeping down some of the cockroaches and other pests, and we find that when they are not present in sufficient numbers then the cockroaches and other vermin become on the increase and we suffer as a result. In fact, some of the birds that might have preyed on rats and mice and things of that nature have been destroyed in the past, and I am not saying that is the only reason why we have such a large increase in the rats and mice across the country, but obviously it has contributed to such an increase.

So I would like to point out to the Hon. Minister that while we welcome this Bill on this side, we would like to know that he is paying particular attention to the machinery which is responsible for giving effect to the provisions of this Bill, and unless this machinery is adequate and up to date at the same time you will find that this Bill will be just another Bill passed and consist merely of words and no action being taken to bring about what we are all being concerned about.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this particular topic. I have been searching for a little while for something that is relatively non-controversial to make an initial contribution which I believe might be in the best parliamentary traditions.

However, it is most important to recognise that the essential feature of Bills of this kind is really an effective symbiosis between man and his total environment. I would not deal with the question of flora and fauna, or the question of other species, but would deal with the ultimate importance of this kind of protection of the environment for man and the survival of man himself and the survival of human beings in Barbados.

I myself have been able to determine a direct contact between unfortunate events in the environment of this country and actually the death of people in Barbados. I recall some years ago when a group of people were working on that canal behind the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in River Road, and we had a succession of people, many young people, who came in and died in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Eventually it turned out that the cause of those deaths was in fact *lepto spirois* which was a condition where it was disputed whether in fact it existed in Barbados, and after that drainage was completed we found no further deaths in that area.

As another example we find epidemics of jaundice during the crop season and during the rainy season — March, April, May, August, September — and it was most significant that during the period when there was controlled burning of the canes that jaundice virtually disappeared from Barbados during that three month period, and of course that was because the rats had been burnt whilst the canes were being burnt. However, we have noticed that several rats have started to be seen again in Barbados..... (Hon. L. R. TULL: There is one in here). I understand there is one in here, and probably more, but there has been an increase in the rat population particularly in the City area. I believe that the rat catcher who was here, I think under the auspices of PAHO.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you are referring to the Rodent Officer.
1.20 p.m.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, the main reason why I make these remarks is because on both sides of the House we recognize that there are problems with sanitation, and indeed yesterday I was faced with a very serious problem where a dead dog was lying at the corner of Seventh Avenue, Belleville, and I succeeded in getting it removed after a call to the Ministry of Health.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suppose you will get around now to telling us about wild birds.

Dr. HAYNES: Yes, Sir, I am getting on to the wild birds. The point I am trying to make is that this kind of protection of the environment, although it starts off with wild birds, it eventually leads to the protection of man himself and therefore it is the kind of legislation that must be taken seriously and it will have the support of this side.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member on his admirable speech on birds and rats and welcome the support of the Opposition in this measure. I think there are a lot more people interested in the fauna of this country than we realize. This is not a controversial matter. The National Trust perhaps attracts more attention for their work on buildings than on fauna and flora preservation, but I think there are many Barbadians who would stand up and watch if they saw an unusual bird by the wayside, who will take note of the cattle egrets that have come to this Island in such large numbers, and we regret the passing of such species as the grass canary, once popular in St. Philip but I believe now being kept down by rats. I think this is a topic in which there are no votes to be won, but it could have the good opinion of many citizens. I believe, and I think I was told, in connection with this Bill that virtually all birds in this country are protected except the two species that eat fruit, that is the sparrow and the yellow breast — though I would not wish the fact that they are not protected to mean that the Government is declaring war on sparrow birds and yellow breasts — but we are told by the farmers that they do eat bananas and other soft fruits from time to time.

One of the reasons why I welcome this Bill is that I have had many complaints that in the Caribbean Island bird hunters are coming from other countries and capturing rare species; they are taking the St. Vincent parrot and the St. Vincent owl; they are also taking birds from St. Lucia. Guadeloupe recently had to institute protective measures in respect of some native species. And while we do not normally have these exotic birds, one never knows, and may be the egrets might become attractive and the next thing you know people start trapping them for their feathers. That is why I particularly welcome the Bill.

But I want to take up something with the Ministry of Agriculture. Some years ago professor James Bond came here in the course of compiling his excellent and leading work on the birds of the West Indies. He examined the rat situation — and Barbados is really a rat-saturated country. The gentleman to whom the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was referring once told me that the rat population in Barbados is now limited only by its own imperatives; that there are six rats to every human being, and the human beings can no longer discard enough food for the rats to eat. In other

words, we are not keeping down the rats, they are keeping down themselves; they have now reached a limit within the food resources of Barbados.

Professor Bond mentioned that the natural prey of the St. Vincent owl was the rat; it preys on small rodents that run about at night. I asked a question in the House and got what I thought was a somewhat shallow reply by the then Minister of Agriculture that it was dangerous to bring in predators, and I think some reference was made to the absolutely false belief that the mongoose was brought here to deal with snakes. The mongoose was not brought here to deal with snakes; it was brought here about one hundred years ago to deal with rats, and now the mongoose and the rat both eat the same thing and no longer eat each other. And the then Minister of Agriculture so casually dismissed the suggestion of getting a dozen pairs of St. Vincent owls and releasing them in the southern part of the Island as Professor Bond suggested to see if they could do something against the rats that prey on the sugar industry in southern Barbados.

Some respect should have been had for Professor Bond's view as he is regarded as one of the world's leading ornithologists, and I think it is unlikely that there is anybody in the Ministry of Agriculture then or now qualified to say that James Bond's considered opinion on the introduction of the predator was unwise or wrong; and I would urge on the Minister in view of the fact that rats continue to be a menace, that reconsideration should be given to the importation of the St. Vincent owl. The Minister at the time said that they would eat chickens. But the St. Vincent owls that I have seen in their natural habitat were smaller than chickens and if they could manage to get into people's farms and eat the chickens I would have to congratulate them, because their natural way of eating is to descend on things running about the ground at night and I don't think our chickens are in the habit of being out at night.

Now that all the yardfowls are coming out into the open again, Sir, it would not worry me too much if the owls descended on a few of them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must enquire what relationship there is between yardfowls and wild birds.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Some of the yard fowls, Sir are proving to be the most desperate wild birds you can imagine. But as I said, I would urge that the Minister consider bringing in some of these owls to see if they could not do something towards the reduction of the rodent population.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the statement made by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central about the machinery for the protection of these endangered species. I would like to let

him know that for some time now we have been receiving complaints basically against the gun clubs in Barbados and this promoted us to communicate with the National Trust to ask their views on this particular amendment. We have had some anonymous letters from persons complaining that they have seen the white egret being shot out of the air over the various swamps. In the Ministry itself we have revoked the licences of certain clubs to shoot in the Graeme Hall swamp. This was one of our biggest problems; every day people complained that these birds were being shot. As regards the other swamp falling under the Ministry of Agriculture, in St. Lucy, we have written these persons asking them to take particular care not to destroy those birds we regard as endangered species. There are also one or two in St. Philip being investigated, and together with Mr. Bill Miller we have been trying to encourage people not to shoot the birds which are now coming to Barbados, such as the pelican which we have been observing recently. I believe this has something to do with the weather pattern and the birds are now nesting in this region.

1.30 p.m.

The hon. member raised the question of ponds. If you will remember, we had set forth in our manifesto the question of inland fishing. We have carried out certain trials in pond conservation, and we have found out that even before the fish can reach the four-inch size, that people have been fishing the young fingerlings out of the ponds. One of the problems will be how are we going to be able to police these various reserves etc. If you pass legislation and if you ask the Police to arrest, I am sure that you are going to hear that we are hard and cruel to the population; and yet at the same time we are expected to protect the fauna of this country.

We in the Ministry will do everything we can to protect the birds and all the other things which we consider to be endangered species. In respect of the monkeys, the farmers are now complaining that the monkeys have left their normal habitat and are coming as far down as St. Michael. We are looking at ways and means of controlling these animals so that you have a reasonable tolerance between man and the monkey. As to the question of rats, I am surprised to think that because you burn canes for three months there was no question of jaundice. I wonder if the town rats and the bond house rats do not carry jaundice; and if it is only the canefield rats that carry jaundice. It is only the canefield rats, then we are in a serious position; but since I am not a technician in that field, I will have to take up the statement made and enquire whether or not jaundice is spread by the bond house rats or by the canefield rats.

Dr. R. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything about rats carrying jaundice. What I said was that when the canes are cut and are burnt, because of human contact with the faeces and urine of the rats, then in that situation they are more likely to get

jaundice. Not that rats give anybody jaundice or anything like that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's point is well taken; but — however —

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I believe that the hon. member was really not himself when he was speaking because it is the first time that I have heard that aspect of it; but I am grateful to him for that explanation. Referring to the hon. member for St. Thomas, I believe that I did table a question in the last Administration asking about the importation of owls for the control of rats. I will look at this more seriously from the Ministry angle to see how best it can be achieved in Barbados.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I move that the Bill be read a second time.

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

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

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and agreed to.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill, I would like to move that the final word in Clause 2 — the figure "10" be deleted, and the figure "100" be substituted.

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

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

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, under this clause I beg to move that the figure "10" be deleted and the figure "100" be substituted.

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

The question that Clause 3 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Clause 4 stand part, I beg to move that the figure "100" be deleted, and the figure "250" be substituted.

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

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

Clause 5 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to move that Clause 5 and the Schedule stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, in the Schedule which is being amended now — the Schedule to Cap. 157 — the Blackbird carries a particular name and in the amended Schedule there is a variation of this; and I wonder if the Minister could explain why there is a change.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, this was drawn to our attention when we were preparing the Bill. Apparently scientific names have been undergoing changes from time to time, and this is one of the evolutions of these scientific names. It not only occurs among birds; it occurs among fishes as well; and I can vouch for that. We have written — we have consulted with Capt. Hutt. We queried it as well; and he said that based on modern development, it is something to do with the persons who discover the birds — this is something that I am not versed in — that these names, for clearer definition, are being changed to save confusion with other words, and they assured us that these are now the correct terminology for these birds.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would wish to put for purposes of identification in Barbados — I am putting it for what it is worth — he might wish to amend the clause to put in parentheses "Blackbird".

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Blackbird is already listed. It is a change in the scientific name which is given, and the local name is also given. It is the change in the scientific name. Mr. Chairman, I deal a lot in tropical fish; and what has been happening in these things is that somebody discovers a bird or a fish and gives it a name. Somebody comes along 10 or 15 years later, and because of the bone structure, because of the length of the feet, because

of the position of the eyes or something, they say that it falls into a different category.

1.40 p.m.

There was a meeting of all these technical people to determine what is the correct classification of the particular object, and this is what has happened in the case of birds. We have written off to those persons involved. To satisfy hon. members, we wrote to the National Trust. If they will find the date. Anyhow we have a note back which says they discussed with Captain Hutt the difference of the names of some of the birds and also the spelling, and he assured me as a ornithologist of some repute that he is sure of his submissions. He said the names, including scientific names, had changed over the years. That is the situation that has happened and we have recorded the names as have been presented to us by the experts. There is nothing more than that to it. As a matter of fact, on file we have said that if at any future time we find that there is any difference in the scientific name or spelling, we will make the necessary amendment to the legislation.

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

On motion of Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. C. L. BOLDEN seconded by Hon. H. deB. FRODE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (EXPORT INDUSTRIES) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1978

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Industries Development (Export Industries) Act, Cap. 74.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill stands in my name.

The object of this Bill is to establish an easier procedure to ensure that in a small number of situations which have arisen of late, namely, companies who have enclave industry status, that is, they have been granted fiscal incentives upon the basis that their exports must be outside of the Caricom area, are able where the Industrial Development Corporation and the Ministry of Trade and Industry are satisfied that they are associated products for which there is a market within the Caribbean, can convert from being an enclave industry into a normal fiscal incentive industry and as such are

able to sell within the Caribbean area. There have been of late three outstanding examples of this, and when legal opinion was taken from the Attorney General's office, it was discovered that it was possible for them to give up their status as enclave industries, form a new company and apply for fiscal incentive industry. The Ministry of Caribbean Affairs has taken the view and we have indicated very clearly that any company which wants to convert from an enclave status industry into a fiscal incentive industry and take advantage of the Caricom market cannot get any greater incentive than the unexpired period of time which remains at the time when they applied for the change of status.

However, we came up with another problem, and it is that the Commissioner of Customs ruled that it was perfectly proper to do that, but they would have to pay duty upon their existing equipment in Barbados, because under the Fiscal Incentive Act the duty free concessions for machinery and equipment only applied to machinery which was imported subsequent to the date of the application and the granting of approval, so it would mean that they would have to export the equipment and bring it back in subsequently.

Now, Sir, we thought that in view of this we would ask the legal officers' opinion, and their opinion was that there would have to be an amendment to the incentive legislation so as to permit a waiver in those circumstances. I can give hon. members an example.

We have a firm here like Cooper who came here to basically manufacture sporting goods for the hockey trade and things like that. As a result of the experience of Cooper here and the good workmanship, as he explained himself to us, of the Barbadians, he has found that the stitching here is of such a quality that he can get into the cricket field, so he is contemplating going into making cricket pads and footballs and equipment for skate boards. Particularly he has designed and adapted some of the protective equipment that you use for the ice hockey and for the new industry, the roller skating industry. Of course we in Barbados have roller skates too.

During the last regime in principle the former Minister of Trade agreed they should get the unexpired period, but then an Order was actually made, but it was challenged by the Commissioner of Customs because you will appreciate that you cannot have the same machines that you use for stitching the export industries outside the Caricom would be the same machines you would use for stitching the cricket balls or things of that kind. It is also an opportunity to permit fuller utilisation of equipment over a twenty-four hour period. So that was an example.

1.50 p.m.

That was one example. Another example we had was the question of Zyl-Craft who make spectacles. They make spectacle frames, and a demand came about in Barbados from people from abroad who used to take the spectacle frames they bought with shades in them and take them to the optician and ask the optician to take out the lenses which were just ordinary lenses and put in lenses because the frames were very attractive. But of course the machinery that would make the lenses for the sun shades could also be used for making glasses which are prescribed, so that again we have the problem of the Comptroller of Customs ruling that the equipment would have to be exported and then brought back in. Well, this is of course a waste of time. So that we are asking the House to amend the law to permit this flexibility, but it has been clearly agreed that no company can get a double period of fiscal incentives, all they can get is the unexpired period.

I may say also that there are some compensatory benefits to the revenue because under the Fiscal Incentives Act at the expiry of your fiscal incentives under the enclave industry status you get a 12½% tax rate for a period of years thereafter. When your incentives are expired under the fiscal incentives normal CARICOM trading arrangement, you have to pay 20 or 25%, I am not sure which it is, so that when you balance out the revenue gains, and you balance out the employment gains and the fact that in a number of our industries it is not beyond the realm of contemplation that some of our electronics industries, for instance, may move from the stage of the pure making of components for total manufacture into making a complete job for the Caribbean area in which there is a growing market now that the development of micro processors has taken place at such a fast rate, and it is contemplated that this development is equal to the development in the industrial world of the founding of electricity.

Again, I think that this is another reason, looking to the long term, where our legislative machinery should be sufficiently flexible as to permit the changeover, and I will say that the Attorney General's Office, the legal draughtsmen, have used as a precedent the normal provisions of waiver which one finds in a number of other Acts but which were singularly absent from the Fiscal Incentives Industries Act.

That, Sir, is the motivation behind the amendment, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, especially in the light of the explanation given by the Hon. Minister, this amendment is not likely to find any controversial

reaction on this side. Indeed, I am very glad to see that the Minister is continuing in a pattern which I believe in the medium term will be of substantial benefit to the country. I would like the Minister to indicate whether he will use this amendment as well to deal with a problem which was there and I am not certain it has been solved, that is the problem where a number of small industries did not qualify for duty free entry of their raw materials and/or equipment because they had not been employing the requisite number of persons. I am not sure if that has been dealt with, but I am sure the Minister will wish to deal with it in this amendment to give the Minister of Finance the power finally to deal with this problem. It was a very serious problem and I think the legal people and the Comptroller of Customs found some difficulty with this because they felt that persons should have been employing a certain number of people.

I believe that so long as company is manufacturing a certain kind of product and is contributing to the Gross National Product that in the opinion of the Minister and the Development Agencies that company ought to be allowed duty free entry of raw materials and machinery.

The Minister did not mention this, but I am sure he would have checked this, whether the amendment would in any way conflict with our requirements under the Treaty itself. There was a commitment in principle that we would have a harmonisation of our incentive legislation, and I am pretty certain that this particular amendment would not violate the principle, but I am fairly certain that he will have checked or that the legal people would have had to check to ensure that we are not by omission violating the Treaty. But I wanted merely to assure the Minister that we on this side will support this amendment for the reasons he has given, and I am very pleased to see that by his statement he is giving the lie to all those who had indicated originally that the bringing of what were described as screwdriver industries would do nothing towards the development of this country. In fact, what has begun to happen, now that our people have become accustomed to the workbench in the industrial sector of the new industries, and now that the people who brought in the industries have recognised the inherent quality of our people at the workbench, they are thinking in terms of deepening their commitment to the Caribbean region, and the mere fact that they will not be able to get double incentives by switching to the Fiscal Incentives Act, and the mere fact that as a country we would be getting a higher return from the taxes which they will pay when the industrial incentive period has gone, is an indication that those industries which are coming in can be of long term benefit, and I hope that the Minister will use this particular amendment wisely, as I think it is not unreasonable to say they have been doing up to now.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, there were two interesting points raised. One was the question as to whether this amendment will in any way conflict with our obligation and commitment under the harmonisation of schemes. We have been assured by the legal officer in the International Law Section of the Attorney General's Office that provided we do not attempt to grant any additional period other than the unexpired period, that it would in no way conflict, nor could it be suggested that it was an abuse by granting double fiscal incentives, so that is why we are rigidly limited to granting the unexpired period.

In respect of the other matters raised by the hon. member, that is an area of profound conflict between the Ministry of Industry and the Customs Department, and we have been able to clear a number of outstanding applications in that we have got orders under the Customs Act which have defined the eligibility of duty free treatment in respect of certain crafts, particularly the agro industries, particularly the food processing industry, that they almost now automatically get a Customs Order which allows them to bring in their machinery and other equipment and their packaging materials. The Ministry of Finance is satisfied that the revenue lost by the duty will be more than compensated for by the added value, and particularly if they are processing raw materials which are produced within the CARICOM area, so we have got the food processing industries fairly well solved. But there are a number of other industries in which the Ministry of Finance is very concerned about the revenue loss. It is very clear that our whole attempt concept of duty free treatment in relation to the Common External Tariff has to change, and I am pleased to say at the recent meeting of the Caribbean Trade Ministers a specific committee was appointed to meet in October this year to deal with the Common External Tariff and the limitations of the harmonisation agreement in the light of the fact that the duty and the protection which were devised for indigenous industries were done pre-1974, which was before the oil and the energy crisis, so that obviously with inflation and changes in patterns of consumption since then, some of the protection which was thought to be adequate previously is inadequate, and in addition to that duties are on items which hitherto was regarded as revenue but have now been looked at in the light of the essentiality of the supply to cater for the demand in view of the increased prices. So that whole question has got to be gone into, and we are looking at it and it also has to be harmonised with the new rules of origin, obviously, that have now come in, but we are constantly reviewing them and we have given relief to a number of the agro industries.

There are other areas which, as the hon. member will appreciate, there is a conflict between the Ministry of Industry, Customs and the Ministry of Finance,

because they look at it from different points of view. One looks at it from the point of view of revenue, the other looks at it from the point of view of employment generation and industrial development, but we are keeping it under review and we hope to have a comprehensive scheme put forward so that Jamaica, Trinidad, Barbados and all of us can look at our duty free provisions in a similar manner so that there will be harmony not only in fiscal incentives but in other incentives.

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

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

But we are keeping it under review and we hope to have a comprehensive scheme put forward so that Jamaica, Trinidad and Barbados and all of us will look at duty free provisions in a similar manner so that there will be harmonization not only on fiscal incentives but also of other incentives.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 2 o'clock and this Sitting stand suspended until 2.45 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. I have been advised there are no questions or replies to questions, so we automatically go into Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that Item No. 2 under Private Members' Business be now taken.

Mr. TAITT: I beg to second that.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that Item No. 1 under Private Members' Business be taken.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, as I recall, when last time the Question of Private Members' Business came up

we had a request that the Item then being discussed be postponed to give the Government some time. In any event, as I understand it.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Which Item is this?

Mr. TAITT: Item No. 1 of Private Members' Business, Sir. As I was saying, in any event it would seem to me that the Opposition has traditionally decided the order in which they would suggest Private Members' Business be called, so that it would not now seem appropriate for the Leader of the House to be directing what to be called. My colleague has put the motion that Item 2 of Private Members' Business be taken now, primarily because as I recall when last.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take the hon. member's point.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. At that time I was acting Leader of the House, and I believe that the question of Private Members Business is a matter of consultation between the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition. I do not know of any rule which says that a member of the Opposition can get up and propose the Item to be called.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is taken.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I get into too many things, but as far as Item No. 2 is concerned — I am speaking on the motion that Item No. 1 be the instant order — I have heard what the hon. member for St. Michael South West has said when he moved that Item No. 2 be the first order. I would not like this to get into one of those jurisdictional disputes that we used to have in the last Parliament, and I wonder if I said something about Item No. 2 if it might help hon. members. Only last night the Leader of the House was discussing with me the desirability of having a debate on unemployment, and the Government would like to use Item 2 to give all hon. members an opportunity to say what they want to say about unemployment and let us have an exchange of views. But the Government feels that an essential input into this would not only be the figures from the National Insurance Scheme — which are not ready — but also the figures from the Statistical Department on unemployment. Following criticism of the way in which these things were presented as percentages — and it is impossible to extract from percentages any actual run of numerical data on the actual number employed quarter by quarter — I have asked the Statistical Department to go into this in depth and produce figures which can give hon. members some accurate data on which to argue about unemployment, whether it is getting worse or better. I asked the Director of Statistical Services today.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope, Mr. Prime Minister that you are not debating Item No. 2 now.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No, Sir. I asked him whether the figures will be ready today, and he said no, that they were not on his desk yet but they were being compiled in this department. I asked what about next week so that the House could have a debate on unemployment on the basis of accurate data, and he said he did not think he could supply reliable figures by next week. In all the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I am giving hon. members opposite the assurance that we want a full debate on this subject, perhaps even longer than is normally afforded Private Members' Business if this should prove to be necessary, and I wonder if in light of this and with the understanding that the Government does not intend to hide anything but to let it all hang out, let us produce the best unemployment statistics from 1975 up to now and debate unemployment and the desirability of unemployment insurance on a data base on which we can rely. The hon. member will agree to postpone the Item for a little longer. The hon. member will not lose the credit for being the first person to bring this in Resolution form to the House, although he was not the first to raise the idea, and I think the whole of Barbados will benefit from an accurate examination on the present employment position in the Island.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect I have heard what the hon. member had to say, but I did not rise.....

Mr. SPEAKER: With all due respect you have already spoken. I think it is but right that I get the feeling of the House on Item No. 1 before we turn to Item No. 2 or any other matter.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution stands in my name, and though I have already spoken I think it is fair to say that I still maintain the conduct of this matter. As I understand it, Sir, there are some hon. members who would like to speak today, and to that extent I would be happy if we could continue with my Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 1 is the instant Order of the day.

RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND WORKING GROUP TO EXAMINE ALL ASPECTS OF THE BARBADOS CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution calling for the establishment of a system for the evaluation of the present effectiveness of the Civil Service organization is one which I am sure will attract

the attention of hon. members because it perhaps identifies one of the most urgent problems with which modern Government in any society must of necessity be involved. I suppose it will be recalled that not so long ago, even before this Resolution was tabled, I speaking on a matter of temporary appointments at the hospital, made a plea at that time for an examination of the present Civil Service structure, to see if more effective use could not be made of the present manpower resources available to us and see whether modern management systems could not be employed to make the Civil Service a more effective organization for the implementation of Government policy.

I believe it needs to be said at the outset that a call for an examination of the Civil Service Structure does not necessarily imply criticism of the present civil servants. Sometimes one finds it difficult to distinguish between criticism of the system and criticism of the person who operates within that system. I would like to state at the beginning of my discourse that I mean no criticism of the members of the Civil Service, but I mean to take a careful and critical look at the present system under which Government policy is administered in Barbados today.

3.00 p.m.

I believe, Sir, that it is generally sound to say that the present structure that we have in Barbados is a model of the British system of the Civil Service with one serious defect. The British Civil Service was the subject of an exhaustive study bearing the name of the Fulton Report, 1968 - 69; and subsequent to that, there have been other modifications of the structure of the Service; but in Barbados I believe that it is reasonably fair to say that our present system of the Service is a carbon copy of the 1854 Lord Macaulay model with all of the serious implications that that would allow.

In 1854 when Lord Macaulay examined the British Civil Service he reasoned then that the most effective model for training, or preparing people for service in the public sector was a category of young men who were not specialist trained. He was making a plea for training Civil Servants in General Disciplines, or Classics, Theology, I suppose, Humanities; and with that sort of orientation, inducting them into the Service with the hope that they would be able to bring a sufficiently broad approach to the intricacies of Public Service administration.

I believe that that may have been a good model at that time because the complexities of Government with which we are now faced today were not as critical then as it is now. For example, I suppose that it is reasonable to expect that a man who is called to sell stamps, or to work in the Audit Department, or to

work in the Waterworks Department need only to be trained in Classics; but today's Civil Servants, Sir, have a complex range of duties which are extremely critical and which bear heavily upon the available financial resources which the Government is having at its disposal.

There is a serious problem, therefore, with our model in Barbados, because, as I said, it is comprised fundamentally of generalists who spend a good portion of their time in the Service moving between Departments, moving from one section to another, and acquiring little bits of administrative detail across various Ministries; and that is all that is required, with the exception of seniority, for people to migrate upwards throughout the ranks. I submit, Sir, that in today's terms we have a serious, urgent, compelling need for men trained in management disciplines in the present Civil Service Structure - men who are called upon to be administrators within the Service, particularly high ranking administrators - in my estimation ought to be men who understand some of the fundamentals of management as it is presently conceived.

Public Service management is not identical to, or in all measures similar to, private sector management; but I would submit that even though private sector imperatives do not necessarily always operate within the public sector structure, that none the less, some serious imperatives do indeed operate; and I would think, Sir, that the Government's business is as urgent in all its measures as General Motors, banks, or any other private sector organisation.

We are to start looking towards goal orientation in the Service. We must, first of all, in my submission, set out clearly within the Service what it is that we want to achieve; and once we have set out in clear terms what it is we want to achieve, we ought to have available to ourselves men who are capable of implementing that particular programme. There is a variable which operates within the Service which does not always operate in the private sector companies.

I am speaking now, Sir, of the political variable. In a private sector company managers are charged with responsibility. They are given authority with which to achieve all of the aspects of that responsibility which has been given to them; and therefore, in pure evaluation terms they are accountable to the directors of that company for the results which they achieve or may not achieve. Within the public sector, because of its present structure, it is difficult, if not impossible, to charge any senior manager with accountability for the non-attainment of any particular objective; because if he does not measure up to the expectations of his Minister, the worst that can happen to him is that he is transferred to another Ministry where he can perpetuate

the same quantum of inefficiencies which may have existed in the previous Ministry; and he goes along and institutionalises a programme of non-achievement, for which there can be no sanctions; and by sanctions I refer to both negative and positive sanctions.

For example, a Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Communications and Works, if he does not measure up to the expectations of that Minister he can at once be transferred to the Ministry of Health where he brings whatever expertise he had over at the previous Ministry to bear upon problems of the Ministry of Health. Indeed, Sir, this is frequently a means of punishing certain Civil Servants — move them laterally through the system without managing to deal with what is the fundamental problem, and that is that that particular Minister has not been able to arrive at or to achieve the results or the objectives which he should have achieved.

It is virtually impossible to move a permanent Secretary from office for any offence, perhaps, other than murder; and even that, I would think has to go through a long and tortuous route before you can move him. The hon. member for St. Michael South West is not in a similar position, as he would understand how easy it is to move him for non-performance in 1981. (*Asides:* Not for murder?) No, I would hope not. There are members of the Service who cannot be moved.
3. 10 p.m.

I submit that until Government sits down and begins to bring a new dimension to the top echelons of the service, we are never going to be able to achieve the measure of efficiency which we all seek to get, because as long as a man knows that he is immune from any sanction, as long as he knows that you cannot punish him for non-achievement, the incentive for performance is necessarily dull, and I would submit that we need to attract to the service a new brand of Permanent Secretary and Senior Assistant Secretary, men who are prepared to take risk, men who are prepared to expose themselves to critical analysis and whose records they are prepared to lay open bare to those responsible for public service administration, because they will recognise that the only criterion for advancement or non-advancement will be the merit system rather than the seniority system.

Speaking of the political character of the public administration I should like to touch now upon one of the serious weaknesses which I see in the civil service operating within a limited geographical and sociological environment such as we have in Barbados. A Permanent Secretary operating in any one of the various Ministries in Barbados is a man who is charged with the responsibility of executing a programme developed or devised by the Government in power at that particular time; but, Sir, I

am raising it for critical examination, can we in Barbados reasonably expect that a man who has been nurtured in our system can be free from the political constraints that impinge upon him; can he serve the Barbados Labour Party Government when he may have been appointed under the patronage system by the Democratic Labour Party Government? This is a question, not a criticism. I am submitting that what we need to do is to as nearly as possible try to find a mechanism for the appointment of men at the top which does not bring into consideration political considerations. All we ought to be concerned with in my submission is service, and the Minister, the Permanent Secretary or any other senior civil servant should be professionally competent, and he should be so professional in the discharge of his responsibilities that he pays little attention to which Government might be in power and discharge the responsibilities entrusted to him by whatever Government is at that particular moment in time, to use a common parlance, calling the shots.

It may be that one Government may have been looking at the advisability of establishing a polyclinic, and a civil servant or somebody within that particular Ministry may become so attached to that particular project that he finds it difficult to detach himself from the emotional aspects of the project and bring only professional light to bear upon the decision to change one project and to implement something other than the project that was at the time on the drawing-board. There is a question of administrative leadership which is inherent in any examination of the service. I believe that under the present system the men at the top generally regard themselves as advisers to Ministers rather than managers of their subordinates, and this, Sir, is something which is a problem of the present system which we operate. Unless and until our civil servants are so structured on an organisational pyramid that the delegation of responsibility becomes easy and the management by objective system employed in private sector companies is applied to the public service, it is going to be impossible to avoid the shuffling of paper that goes on and that passes too frequently for productive work.

I submit to you, Sir, that productivity in the public service is a matter of serious and urgent moment, because frequently persons within a civil service system such as we have seen their responsibility as ending when they have written on a file "bring up urgently for attention" or some other lexicographical jargon that passes for communication on the files of the service. There is a book written by a gentleman called Ambrose Bierce called "The Devil's Dictionary" and I submit that he must have been taking a look at the jargon of the Barbados Civil service when he wrote the "Devil's Dictionary" because it is full of a lot of the words which people use frequently and which they masquerade as meaning something. In the service this passing of responsibility is one of the serious defects with which we will have to grapple if we are to

bring the present service into line with modern expectations in our progressive society, because unless we are able to tell the Senior Assistant Secretary or Long Grade Secretary that we expect him to do work, meaning make certain that this set of objectives is implemented, he is not going to take any decision; he will just simply write on a file and pass it to the next subject until ultimately mountains of incomplete files end up on the Minister's desk with no administrative action having taken place.

The hon. member for Christ Church East in laying his case for the modernisation of the service structure talked about the cost involved. Sir, I would like to submit when we look at the cost of running the civil service, I believe he said a figure in the area of \$150 million, I am certain that that only took into consideration the emoluments and a few other direct costs associated with the service, but there are other aspects of accountability which put on additional indirect costs which are not immediately evident. The accrual system of sick leave is one of the most serious problems I believe that the service will have to deal with, because it gives members of the service an opportunity to defer their sickness so to speak to accumulate to the point where people believe that at the end of the year they have a duty to accumulate X number of sick days, and if you were to look at the total cost of this non-productive decision, the cost to the taxpayers of Barbados is going to be staggering. I believe the time has come when we will have to treat illness as something which is real. A man goes in for an operation; we would think he would be able to get that operation within the limit set out by the allowable time, and if additional time needs to be taken, I suppose human considerations can be brought but I do not believe that people should generally regard sick time as a means of extending their normal vacation periods as is the case in some instances. Bear in mind that I am looking at the present system and not necessarily making a criticism of any practice that might inhere within the system. (Asides) Which doctor we will get to in due course.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to be necessary for us to look at perhaps the most important division of the service, and that is the human resource section. We have to have a personnel administration set up that takes into consideration the human resources aspect of the public service.
3.20 p.m.

We have to have a personnel administration setup that takes into consideration the human resources aspect of the Public Service, because I submit that it is dehumanising, it is stultifying, it is a direct assassination of any aspirations that people might bring to the Public Service to take a man into an area where after a time his interest in productivity is going to diminish. The Service ought to be an area where people with certain aspirations can find fulfilment of those aspirations.

where talent can be mated to specific tasks, where indeed you will not be asking a man who shows proficiency as a statistician to do work that has to do with human resources administration. We should put people to do the things that they do best, and the only way we can do that, I submit, Sir, is to have a personnel department, call it what you will, public service commission, or whatever you want to call it, to have a department which recruits people according to the specialisations needed in the Service. If you need an engineer, that engineer should be brought into the Service and his expertise in engineering should be put to good productive use. It is foolishness to put a man who is skilled in structural engineering to sit down in a Ministry dealing with social service matters that have nothing at all to do with his particular specialty, unless of course that he also brings with that technical expertise some proficiency in public administration. So recruitment is urgent.

The member for Christ Church East pointed out that only in the Civil Service can it be possible for a man to act for eighteen years, or to act for ten years without getting an appointment; only in the Public Service is it possible for a man to come in, to go on suspension with half pay for five years. I have a man in my constituency now who has been on suspension for over two years and he is still waiting for his case to be heard. I believe that this is cruel and inhuman treatment, and the speed with which we are able to execute measures of this sort should be sufficiently brisk as to let people see justice done urgently, so that a man does not have to go and walk around and lose all sense of commitment or involvement in anything, that he becomes normless, he walks about feeling indifferent, feeling bitter. I believe that these are things which a modern, structured personnel service will be able to bring to the Civil Service.

I believe, Sir, that the matter of advancement is urgent, because a number of very productive, very bright, dynamic people enter our Service every year. Within six months those people are dead because of the bureaucracy because of the irregular — I did not say unfair — irregular practices that are brought to bear upon the advancement of people professionally. A man should be able to progress largely on his merit, and there ought to be within the Service a measure of a man's productivity, a measure of the quality of his work so that at the end of his time he will be able to know that he has done useful work for the public of Barbados and we will be able to recognise and laud him during the course of his tenure, and at the end of his service all of us will be able to look back with pleasure and pride and commend men to come into the Service to dedicate their lives to public service, but not necessarily come into the Service to use another common term, to lime, because bear in mind, Sir, if the

Service does not attract bright, diligent young people, if they see that there is no room for advancement within the present system, the only ones who would be attracted to the Service are going to be indolent and the ones who will not be in a position to add measurably to the advancement of our programme here in Barbados.

I submit, Sir, that the need for training is equally urgent, and again within this personnel structure of which I am talking there ought to be a mechanism through which men can advance. I happen to notice that sometimes rewards in so far as training opportunities are concerned are extended to people based upon their affiliation with or their association with people in positions to allocate these opportunities. Frequently people who are not suited to training opportunities are selected and people who could benefit from certain training programmes are consistently overlooked. That, too, is a killer of human initiative, and I believe that we will need to take an urgent look at how we allocate training opportunities within the Service. Men must stop hiding files so that they can come up, and they can only stop hiding files when we have it so structured that the opportunities available will be known generally to everybody who has an interest in advancing himself through the Public Service.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the hon. member to structure the winding up of his debate.

Mr. JOHNSON: Thank you, Sir.
3.30 p.m.

One of the problems with this kind of debate is that we never have enough time. May I just say a final word. I would like to lend my voice to that of the hon. member for Christ Church East in suggesting that there is an urgent need for us to take a hard look at the Civil Service to see if it cannot be more effectively set up along the standard set by private enterprise.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this matter I would begin by saying that Barbados has developed significantly particularly in the period after the turbulent uprising of the 1930s. Considerable progress in the economic, social and political fields have been registered and this has been due to a number of factors. First of all the political directorate of the country in the 1940s, with the political parties then existing, and then the Barbados Labour Party took over the reigns of government in this country in 1947, to be succeeded in 1961 by the Democratic Labour Party, and in 1976 a change of government. I believe that one thing that can be said is that throughout all of these years there has been progress and development in this country. And in addition to the contribution that has been made by the political directorate I would say without fear of contradiction that the Civil Service — or as it is

sometimes termed the Public Service — of this country has made an outstanding contribution to the development of Barbados. There is no way that that development and progress could have taken place were it not for the dedicated work of one of the key institutions of this country — the Public Service and I say that, even though there may be criticisms of the Public Service, that it is too slow, that they take ages to come to a decision, that it hides behind the concept of anonymity, or whatever charges would be levelled, I would say that that institution has made a significant contribution to this country and I would therefore like to preface my remarks on this resolution with a tribute to the Civil Service for the contribution made to the social and political life of this country.

Having said that, I am lending my support to this Resolution because any great institution, if it is to remain great or maximize its contribution to the situation in which it exists must be subject from time to time to scrutiny and creative proposals for reform, and I believe that the best of Civil servants will recognize that there are areas for examination and possibly for reform. The Civil Service of Great Britain has undergone quite a number of examinations; a number of Commissions have been established to examine the role, function and character of the Public Service in Britain. Sometime it is forgotten that it is only just 120 years ago that the merit system in the Public Service in that country was introduced, arising of the report which has taken the name of the two principal architect of that examination, the Northfolk-Trevelyan Report, which said that the persons for the Public Service should be recruited on the basis of merit and that promotion should be on a similar basis. That was only 120 years ago — not a very long time in the life of a country or institution — and since that time there have been many commissions on the Public Service in the United Kingdom. For instance, in 1890 there was the Ridley Commission; in 1914 the Macdonald Commission; 1918 the Gladstone Commission, 1921 Tomlin Commission and in 1968 the Fulton Commission.

Now if a developed country such as the United Kingdom could have these frequent commissions on a major institution in the country, all the more reason why such a country such as Barbados which has not, to the best of my knowledge, had any thorough examination of the character and structure of the Civil Service in many years, should have such an examination.

I have indicated that many changes have taken place, the most important being in recent times Independence in 1966 through which the whole character of this country has either changed or is due for change, and it is futile to think that this change can take place merely by a little tampering here or a little development there. I believe the time is right for a full scale examination, but bearing in mind that such examination

must not start with the premise that the Civil Service is bad or is getting worse and that nothing can be done about it except a whole sale reorganization. I do not share that view, and I do not believe that the hon. member who introduced this Resolution shares that view, but it is good to clear that cobweb out of the way so that we can understand what we are talking about.

Now one of the problems which frequently come up for discussions is the relationship between the Public Service and the Political directorate in any country. Make no mistake, the top public servants have to perform a political role; but by that I do not mean that they take the heavy beating in the constituency of St. Michael South Central or anything like that. But Mr. Speaker, what I was saying is that for those persons who are successful at the polls and who assume positions of political leadership in the Parliament of this country the Public Servants have a political role to perform. Let no one believe that when a Minister comes down to Parliament with a particular Resolution or Bill dealing with a social, economic or political issue that there is not a tremendous input into the preparation and development of ideas which has led to a measure being brought before us. The Public Service makes a political contribution at that level although it may not be fashionable to call it that. When a member gets up and asks a question and the Minister comes down with a reply, the public servants have made a contribution towards the examination of that question, the analysis of it, the sorting out of possible options and the answers to that question in order that the Minister could take a decision. In these ways and also in the area of giving advice the Public Servant played an important political role, and I do not think that this problem can be brushed under the carpet or whisked away merely by indicating that at the top you should bring in some persons who are not in the Civil Service and who may be removable with the fall of the present Minister.

3.40 p.m.

I do not believe personally that that will solve the problem. I believe that you can get better contributions in those and other areas through the area of training; and again sometimes memories tend to be very short. If there is a good army of occupation, every army needs training. Any good army needs training, and any good general recognises the need for training in the army; and it was recognised very early — let me put it this way, Mr. Speaker, that in Britain after whom a number of the conventions and developments in this country have been patterned — I believe that it was in 1944 with the Asheton Committee that there was a recommendation for training officers to be appointed for the British Civil Service; and following that development there is normally what is known as a cultural lag in this country; and I believe that the member for Christ Church West may have a nodding acquaintance with the

term, not that the member for Christ Church East might not have it as well — may have a nodding acquaintance with the sociological concept of the cultural lag.

You mean that after a certain decision has been taken, before that is adopted some place else there is usually a period of time elapsing. I have calculated that it takes in some cases 20 years or so for ideas to seep through. We are speeding up a little on that, and in Britain we recently had the establishment of a Gambling Commission, and so we have one shortly after that period; so things are speeding up a little. They had a Gambling Commission in Britain, so we are going to have one in this country as well. In 1944 we had this recommendation that training should constitute an important part of the Public Service in Britain; and it was in 1970 during those bad days when those who were then in Opposition that the then Government was calling for more training. It was during those bad days, the days of the Democratic Labour Party — that is what they are saying — that the need for developing training in this country through the establishment of a Civil Service College or training institution came to fruition. So all was not bad in those days. A lot of good was done for this country. During the period 1961-1976 — we are still assessing the period after 1976 — but we will have to wait before we pass full judgment on that.

Mr. Speaker, one of the main charges levelled against the Public Service is that it is subject to excessive caution. That it abides too much by the rules; and that probably it has devised its own lexicographical jargon. Well, I would not like to knock the Civil Service too hard for putting on a file "B.U." which means "bring up." That is a regular device. If you are on top of your job and you are dealing with a matter, and you cannot see your way to take a decision at this particular time, you put on something like "B.U." in 10 days or three months depending on the matter; but that is certainly a better device than allowing the file to be lost somewhere in the desk or burying it somewhere else, and simply have something called a "P.A." Not public address system. We have passed that stage, but "put away". "P.A." in Civil Service jargon means "put away". That means you are done with that. It will be seen out of experience that these are useful shorthand methods of dealing with the management problem. (*Aside*) Well, I do not know if in your time they deferred management decisions. I do not know. You would be.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please address the Chair.

Mr. SANDIFORD: You manage this House well, Sir. Even when people curse you. That is what I call a proper use of the diary. The danger is that when those letters — B.U., P.A., S.M., Y.M.A., "see for your necessary action" or something like that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members are interested in the PAYE system.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am interested in that too, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that all of us are interested in when — let me not pursue that line. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the danger is that when those letters are the only thing that is put on the file, you get a certain sterility rather than creation and imagination. It is only when all that you can get as a comment is B.U. or some other letters inserted on the file that is where sterility sets in; and I think that those should be identified early and the person should immediately be sent on some type of pressure course or taining programme, so that he can be rehabilitated into the best traditions of the Public Service.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that there are some 15,000 — I believe that in 1976 the latest figures available to me showed that there were some 15,260 public servants in this country, including those working on the Statutory Boards; and as I have said, they have made an important contribution. They are an important institution in this country; and Barbados could not have achieved its present rate of development or its present economic, social and cultural level were it not for the host of public servants, from those who work in the lowliest categories to those who are in the management echelons of the Service; and I pay tribute to them.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that in this particular Resolution the term "working group" does full justice to the job that needs to be done. This Resolution refers to the establishment of a Working Group; and I do not think that the first major examination of the Public Service should be carried in terms of something called a Working Group. Commissions are two a penny now. There are a lot of commissions now around the place; and we do not want another one.

3.50 p.m.

I believe that the importance of the civil service should not be downgraded by the use of a term which sounds to me too informal, too catty and certainly not dealing with the great institution that the public service is at the level it should be dealt with, and I would like to suggest to the Mover of this motion that the word "Committee" should be substituted for the term "working group".

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member is making an amendment.

Mr. SANDIFORD: If you would permit me, Mr. Speaker, I would so wish to move, that there should be an amendment to this Resolution, and that the words

"working group" should be deleted and that in their place the word "Committee" should be substituted. This does not do any violence to the nature of the Resolution that is before us which I have already indicated, and I hope that it would meet the full support of both sides of the House in view of the importance of the institution that we are inquiring into.

I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to go into the ways in which the public service should be reformed. I believe that that is the function of the Committee or working group that may be set up, so I do not intend to go into those areas. I myself have taken a deep interest in this particular subject. When I was in the Ministry of Education we experimented with a number of concepts, and I have worked with a number of Permanent Secretaries and other public officers, and they gave me wonderful support; and I remember one in particular who experimented with the concept of a management group or a management team in the Ministry. I believe that top public servant has been bequeathed to the Minister of External Affairs. I believe he can use talent when he sees it and knows how to use it I hope. I would like to say that there are some brilliant public servants in this country not only at the top, but at all levels in the country. (*Asides*) The hon. member for St. Michael South West got very good work from his public servants as well, and I hope the present Government is getting good work from its public service too, because the important thing is to know how to get the best out of your workers.

I do not intend to go into the proposals and suggestions for reform of the public service, because I do not wish to anticipate the work of the Committee, but I believe, as I have indicated, that the time is opportune, it is ripe, for an examination, and that the public service must not consider it — I am speaking for the Opposition benches, I do not know what is the feeling over there — they must not consider it as any statement that public servants are woefully inadequate or that the Government is totally dissatisfied with the performance of the public service. We hear of some problems but I do not want to go down that particular road. I believe the hon. member for Christ Church East who moved this motion is genuinely concerned about this particular problem, and I join with him, and I hope he gets the support of his side over there, back and front, on this particular matter, because his words are not often heeded in that party. Sometimes they do not listen to the words of the goodly doctor.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chair is listening to every word from the hon. member who is addressing the Chair.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I will take your admonition to get back to the subject.

You do not have to say it directly. Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member for Christ Church East was in hearing distance when I proposed the amendment substituting "Committee" for "working group", which I think would be better for the terms of the status of this Resolution. With those words, Mr. Speaker, I commend this particular Resolution to the Honourable Chamber and I do hope that in the selection of this Committee or working group however it is to be selected — the Resolution is silent on that particular matter — there will be persons who are interested, knowledgeable and committed to the further development of this country and interested in the contribution that an efficient public service can make for the further advancement of this country.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, may I first begin by commending the hon. members who have spoken on this Resolution. I did not have the opportunity to be present in this House when the hon. member for Christ Church East spoke on the Resolution, but I am sure that the Resolution is one, the sentiments of which will meet with some approval from the Government and in due course the Minister who is responsible for the civil service will I am sure, together with members from both sides of the House, and after taking the advice of the civil servants themselves on the matter, perhaps come up with a sort of Committee or working group or commission which will be appropriate for the enquiry asked for.

I think one should begin by saying that regardless of what one may style the body finally established to look at the civil service, that it must be admitted that in many cases in which we are called to form judgement and give an opinion that there is no easily available body of collective facts on which one can pass reasonable inferences and sound judgments and opinions; and indeed in many cases here as happened in the case of the subject of women's affairs, a commission is probably the ideal body to look at the circumstances, away from the area of merely securing political points which sometimes happen, but having available to it academic and other expertise and sufficient time and money and other resources to enquire into the facts, find the facts, look at options and alternatives and suggest them, and finally leave them to the decision makers to come to an opinion.

I do not know why the hon. member who has just spoken should be frightened of a commission because I think those of us who are familiar with Commissions of Enquiry recognise that they have been used in this way from time immemorial, and indeed with great success, and I would not want him to think that because some Commissions of Enquiry also have to enquire into highly political matters that of course this is a condemnation of all Commissions of Enquiry. If the hon. member wishes at any time to have available to

him some of the literature which I have of Commissions of Enquiry, I would be only too willing to make it available to him, and I think that an objective perusal of the body of opinion of such enquiries will satisfy him that they are proper tools to be used.
4.00 p.m.

In the case of the Civil Service, Sir, let me say as John Galbraith said, that what is appropriate at one stage and in one place may all be wrong in the other. Now, this is so because human events, and indeed other events, change and as one gets changing times the methods and the tools that one used for instance in the medieval ages may not be appropriate to the development or the technology of the twentieth or twenty first century. So too it is with the Civil Service. The Civil Service in this country has grown essentially from being a colonial service in which the higher echelons of the Service were staffed mostly by non-nationals, or expatriates, whichever you like to call them, and whose primary loyalty was to the Colonial Office of the time. Yet, in all fairness to most of these men, they were able to instil in Barbados and in Barbadians who worked with them a sense of dedication to duty and also to upholding the highest standards of integrity.

I think it is true to say that by and large we have a Civil Service in which corruption is not the day to day practice. That is not to say that there have not been both detected and undetected instances of corruption in the Civil Service. In fact, I think in almost every Civil Service that I know of, certainly in the western world, there have been such instances occurring. I think it is true to say that despite the political divisions which exist in this country that by and large the Civil Service has come to appreciate that they are the most important and continuing link in the day to day administration of this country. Should the Government of this country change again, for instance, the same Civil Service will be called upon to continue some of the basic policies which must be accepted by all the political parties, and there is nobody more aware of this than the civil servants themselves. Despite the height of political confrontation the civil servant must keep his cool, and where the civil servant is criticised is where he wears too obviously what might be his internal political opinion on his external sleeve, because in a small community such as ours it is very difficult for people to genuinely believe that the civil servant who is politically and obviously politically committed can remain objective when he is dealing with the things of policy, and for this reason I have always believed that in Barbados and countries of the size of Barbados one has to have a Civil Service which is conscious of politics but must recognise that partisan political beliefs cannot be lived out in the same way that they may be

lived out in bigger countries where your personnel resources are wider.

Mr. Speaker, if I may give a recent example of a country that contrasts with Barbados, in Costa Rica only the other day there was a change of Government, and there was immediately complete movement out of people in all posts, including Secretaries, from the administration, and this must mean a void, it must mean that people must take time to readjust, and that is one reason whenever I came to deal with the Civil Service I have always contended that one has to get for a country such as ours the nice and necessary balance which must exist. I would like to have been able to say today that I have always detected in Barbados, and indeed in the Caribbean, a Civil Service that has never taken up a political view. Individual civil servants do. Politicians from time to time on both sides of the political fence have complained about one or two or three, if you like, civil servants who adopt this view, and I have always appealed, particularly in the areas that are critical, to the civil servants to be very careful in how they exercise their judgment in this regard.

Let me cite one of the cases, Mr. Speaker, the case of the Police Service. The Police Service must protect every Barbadian, it must be above board and above suspicion in being even-handed in the day to day running of law and order, and I would hate to think that there are any members of the Service who believe that they should show their political allegiance to the detriment of their duty to the public at large. I cite that as one instance because Police comes under me, and it is not easy always as a Minister not to listen to the complaints that one gets from both sides of the political fence on civil servants. I have had, for instance, a complaint against the Fire Service in relation to a death that occurred in Charnocks, and the member of Parliament who complained genuinely believed at the time that his complaint was well founded. We investigated it, we sent him all the necessary documents, and I think he was satisfied that in this case the Fire Service acted in the best traditions of the Service and there was no way in which the public would suffer.

But I believe there are other areas, Mr. Speaker, in which the Civil Service perhaps needs a very close look being taken at it to see whether we can improve some of the techniques being used, to see if we can get a greater co-ordination, and to see whether or not we can give it a new goal for efficiency and performance.

One of the worrying problems of most Civil Services, and certainly of this Civil Service, is the problem of size, Mr. Speaker. There is no doubt at all that the hon. member for Christ Church East was correct when he said that the Public Service today was the highest employer of labour and that its total cost to

the public of Barbados was in terms of our economy very significant. I think something like 45% of all the revenue collected in this country is spent on paying civil servants' salaries, and I use that term not in its strict construction sense but in the widest terms to include people who are not merely in the Public Service but in the quasi-Public Service as well. That is a tall bill for any country to pay, and one of the problems which confront us as the political managers of the country's business is that in an economy such as Barbados' the Public Service is seen not only as a body of men there to perform most efficiently and economically the public's business, but it is also seen as an avenue for employment.

4.10 p.m.

There is no member of either political party who at some stage or other has not been bombarded with a request for a letter or some sort of assistance in getting some person a job in some part of the Public Service; and I am afraid that the public of Barbados still cannot comprehend if you say to them that there are at present no more openings, because if you just create jobs in order to satisfy the number of people who must be employed without contributing to productivity, eventually you are doing that person a disservice because the cake is not expanding; the number eating the cake may expand and the amount available for each gets less and less, and instead of having a reasonable number of satisfied people you can end up with all the people dissatisfied. I say this is hard for the politician, because in times such as these there tend to be mistaken ideas in this country about how the Public Service should grow and for what purposes it should grow. I believe that the next step when we are talking in terms of the increase in the Public Service is to talk in terms of greater productivity, higher efficiency and getting tied to employment that can really create wealth in the country. If we are merely to find jobs to fit people into slots without producing more, without better management and without increasing the gross domestic product of the country, then we are failing as politicians no matter what side of the table you sit; no country can go on for ever in blissful ignorance that it is making a contribution to national development if it is fooling people all the time. I say these words very solemnly because I have had the privilege of being a member of this House for seven years during which time I first sat on the Opposition benches, and I now sit on the front bench with the responsibility for departments of Government; and I am deeply convinced of the easy role each one of us can play in being a crowd pleaser in order to get the cheers rather than the jeers by catering to the gallery. My role when I look at the Public Service or any other aspect of the Government of Barbados has to do what is the long term best for this country, and I am not concerned with the cheers or jeers but only with constructive

ideas; I am not concerned with the mob either, and those of us who may think that the answer is political satisfaction today will be mistaken tomorrow, for history will judge our role correctly if we have merely been aiming at crowd pleasing without looking at the necessity to educate the people of this country to recognise what is best for the country in the line of long term development and progress. And I would hope that in dealing with the size of the Civil Service we recognize that we do not just create new jobs for the sake of creating jobs and that size must be related to true economic development.

We have grown rather rapidly. Some of our civil servants are still not being effectively used in this country. There is a lot of frustration because of the system and structure of the Civil Service. I have seen it, I have heard it and I recognize it; and we must find out the causes and get the answers. In some departments we are probably over wieldy; in others we may be understaffed. It is not easy for any politician to tell Barbadians that they have to recognize what is in their interest. I have said before that I came into this House not to get glory and money for myself but to serve, and even if it takes my life to speak the truth to Barbadians I will point it out no matter what they say. This is one of the problems, the problem of size.

The other major problem is co-ordination within the Civil Service, between departments of Government and coordination sometimes within the department and coordination between the public service and the private sector. Daily I have witnessed between departments of Government a lack of adequate flow of information which would assist in quick decision making, and I have witnessed that sometimes information does not flow as quickly as it should to the decision makers, and I have witnessed that some Ministries of Government at times do not know what is happening in the other Ministries of Government. I have just said to members of the Public Service that we are working for one conglomerate, the people of Barbados. Information should not be limited to a few people — a few Ministers or Permanent Secretaries or a particular department; it is in the interest of the country that the information should flow where it can be most effective, and I believe that my criticism is appreciated; it certainly has been made with the greatest *bona fides* I can think of. And what has been more startling to me, Mr. Speaker, is to find that at times information is not flowing from the public sector to the private sector. I cited on the radio of this country instances where scholarship opportunities have not been taken up because somebody somewhere had not taken the trouble to see that the matter was passed on to the appropriate departments. I am not saying this was deliberate, but sometimes it is the system which has been worked for so long that it has become accepted as the rule. I think

we should change that. I can cite the instance of a young man from a family not well off who had the opportunity to get a scholarship in tourism in Austria. What happened was that when the papers were ready some officer sent them on by post rather than by diplomatic bag and the postal service was so bad that it took three months for the letter to reach that country; as a result the deadline passed and that young man never got the opportunity to benefit himself and improve his condition in life. We have had to try to correct this and I am thankful to the Civil Servants who recognized that something had gone wrong and who tried to put it right. That is only one case, but there are several other areas where this sort of thing has occurred, and we have a duty to minimize this, and I believe that a case can be made out for looking at the machinery of consultation and coordination in order to improve this and to see that this sort of thing is avoided.

- octopus

Mr. Speaker, the management of the Civil Servants itself needs overhauling. Before I was actively engaged in politics, some years ago I delivered a lecture to what is now the National Union of Public Workers — at that time it had another name — in which I said we could almost make out a case for a Ministry of Public Services. And although I recognize that one danger in that would be putting too much political influence in the hands of a particular Minister, I think we ought to be able to devise schemes which would minimize this but would get the other benefits that would accrue from such a structure. Let me back my general statement with concrete facts to make you realise that my inference is correct. We have an Establishments Division which deals with some aspects of the Civil Service, operated by a Permanent Secretary; we have a Training Division which deals with some personnel questions of training, so to speak, under another Permanent Secretary; and we have a Personnel Division under another Permanent, and there are not many instances that there is real adequate machinery for consultation between them. But what is worse is that although we have a Training Section, the manner of training is itself divided among three different Ministries, so when you come to deal with scholarships, for example, the Ministry of Education handles some, the Training Division handles some, and the Director of Finance and Planning handles some. Some times they are all handling scholarships for the same organization, like scholarships given by the Organization of American States, and there is not the co-ordination that is necessary. Let me say that I believe that the Training Division under its present head recognizes this and he tries wherever possible to get co-ordination. But why is there the necessary for this dispersion which cannot lead to the best use of scarce resources?

4.20 p.m.

Why the necessity that the Minister must consult three different people all down the line on different aspects of questions without each having a total view of what is involved in the Service? I believe that one of the things that the committee, or the working party or the commission should look at is how best to manage the Civil Service in itself. We also have the position, Mr. Speaker, in which we have various Service Commissions, true enough, most of them staffed by the Personnel Division; but I doubt whether we have a full time Executive Chairman so that decision making can occur very readily and quickly.

Mr. Speaker, one of the tests of a good Civil Service for those of us who believe in the western model of management of the public sector is whether we can achieve in the Civil Service efficiency based on meritocracy of promotion, or whether we will lean to a system that leads to mediocrity and wastage. It is a well recognised test. Now, many of the rules that we have built up for the Civil Service have been predicated on the basis that we are moving to meritocracy. That is why Civil Servants for some time, it has been said of them that they are fireproof. That it is very difficult to get a Civil Servant fired; because as hon. members have said, there is a long suspension period. There are special regulations which allow the Civil Servants to get more than natural justice in many instances.

Yet we know that we need to devise a system which, while protecting the Civil Servant, will not let us have to keep the Civil Servant who is mediocre and who is not performing, and who is therefore drawing public funds without making a direct contribution to the public weal. I want, Mr. Speaker, in this regard to join other hon. members who have spoken on the question of promotion within the Service. We have come along thinking that the question of promotion should be based on seniority. Too often we think so. Rather than being based on the performance and ability of people.

There was a young officer in my Department, aged 38, who rose at that time to be Permanent Secretary and an Ambassador. One of the outstanding Civil Servants; and yet I heard — I am not citing rumours because I do not like to base my statements on rumour — I heard complaints about why did you want to send such a young person to the stage of Permanent Secretary and Ambassador. The Minister must be favouring him or the Public Service Commission favours him, because other people much older in the Service have not had the opportunity to be promoted; and yet this is one of the outstanding young people that we have. I think that when promotion is taking place, one must balance seniority with natural ability. I can think of five or more than that people now who are capable of moving up to the stage of Permanent Secretary but must remain

because the Service happens to be so limited; and in this regard, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment on long acting appointments.

I think that the hon. member for Christ Church East was quite right when he said that there was nothing more frustrating in the Civil Service and nothing more debilitating indeed, and more leading to inefficiency in management than to have people acting in the Civil Service for eight to 15 years. I took issue in this House with this occurring in the Registration Office, and the next thing I knew was a complaint from the Public Service Commission to the Prime Minister in relation to my statement; and I made the position quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes to speaking out on public matters I do not care who it is. If I hold an opinion fairly and honestly and I express it properly, I will express it in this House or outside this House regardless of what happens. I go back to what I said just now. No cheers, or jeers, no boos or claps will make me move from the views which I hold firmly, and that applies to the Public Service Commission, it applies to the mob. It applies to the paid servants. It applies to fly by night operators or anybody, Sir. That is what it applies to.

That is my position, Sir; and I believe that I was right when I spoke out on the Registration Office, Sir. Appointments have now been made, but I had to speak about it; and I am sure that the Public Service Commission acknowledge that I must have been telling the truth because one of the facts that they conceded was a fact on which I had based my case. I have said before to the Establishments Division that there should be more supernumerary posts so that people who are on secondment and making higher money outside could get on with bettering themselves and allowing some younger people to get an opportunity for promotion within the Service; and so we can get a system that rewards efficiency, and rewards dedication.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that we do have.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You are now going to wind up?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Yes, Sir, I am going to wind up. We have lack of expertise in many fields. We do not have the resources that many countries have so that we can have several people being trained across the whole area across the whole set of areas that Governments must now operate in. Therefore we must use our sparing resources wisely and well. I recognise the necessity for us to have a new look at the Civil Service, and I hope that the statements which hon. members have made from both sides will not be interpreted in any way as a criticism of a particular Civil Servant, but merely as a desire, I think, of the country to see that we get the best value for money and the best use of our human resources for the balance of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st Century.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who desire to speak?

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, at this stage, with the concurrence of the mover of the Resolution, I would beg to move that further consideration of this matter be postponed.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, I would give way to the wishes of the Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is agreed that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Private Members' Business. I beg to move that Government Business be now resumed.

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

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

THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker when Government Business was last taken, the second reading of a Bill to amend the Industrial Development (Export Corporations) Act was passed. I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Mr. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Odle in the Chair.

4.30 p.m.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Item No. 2.

THE BETTING AND GAMING DUTIES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1978

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 is the instant Order of the Day, to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Betting and Gaming Duties Act, 1977-27.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is also a Bill to implement a budgetary measure. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the original Betting and Gaming Duties Act passed the House without a division, but that at that time I indicated that the imposts and other conditions which were being applied to the use of these gaming machines were subject to review.

We have discovered, Mr. Speaker, as I said in my Budget Speech, that our policy objectives might be better served by applying additional taxation to certain places where these gaming machines are collecting together and which have become places of resort; and Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that the amount selected was \$30,000 for a whole year licence and \$15,000 for a half year licence. There is one misapprehension which seems to have been canvassed although not particularly in responsible circles.

I do not remember any hon. member, for example, sitting on the Opposition benches saying in or out of here anything to this effect, namely, that this tax is in substitution for rather than in addition to the ordinary machine tax. It should be made clear that this tax is in addition to the ordinary machine tax, therefore an arcade which contains fifteen machines in fact pays \$60,000 a year in licence fees, and those of us who read the daily press and who have reliance in what we see therein will observe recently that an operator of these machines has been complaining bitterly that he has to pay the Government \$42,000 every six months for the use of his machines.

This Bill is a little longer than might otherwise have been expected because the concept of an amusement arcade has had to be introduced into a number of sections since we were imposing a tax now on arcades. An arcade is defined as any approved premises not including an hotel, because a hotel is subject to different considerations; they can have machines according to how many rooms are in the hotel, but other than hotels, arcades are places with more than two gaming machines. This figure of two gaming machines is a figure really taken from the practice in the United Kingdom where, if hon. members care to consult the recently published report of the Royal Commission on Gambling, it will be observed that numerous premises, virtually every public house in Britain according to the Commissioners now has two gambling machines of the sorts we call one-arm bandits, and virtually every club — it is a whole host of things — clubs, all sorts of organisations have two

gambling machines. This figure apparently is a balanced figure which does not encourage undue gambling, and at the same time it satisfies the wish of the proprietors of these premises to have a source of income additional to their other activities. Well we have not touched places that have two machines in Barbados, but the places which have more than two machines that people go to, we have put the arcade tax on.

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

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

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

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.
4.40 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 6 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In moving that clause 6 stand part, section 23 of the original Act has been found to be a little ambiguous, Sir, and for that reason there has been a little further amendment than was otherwise necessary.

This is the clause that permits people to have arcades that do not have gambling machines in them, and at the moment I must say there is no tax on an arcade that does not have a gambling machine other than the amusement machines. This is all taken from the English legislation, but apparently there has been some little ambiguity, so there seemed to have been the need for an amendment, but this section is being repealed and replaced for that reason.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Prime Minister would accept a grammatical amendment to clause 6. My copy of the Bill says that clause 6 should be repeal. Where the past tense should be expressed it is not expressed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: My copy has "repealed", Sir, but I will be glad to accept that amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am moving that the word "repeal" be properly spelt.

The question that clause 6 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 7 to 13 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.
4.50 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978-79 No. 2

Order No. 1 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to amend the note to Item 15 — Expenses of Commissions, under Head 8(1) Ministry of Finance and Planning, and to grant the sum of \$25,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1978-79, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1978-79, No. 2, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to proceed with the amendment to the Note, Unfortunately, one of my files is missing, but I think that hon. members if they see that expenses for Commissions is the Item they will be satisfied to leave it to the Auditor General to tell me that the Duffus Commission and the Gambling Commission are not really Commissions. I do not think it is necessary to go through with this business of constant amendments of notes. The House has been called on from time to time to amend a lot of notes and I think that time is being wasted by those people who are afraid of Commissions in future perhaps and do not want to find that they have approved something they are doubtful about. However, we will have to amend the Item for expenses of the Commission, for while we do not think that the vote of \$100,000 will be exhausted by the first Commission, we wish to be on the safe side in the event of the new Commission. Hon. members would have taken note of the public outcry and

concern, some of it honest and the protest of God-fearing citizens, some of it hypocritical; but whatever sort of outcry, I understand we are not to be characterized as out and out vagabonds. But I am not so unkind as to categorize the clerics of this country or people who are God-fearing citizens as sanctimonious vagabonds I leave that to the Leader of the Opposition; nor indeed will I categorize any member of this House as an-out-and-out vagabond; I also leave that to the Leader of the Opposition. But whatever the nature of the criticisms, there has been some concern about the matter of gambling. In the entire English speaking world gambling over the last 40 or 50 years has given rise to strong feelings one way or another. In most of the non-English speaking world — Catholic countries, Moslem countries and so on, — gambling is taken as one of the incidents of mankind's life, an old practice going back as far as mankind has existed; and those who are familiar with R. H. Tawney's seminal work "Religion and the Rise of Capitalism" will also be aware that the Protestant ethic has produced an opinion most pronounced in English speaking countries but to a lesser extent shared at one time in the countries of Northern Europe, and one of the things about the Protestant ethic is some historicity of what is described as gambling. I do not want to go into the rights or wrong of it; that is precisely what this Resolution is to avoid.

In Great Britain in the last 30 years I think there have been three Commissions on gambling. In the United States — I think the hon. member for St. Michael South West will probably tell me how many Federal Commissions there have been on gambling and in how many States there have been referenda, up to the recent referendum in New Jersey. I think that something like gambling which should transcend party consideration in a political system such as we share with much of the English-speaking world, should be analysed as far as possible outside the immediate day-to-day bitterness of politics. Accusations are easy to make, attitudes easy to strike, charges of hypocrisy easy to be thrown around. When politics gets into something about which people of all political persuasions have gut feelings, you get a good deal of mud, of dirt and of rancour. I am not putting the case for or against gambling. I have said in numerous places that I have no intention of letting my back be pushed to any wall over the issue of gambling. At different times when there has been less cant and hypocrisy in the House, I have heard the Leader of the Opposition freely admit to having nothing against gambling and that he gambles with one game of dice that is legal in Barbados; and I have heard other members speaking of gambling machines indicate that they are all right in hotels. And I have heard every opinion expressed in here except, strangely enough I have never heard anybody in here say out right that he is actually against gambling; I do not know if we are going to be treated to that today; when we hear that we will have heard every opinion expressed.

Now I do not mean to provoke any hon. member, for I am in fact making an appeal to hon. members to permit the work of the Gambling Commission to be done in an atmosphere shorn of party consideration. Honourable Members will have abundant the opportunity to talk about gambling when the Commission reports in the fullness of time. I said I do not wish to provoke any hon. member, but it is my belief that there are more members on this side who are fundamentally opposed to gambling as such than there are on the other side.
5.00 p.m.

In advance I am going to say that I do not believe that there is anybody on the Other Side who is fundamentally opposed to gambling. It is suggested to me possibly the hon. member for St. Phillip South. He will have an opportunity, like the rest of us, to represent his views to the Gambling Commission. I have my views. I do not think that I am going to put them to the Commission. I think that the Commission will have an abundance of material from other sources on which it can come to judgment; but the whole public of Barbados will be free to the Commission on Gambling and other matters — well, on gambling as a principle and on the mechanism of gambling.

I am making arrangements for Scarny's Handbook on Gambling which is the bible of gambling in the United States of America to be made available to the Commission. I am making arrangements for the various reports of the British Royal Commissions on Gambling, including the recent Rothschild Report of which I have a copy here in the House, although I am not making it a document of the House, also to be made available to the Commission. I will make arrangements for the neuro-monitor survey of gambling, 1978 — a single copy, since it is a very expensive book — to be made available to the Commission. The Commission will be given every opportunity to obtain the best professional advice, where appropriate, on different forms of gambling, and particularly the forms of gambling being practised in Barbados at the present time.

Now I said that I would say something about the time tables. Some persons in the Press, relatively uninformed, have made comments about a report that the Commission is going to be asked to submit the result of its deliberations within nine months; and it is suggested that this is a way of keeping the issue out of reach for a period of nine months. This is a gross and foolish mistake. Commissions do not normally report within nine months. That is the entire point. A Commission on Gambling in particular which has to take a great deal of evidence may very well take a great deal longer than nine months to gather the evidence, come to a conclusion and have it printed.

With all the authorities, with all the assistance available in the United Kingdom, Lord Rothschild, William

Anderson, and Messrs. Blair, Carbury, Coolman, Disley Hoffman, Tudor Price, Dame Marjorie Proops and Bernard Williams – with all the work of the previous Commissions having been done, they still took from the 24th of February, 1976 until July 1978 to report. I will draw to your attention that the Duffus Commission which is the sole Commissioner, taking evidence from not an immense number of people, has obviously not reported within nine months. These Commissions are not overnight things. Those with experience in politics perhaps recognise this. Those who see the figure of nine months perhaps do not understand it.

I have not collected together all the reports of Civil Service Commissions and other things; but it will be found that nine months is an abbreviated time rather than a long time in dealing with a subject such as Gambling. To some extent I will confess to hon. members that I do not believe that a proper job can be done within nine months; and I have therefore been giving some thoughts to the matter as to how the demands of the public, plus the necessary demands of the Government in the interest which the public should have as taxpayers, can be reconciled; and I have come to the conclusion that the safest way to reconcile them is to allow the Commissioners to make an interim report at any time, on any aspect of their terms of reference – in other words, if they come to a conclusion about something the first week they sit, they can report in the second week; and take a more leisurely look at the matters which perhaps may not be thought to be of such immense public moment. So it should be clearly understood that if the Commissioners feel strongly on any subject, they will be at liberty to come to a conclusion on that subject after due deliberation, and make a report on it at their own speed, within the period of nine months.

If for any reason the preparation of the report, say the printing or any other aspect takes them a little longer than the expected time, well perhaps His Excellency the Governor will grant them a little additional time at the end; but I think all the arguments that some haste is necessary about this matter can be met by permitting the system of interim reporting. I have no idea how far hon. members intend to take this matter this afternoon. I could go into every aspect of it – the Turf Club, the Betting Shops – I will say this. I do not intend this to be made a Commission of Inquiry into the West Indies Hospital Sweep which was a scandalous and vile form of gambling introduced in 1964 under the previous regime, riddled with dishonesty from start to finish, and in which, unfortunately, a former member of this House was involved, the same man who said that he looked forward to a one-party state in Barbados.

We do not intend to have a Commission of Inquiry into the operations of the West Indies Hospital Sweep. You would hear then who interfered with justice. It is intended

to be a Commission enquiry strictly into the forms of gambling that at present exist. I can tell you that I share the views of the Leader of the Opposition that it is an anomaly – in fact he shared my views when I expressed them, and I would like to think that they are *ad idem* – that boys could be punished for dicing under the light, whereas the Leader of the Opposition said that he is free to play backgammon, which is a dice game for money in private homes. He himself admitted that in here, Sir. I believe that that is an anomaly which should be ironed out. I believe that we are excited at the moment about gaming machines; but we really have to ask ourselves whether the betting shops, on which the turnover may well be larger than the gaming machines – I suppose the Commissioner will discover that. I do not know what the current figures are.

It may very well be that those who object to gambling machines may, upon a careful analysis of their views upon these matters, realise that they have to object to betting on horse racing, and that theoretically they should also object to betting in the Turf Club sweepstake. 5.10 p.m.

They should also object to betting on bingo. It may be all of these forms of gambling practice, sending money out of the country on betting pools. To the best of my knowledge the gaming machines do not involve the sending of money out of Barbados once the initial equipment is purchased. There are other forms of gambling, the betting shops which do involve the sending of money out of Barbados. All of these matters the Commission will canvass in due course.

As I say, I could talk about it. It do not hide that it is a subject in which I have pursued an interest over some time. I may not bet on horses; I certainly have never bet £20 at 40 to 1; I was not such a madman. I do not bet on horses, I do not throw dice, I do not buy bingo tickets; I only buy sweepstake tickets if the lady or the seller is somebody I know who urges them on me, and I do not even look to see if I have won. Every year and a half or two years I used to pick out the sweepstake tickets and send somebody to the Turf Club to see if they have won. I know the sweepstates are only a way of wasting money, but I have followed the subject, and if hon. members wish to ask questions I will do the best I can to answer them. But I will urge on hon. members not to anticipate the work of the Commission. Allow the Dean and the other Commissioners to settle down in an atmosphere of peace and tranquility to discuss gambling. Do not make them feel that there are political issues at work which will cause them to strike political attitudes rather than the moral and the social attitudes which we are appointing them to pursue in the interest of all the people of Barbados. There has seldom been an occasion where the short term should be more positively laid to rest and the long term pursued in the interest of all of us.

Gambling employs, so it is estimated to me, something like 2% of the work force in Barbados. The Turf Club informs me that the direct and indirect employment given by gambling — it was once calculated to me — is in the region of 600 persons. It seems a bit on the high side to me, but that is what was told to me. Well whatever it is, that is the maximum figure that was given to me. I am informed that the gambling machines employ over 200 persons; the betting shops employ perhaps 70 persons. I did have the exact figure, I think about 68 persons at one time. In fact I believe employment would have gone up as a direct result of one of last year's Budgetary measures. It was necessary to take on more staff to stick on the stamps on the receipts or something like that. Representations were made to me about that matter. I suppose the pools employ a certain number of people; I really do not know how many. There are a certain number of people engaged, I dare say, in bingo. Certainly the applications that come before the Gaming Committee for permission to hold games at fairs would indicate that there are self-employed persons who gain some part of a livelihood in gambling, and I think you have to think of the welfare of those people before you begin to make too many hasty political judgments based on short term political interest that may already have been served.

I would not like to think that there is anybody in this House who is opposed to the principle of having a Gambling Commission. Wonders never cease. Perhaps somebody will say it is wrong to have a Gambling Commission, that the experiences of all the other countries in the world which have found it wise to submit social matters to the sober analysis of persons concerned in social affairs, maybe there are people who will say that this is an error and that politicians are the best people to decide these matters. I myself know of virtually no Government and know of no set of politicians except perhaps the legislature of Nevada who decided that they were qualified to pronounce on gambling without the assistance of that wider society that can make its opinions felt without strong political partisanship. I myself do not subscribe to these views. I believe that there are certain social issues, gambling may be preeminent among them, but there are others for which the opinions of the Church, of leaders of society in other fields, should be sought and should be invited. I know this has not been the policy of the Opposition and of course it would be nothing inconsistent in the Opposition in wishing to see the opinions of the Church, bearing in mind the way they treated the representations of the Church at the time of the Constitutional debate. I would not be surprised if there were persons who condemned the attitude that we have taken to that God-fearing part of community as is represented by the two serving clerics on the Commission and by the well-known Methodist Lay Woman who is also one of its members. Anything is possible in this world, and there are some of us who admire consistency; so you

can say if they did not want to hear the Church on the Constitutional issue, they do not want to hear the Church on gambling either. This may be, but I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that it would not be, and that this supplementary for \$25,000, modest enough in the circumstances, will be passed. I have no particular wish to see it passed without debate, but I would hope it would be passed without any reflection on the principle which we think we are introducing, not for the first time and I hope not for the last, but which we are introducing in the interest of society as a whole.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I sat and listened to the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance introducing this measure and I wondered at which point he was going to get into the meat of the matter, and I observed that he preferred to talk around it and to leave it in such a state that if one were not careful one would have been lulled into a position where one says "well, let it go by".

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state before I go any further that I heard him say that the Opposition might not wish to hear the views of the Church on gambling, and the inference there is that somehow whomsoever is appointed to this Commission is speaking for the Church. Now Mr. Chairman, before I go any further I would just like to disabuse this House of a concept which has thereby been introduced. The suggestion that choosing a particular cleric or a particular individual to sit on a Commission therefore means that that particular individual or cleric is speaking for the Church is inherently wrong. If the Government had sent to the body which represents the Church and said we are setting up a Commission and we would wish you to send a representative, the Minister would be in a better position to talk in terms of representing the Church. I am a person who is not embarrassed to say that I am an Anglican, and I further state that I represent a congregation and indeed I have been elected on the body of the Church which is the government of one of the denominations of this country, and I do not recall at any time that body nominating anyone to represent the views of that Church on any Commission.

5.20 p.m.

I do not recall at any time that body nominating anyone to represent the voice of the Church on any Commission. I think it is necessary to clear up that particular point. I go further, Sir. If in terms of representation of the Church the Minister is talking about the numbers represented by individuals in terms of their denominations, I would have expected him to indicate why it is that the one body of christian thought in this

country, the Evangelicals, which represent some 90,000 persons in this country could not find it possible to be represented on this potential Commission, bearing in mind that their position on gambling is well known, very clear and without any ambiguity, and I think that is one of the areas to which the hon. member will have to give due consideration, and furthermore some satisfaction to those 90 to 100 thousand persons whose voices will not be heard in terms of the representation on this body.

In the course of introducing this measure the hon. member indicated that I would be in a position to say how many Commissions there have been in the United States in the various cities or States on the question of gambling. I wish to state at the outset that my position on gambling — and it is no point anyone saying to me that we have to look at the logic of this — my position on gambling is one position, my position on the institution of the one armed bandits in Barbados is another position. The two are not virtually exclusive, but on the question of the one armed bandits I maintain now, have always maintained, and will maintain that the one armed bandits in Barbados is a negative force on the social, economic and cultural development in this country, and that you do not need a Commission of Enquiry or any other kind of Commission other than a simple application of commonsense, a simple application of what you can see with or without the naked eye as it occurs in this community, to conclude that the one armed bandits should not be in this country.

I am very glad to hear the hon. member saying that the Commission will be able to report on an interim basis. Be that as it may, it would seem to me that all that is necessary for the Government to do is what the previous administration did, send them out of this country, and my position here is very straightforward, my position here does not require any kind of documentation other than that which they can find in the files.....

Mr. SISNETT: On a point of order, Sir, I am not sure whether I am hearing the hon. member right. I would like to be sure that I am not mistaken in any way that the hon. member is saying that his position is such that the one armed bandits should not have been in this country.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member cannot get up and say he is speaking on a point of order and talk nonsense.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to your attention that the member just taking his seat cannot refer to the hon. member as talking nonsense.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. Michael South West please continue? It is not my view that the remarks were offensive.

Mr. TAITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the records, if they still exist, will show that the previous administration, despite what has been said on a number of occasions, took the opportunity — and I can say without impugntly that I myself made the Order which stopped the importation of bandits into this country — and after the then Attorney General had ruled that the operation of those bandits was illegal and the police had gone out to remove them from the streets for five months prior to the Government being removed from office in 1976, there was not a one armed bandit in any public place to be seen in this island. Mr. Chairman, for what it is worth....(Asides).....No amount of intimidation....(Asides) The fact is that in the rest of the world, and the United States in particular, with over 200 million people, they find it convenient and necessary to remove the one armed bandit as a mechanism for gambling to an area in the desert. Those who wish to go there, until recently when the gangs moved in to New Jersey, could get on a plane and fly to the desert and play the one armed bandits, and I have no doubt in my mind that if Barbados was as large as the United States we could find some area that corresponds to the desert area where those who wish to play the one armed bandits could go and do so.

Mr. Chairman, what an individual in this society does is his business, to a large extent, and I am not going to stand here and try to cast any moral judgement on any individual who leads his or her life in the way he or she sees fit.

5.30 p.m.

I would like to say, however, that a government has a moral duty not to place in the way of individuals — any individual — I am not saying that one-arm bandits should be at Sam Lords Castle or Miramar — I am saying they should not be here at all, because the social evils attached to one-arm bandits wherever established are too many and too strong for a society like Barbados. Those who have vested interest in one-arm bandits are bound to become emotional about this subject, but I am not going to be put off by any amount of heckling on this issue. I feel it is an issue on which I have spoken and written publicly I feel that the Government should recognize that it is not merely a question of loss of money in terms of one-arm bandits; it is a whole conglomeration of ancillary problems attached which Government should recognize. If in their collective wisdom they are satisfied that the country can get along with one-arm bandits it is their right as the Government to say so, but it is our right to indicate it is not in the best interest of the people of Barbados; at least I do not so consider it. The one-arm bandit has become controversial. I do not intend to interfere with the personal life of anyone, but I think I have a duty as a member of this House to take the position I am taking, and I do so in full knowledge of what has

occurred in the past and what is the wrath likely to be heaped on my head.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has said that there is the possibility of some loss of employment. I would say this, that the amount of employment generated by the one-arm bandits in this country cannot, in my mind, make up for the amount of harm the one-arm bandits have done and will do to us in this country as a divisive element in our society, and I am going to say that it is only a matter of time, for there is nowhere in the world where one-arm bandits have been operating that there has not been the influx of the Mafia, and that is the basic and the major fear I have; for once they are entrenched there is no force in Barbados that can remove them.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, for too long there has been double talk and double think and hypocrisy in respect of gambling in this country especially over the past four or five months. After the budget presentation in 1977 when it was made clear that certain forms of gambling were to be regularized. I did not read with the same consistency the criticisms and invective to which we have been regaled in the last four or five months and immediately prior to the recent bye-election in St. Michael South Central. All of a sudden members of the Democratic Labour Party are adopting a holier-than-thou attitude in respect of gambling, particularly about the one-arm bandits. I am led to believe now that there has been a shift in the political philosophy of gambling only in those months immediately prior to the bye-election.

As a member of the Committee of Management of the Barbados Turf Club and also representing in a legal capacity one of the companies which operate one-arm bandits, I think it is my duty to this House to disclose any peripheral connections I may have with gambling. Now no member of the Opposition voted against the gambling bill when it was passed in this House last year. We can imply that they saw no good reason to vote against it, and perhaps the reason why they did not oppose the bill was that the reasons given by the hon. Prime Minister in his Budget presentation in 1977 were almost identical with the reasons given by today's absent Leader of the Opposition on 30th June 1964 dealing with the Registration of Premises Act 1964. One has to see gambling and the attitude towards gambling in the light of historical experience of both parties, and I want to start with 1964. That was the time the Democratic Labour Party was in power and it was the year in which two significant areas of gambling were legalized in this country. Look in Volume I of the laws of this country and you will see the Racing Services Business Premises Act passed in that year and the West Indies Hospital Sweepstakes Act also passed in that year.

5.40 p.m.

I quote from Page 166 of the Debate of the House, for the 30th June, 1964. I want it written down. I will have copies of this debate published in the newspapers so that people will see the hypocrisy that has suddenly taken place in this country. I quote from page 166 of Hansard of the 30th June, 1964:

"Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the businesses which it is proposed to provide registration for in this Bill have been a comparatively new innovation in the sporting life of this Island. There are at the present moment approximately seven places, and I do not know whether they are companies or individual businesses; but anyhow, there are seven places where fixed odds betting is indulged in within the limits of the City of Bridgetown. There is not to the best of my knowledge and belief any such establishment outside the metropolitan area. There has not to my knowledge been any test case on the legality of these operations. Nevertheless the practice has been established now, probably for about two years," (that would be under the regime of the Democratic Labour Party that betting shops had been there and still had not been made legal. The Minister two years later is telling you that they have a habit of gambling for a period of time and then subsequently they are legalised).

I go on to quote: "Many members of the public have resorted to these places without any undue protest or alarm being created in the Press or by religious organisations who are generally supposed to be opposed to any kind of gambling."

"We are not aware that these establishments have created any public or private nuisance. They have in effect been above board in respect of their operations." (I want you to listen carefully.)

"The Government is faced with two alternatives: (1) Whether the Government should go through the legal processes to insist that prosecution should be brought against them -- and it is not a matter for us but for the Director of Public Prosecutions acting by the instructions of the Commissioner of Police; or (2) whether Government should acknowledge their existence, regard being paid to the fact that no civil or other cases have been brought against these organisations, and do what the Government of the neighbouring colony of Trinidad has done, and that is to remove any doubt of their legality by exempting them from the provisions of the Gaming Act, Chapter 3, and the Gambling Act, Chapter 6. If Government has come to accept that these operations are carried on, in the interest of perhaps peace and domestic tranquility from the provisions

of these statutes, it only stands to reason that the Government should make an effort to control these organizations in order that they may not get out of hand."

A little later a very interesting thing was said by the then Premier concerning the operations of the betting shops. He said:

"You will also have to have some kind of eavesdropping on the telephone because a lot of this betting is done on the telephone and over the Overseas Telephone Service," (Imagine the Premier talking about eavesdropping on the Telephone, and you talk about wire tapping). He went on to say: "In the neighbouring territory of Trinidad, a tax of \$25,000 per year is imposed — and some of the services which operate here operate in Trinidad — but we also have to take into account that this country is not as healthy and that the population of this country is approximately one-third or one-fourth that of Trinidad and, therefore, the organisations which carry on this betting may not be able to bear the high taxation or licence fee that that territory imposes; therefore, after considering the matter carefully, I have come to the conclusion that a licence fee of \$12,000 per year or \$1,000 a month would be appropriate in our circumstances."

Now, the present general secretary of the Barbados Workers Union who has been a staunch and steady critic of the one armed bandits, notwithstanding the fact that during the time that he has been General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union, there were two machines operating in the place at the Harbour in which the Union has an interest and is the lessee; but all of a sudden he has got very white, I would say almost snow white on gambling. Listen to what he said, this workers' representative, on the 30th June, 1964. He wanted to know first of all why the Comptroller of Customs was the authority to deal with betting shops. He said on Page 167: "The leaders which we have in Barbados are still genuinely afraid of people in these societies" (He is acknowledging that the Leaders in Barbados were suffering from a colonial and probably a racial complex) "and they are not willing to tell the people that these things are not in the best interests of a developing society. You cannot in one breath talk about high taxation and about gambling in the other. The thing which should be done is to tax the gamblers."

That is what Frank Walcott said in 1964. He said further on: "I feel that the money should be subject to taxation because it is a positive gain, and if the community is not going to share bigger in gambling, the country cannot carry out the social requirements it

needs." Imagine then criticising the one armed bandits for wanting to help old people in this country. I am winding up Frank Walcott's speech. He said: "If you go across Marhill Street any Saturdays, you will find men with motor cars parked there. I believe in a shorter working week; but instead of people going to the beach and getting relaxation, they are bursting their brains with these combinations and the men running the betting shops are making money."

"It is said, Mr. Speaker, that everybody has the gambling urge and you cannot take it away; so if you have to live with it, my idea is that you should tax it. I am making these general remarks on this question of gambling because I too buy sweepstake tickets. I do not have any religious scruples about it, because I feel I am intelligent enough to buy tickets where they do not impinge my income...."

He further said: "I support this Bill, if for different reasons, Mr. Speaker; but the only thing I did not get from the Premier is some knowledge of the assessment just as in England where I said some £90 million is invested." Let me point out that of the three speakers, two of whom I have already quoted, the third was Mr. Elliot D. Mottley who said: "Sir, I agree with the principle of this Bill. I agree with your taxing these places rather than outlawing them. When you outlaw them, they will only be carried on in places where you cannot reach them."

In 1976 this Government came into power and found that a few months previous an affidavit had been sworn and delivered to the Ministry of Trade — I did not say the Minister — stating that there were 158 bandits in this island. We were faced with one or two alternatives as the present Leader of the Opposition was faced with in 1964; but for trying to legalise something which was sinister and which was operating surreptitiously in this country prior to 1976 and as far back as 1973, and for which people had been receiving money during the time that the status of one armed bandits was in doubt, we are castigated by people who are too lazy to look back and read and research and see the stance of the parties of this country and gambling.

The hon. member for St. Michael South West owned that when you let one armed bandits into the country, the Mafia will inevitably follow. I want him to tell us why his party allowed them here for three, four or five years, yet knowing that the Mafia would follow. 5.50 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member might be misleading the House by saying that my party when in administration allowed them in here. The hon. member is making a statement which is contrary to the Standing Orders.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

Mr. TAITT: It is, Sir. Under the Rules, Mr. Chairman, the Rules say that if an hon. member is in the opinion of another hon. member misleading the House, he may draw it to the attention of the Chair, and I am saying that what he is saying is contrary to the facts as recorded.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order. Let the hon. member continue. You have just about half a minute more.

Mr. SIMMONS: If they did not allow them here, they were here for five years and as managers of this country they ought to have known of their presence for the five years, and if their presence carried a concomitant of the arrival of the Mafia, you should also have known that for the last five years. Let us have no more hypocrisy on bandits and gambling after today.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a very sad occasion that one should be speaking in this Honourable House today on the question of allocating a significant sum of money to a Committee to investigate gambling in this country whilst so many people are starving or being threatened with starvation from one source or another. I have absolutely no interest in the historical aspects of gambling in Barbados, except that, as far as I am aware, gambling presented no serious social problem until the arrival and in particular the legalisation of the one-armed bandits in this country. I would like to relieve the hon. member for St. Thomas of some of his obvious anxieties in that there are certain aspects of this matter known to him and known to me which I will not speak about today. Further it is....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, I can appreciate that the hon. member is relatively new in here and he may not be aware of the fact that he has all the privilege in here to say what he so desires to say. He may speak of whatever interest he has in the bandits or anybody on this side.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member continue?

Dr. HAYNES: I will not be rattled, but I must thank you for your advice. Indeed I will say only what I intend to say at this juncture unless provoked to say more. To my mind, Mr. Chairman, this matter is firstly a moral question; it is a question of whether or not this Honourable House should ever have passed legislation at any point in time legalising any aspect of gambling. I am not a gambler, and from a moral point of view I object to all forms of gambling, and in particular I object very strongly to the introduction and particularly the legalisation of the one-armed bandit operation in this

country. I do not think that those of us who were brought up in a christian country would have any doubt as to the morality of gambling whether we are gamblers or not. However it is a very different matter if a few people assemble night after night and have their fun with poker or dice or whatever. I would condemn it as being immoral, but it is a different matter when masses of one-armed bandits are unleashed on the unsuspecting population in this country.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, I do not know if the hon. member is reading his speech, but that is beside the point at this time. If you have a house and I have dope in it, would you rent it to me? If you knew it had in dope, would you rent it to me? This is just for his own interest.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that I will proceed completely uninterrupted and will not be put off no matter what tactics are used. We have a situation in this country, Mr. Chairman, where some \$60 million will be taken out of the pockets of the poor people of this country between now and 1981, and the apparently large sums of money which would be paid by these arcades in fact represent — I have calculated it — no more than 0.016 recurring of the total amount of money that would be taken from the pockets of the poor people of this country. That is the situation that you have; so when people are talking about this big lot of taxes that you are going to get out of the one-armed bandits operations, the fact is that it represents a very small amount of the money that will be taken out of the pockets of the poor people of this country, and the question is, what happens to that \$60 million. It is certainly not put into the banks in Barbados; it is certainly not reinvested in Barbados, and it is my certain knowledge, Mr. Chairman, that money is shipped out of this country in valises having been changed over into U.S. dollars, bought from many hotels in Barbados.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. member is saying that he has knowledge of a breach of the Exchange Laws of Barbados. As a citizen of this country, as a legislator now and as a person with this high moral tone, I am inviting him to give the Director of Public Prosecutions the information, because he says he is certain, and I will assure him that the DPP in his sole discretion, once he has the information, will bring a prosecution. I will ask him to bring this information he has now we are off the political campaign, he has the information and I am challenging him to make it available to the Director of Public Prosecutions himself so that prosecutions can be brought against those persons.

Dr. HAYNES: As I said, I will not be put off in what I am saying. I believe that the Director of Public

Prosecutions constitutionally has the right to act independently, and if I choose to do so then I will submit what information I like to him.

There are, Mr. Chairman, many other aspects in terms of the creaming off of this \$60 million in my view from the poor to a small sector of the wealthy in this society. That money, Mr. Chairman, would normally have found its way into the shops, to the hairdressers, to the artisans and to a whole range of other people and would contribute to the generation of further employment and further financial security to the masses of people in this country. This is where particularly in the economic area the whole question of the one-armed bandits fundamentally differs from any other form of gambling which Barbados has known, and which has certainly not been a major problem to Barbados either in terms of its immediate effects on the social and financial situation of the poor people or in terms of our foreign reserves.

6.00 p.m.

My view, Mr. Chairman, is that these machines should be banned from Barbados at once. It is my view that if the Government intends to set up a Commission and waste more money on another Commission that they should suspend the operation of all these machines at once. They have already made enough money in this country and not a single one of them would be in any way out of business or lose a single cent, because looking at my calculations here certainly within a matter of four or five weeks they should have a complete return on their investment.

There is another factor, Mr. Chairman, which is this, that the presence of these machines in this country is distorting to a large extent the total investment situation in regard to the small man in this country, and people do not recognise what it means when approximately \$15 million a year would be taken out of circulation in Barbados, particularly from among the poor people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what are we being asked to do? We are being asked now to spend more money on a Commission to investigate what we should all know instinctively as Christians, as human beings as to what is wrong in Barbados. Ban the one armed bandits and let us continue with any investigations you might want. I would support that. And if there is any genuine goodwill on the other side, then they should know what the current economic effect these one armed bandits are having in Barbados.

Now, one of us already told you about the Mafia being in this country. I have said that I will not speak on that aspect today, I will not speak on certain agreements in Florida and elsewhere, I will not speak of the intention to introduce casino gambling in Barbados and elsewhere, I will not name the hotels where certain people have been

staying, I just want to make it absolutely clear that I do not propose to do that at the moment, unless I am provoked. But we on this side will certainly oppose any Commission and spending one cent on any Commission in this country, and we will certainly on the other hand support it if you all would agree to ban the one armed bandits immediately. Let us see your good faith.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, we have been given of late to listening to political speeches which are clothed with hyperbole, and in addition we have been given to listening to political speeches in which the speakers assume the role of financial experts when there is absolutely no evidence to justify that they can have any claim to financial expertise. One of the great things about a House of Assembly is that it is completely different from a political arena outside. When you are in the House of Assembly and making statements there must be some rationale for the statements, otherwise one is known as being totally irresponsible and a player to the Gallery.

I note that the last speaker has already found it convenient to make unwarranted statements here without any rationale and to depart in a similar manner like the previous holder of the seat he now holds. But, Sir, for the information of the hon. member, the gross figures that he has quoted cannot hold water unless the hon. member is in a position to state in here the basis upon which he has arrived at the figures. Commonsense will tell anybody that there is a variety of places in Barbados where machines are placed, and the purchasing power of the various areas will have to be looked at before one can arrive at an approximation of the average take per machine. In addition, the hon. member must be a very great expert if the hon. member can tell this House the operation costs of a machine.

I have had the privilege, Sir, of looking at the Royal Commission in the United Kingdom on gambling in which there are two or three chapters and jackpots and slot machines. These have just been published. There was before the Commission many of the issues raised by the hon. member and the benefit of the very highly technical and qualified advice both from the electronic point of view and from the financial point of view, from an operating cost point of view was detailed in this Commission's report. That will be made available.

Now, there is another aspect of the hon. member's speech which displays a certain ignorance which I am ashamed that the hon. member should display in here. If as he says that he knows of these large figures and large profits, does the hon. member know or is he an expert in matters of income tax to know that as companies the Government of this country under the enlightened legislation of this Government is now entitled to approximately 54% of the profits of these machines?

What is the hon. member coming here and trying to tell people in Barbados that some \$60 million will go out of the island, and what is more, the hon. member is saying that he has certain knowledge. Now I am going to pause for a minute, Sir, because never have I seen or read of a member in any part of the world confess to being guilty of a criminal offence on the floor of the House. If the hon. member has knowledge that another person is committing an offence, that is an offence of a felony, it is an offence of obstructing justice, all of those things. The hon. member has confessed in here to having knowledge of people.....(Asides).....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, it is one thing to speak words, it is another thing to use your head when you are speaking words. I do not know, Sir, it seems to me that hon. members on the other side must have to take seriously the confession of the hon. member that he is guilty of such a grave offence as concealing from the police, from the Director of Public Prosecutions the full and certain knowledge of breaches of the Customs law, breaches of the Exchange Control law, breaches of the Income Tax law. Those are serious offences, Sir, very serious offences.

6.10 p.m.

I have no doubt that if the hon. member does not convey that information we shall have to move a certain resolution in here for this irresponsibility; we cannot have criminals among us; we cannot have self-confessed criminals among us. This is a very serious thing. I warned hon. members last week that inside of this House of Assembly is a different place from the public platform. In here the right of reply is devastating and hypocrisy can be exposed instantly. I also invite the hon. member in addition to giving evidence to the Director of Public Prosecutions to give evidence before the Gambling Commission if he has this knowledge. The hon. member in another place said that he had other knowledge in connection with the Mafia. That is also vital information, and it is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, because the head has not taken control in this country of the house and also because hon. members on the other side have decided that they want to make a political football of this matter, that we have decided to submit it to the scrutiny of an independent public commission.

Now I want to deal with one aspect of this public commission. I saw the prince of liars in Barbados in an article in the newspapers saying that millions of dollars of public money were being spent in respect of Commissions. That is a dastardly lie, and you can only get away with this in a country in which you have public media who do not check the facts and contradict, as part of their policy, patent absurdities and lies like that. Millions of dollars what? There are three Commissions set

up and the truth of the matter is that the total cost cannot exceed \$250,000. Look at the Estimates, look at the amount voted. Look at Commissions in the United Kingdom, look at Jamaica. The Government of Jamaica has just appointed a Commission to go into allegations of corruption in their own Government, because in the Caribbean the Opposition uses rumour, lies and distortions to gain political advantage and governments in power have to ensure that their integrity is submitted to scrutiny periodically by independent bodies. That is why we will use the system of Commissions — a device which ensures that accusers as well as accused have an opportunity to state in public their point of view. So this dastardly lie about Commissions costing taxpayers a million dollars has to be exposed because agencies which help to form public opinion in Barbados unfortunately do not make enough money to hire people of competence; that is the problem. We are living in a society where profits are not enough to hire people of competence to check out these things and inform the public on these things. It does not matter what type of comment they make, whether favourable or unfavourable, that is their right; but what galls me is to see published patent untruths which have no basis. How can anyone in Barbados say that these Commissions are costing a million dollars when the total amount voted is set out in the Estimates each year and no such sum is voted? This is absolutely irresponsible conduct. This is what we have to contend with so long as we have to operate in such an environment and it is our duty to face the challenge and let the accusers and the people with knowledge of the Mafia, and the people with knowledge of the illegal exportation of money — let them come forward as a matter of public duty and expose it to the Commission. If there are social evils that they know about let them give the evidence. This Government will not be ruled by rumour, lies, distortions or attempts to subvert lawful authority, of which there is increasing evidence as taking place in Barbados.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak not in any heat on this particular matter; I hope we can get back to the main principles behind this Resolution, and I would say from the outset that I am going to vote against this particular measure because I genuinely believe that there is no need for setting up a Commission on Gambling in this country. I do not believe that the general issue of gambling is a major social issue in this country to take precedence over other issues which might be in need of investigation. I believe that the problem as far as gambling is concerned arose in respect of the one-arm bandits and that this has been the problem, and I do not think that it is necessary to expend public funds on a matter we have been warned about and have been told over and over again that we are facing a situation of private opulence and public penury — I believe these were the words of the Minister of Finance at one stage in quoting from an American writer.

Now let me say that I do not strike any hypocritical posture on this particular matter. Gambling, as far as I am aware, has been present in all societies with the possible exception of Afghanistan, as far as I know. And it is this question of chance in life, whether at birth the chance meeting of the sperm and the egg, or it may be at the point of death, the time and place may be a question of chance. But whatever it is, in most societies of the world today gambling is present, and what we have got to look at is what positions have been taken in respect of gambling in those societies.

6.20 p.m.

We have heard references to the Protestant effect, and R. H. Tawney in his book "Religion and the Rise of Capitalism" — seminal was the word that was used in his book; but if you go even before Tawney, you had some of the church men — St. Augustine in the City of Gaul taking a position against gambling. Both himself and St. Cyprian felt that gambling was inspired by the devil himself; and ever since then, Jeremy Taylor and other clerics, we have had that type of opposition to gambling from the Church. I believe that in other religions — I believe that the Koran abjures its members to avoid all forms of gambling, and they do not consider chess as gambling. We therefore have different positions. Mark Twain himself indicated, I believe that he suggested that there are two occasions on which one should not gamble — when one can afford it and when one cannot afford it. That was his particular position.

As far as I am concerned, people will take a chance on gambling. I confess myself that I may play a little bingo occasionally. I may take a little flutter on the horses. I confess that I may put little on the pools; but I have never played the bandits in my life. The closest time I ever got to them was a couple of nights ago when I was somewhere in the constituency of the hon. member for St. Michael South East going into the heart of the matter, and I saw these machines. Do not get too worried about that. I do not play the bandits, and it is my particular feeling that these machines add nothing to the economic production of this country, and therefore there is absolutely no reason why because of the existence of these machines the taxpayers of the country should be called upon to spend money to support a Commission on Gambling.

I am certain that were it not for those machines, and the promise made, we would not have a Commission on Gambling. So I take that position straight on this question of gambling. I am not against those who gamble; but that particular form of gambling — when you go and stand before that metallic monster and it keeps blinking at you and you keep putting those quarters or whatever it is.....(Asides).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: It is shaped like some kind of phallic symbol. You keep pulling it and it goes on blinking at you. One writer, I believe his name was Dostoyevsky indicated that he actually got an orgasm — not from winning, but when he was losing.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. I have enjoyed the hon. member's speech although I would not have thought that the one armed bandits would be phallic symbol except to a masturbator; but is the hon. member saying that Dostoyevsky used to play the one armed bandits, sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us stick to the one armed bandits.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, as far as the Commission is concerned I will make this point. My colleague, the hon. member for St. Michael South West has spoken about the Commission and its composition, and he is apparently unaware although being a high official of one of the major religious denominations in this country, that no representation as such officially is coming from that particular church. The only reference I see from the Anglican Church is where the Head of the Church, the Bishop, himself indicated that he was willing to sit on the Commission. That was the Anglican Bishop of Barbados. That was reported in the Press. I do not believe that there was any diet of saw dust on that particular occasion, but I do not know what happened to that indication given from a very high source; but we notice that the Head of the Church, who indicated publicly that he would be willing to serve on such a Commission has been by-passed.

I know too that the youth of this country through the Barbados Youth Council have been very vocal in having been omitted from serving on such a Commission. They have claimed that certain letters have gone to Government officers and they have not got a reply; and they have got no representation. As far as this is concerned, I think that that is a failing on the part of the Government to recognise the voice of the young people and give them a say in these particular matters; but my whole position on this is that a gambling Commission was set up in the United Kingdom. I see that some copies are liberally being used on the other side. It is all right for the UK. Let them do that; but in this society I maintain that there is absolutely no need at this stage in order to show that one might not be backed into a corner, to set up this Commission on gambling. I think that it is a waste of the taxpayers money; and it is my view that that money could better be used for different purposes. That is my particular position on this particular matter.

I would say further that as far as the organisation of gambling is concerned, in the USA there have been a number of investigations. I believe that Senator Kefauver

in 1951-52 headed a Senate Committee and he found that all forms of organised gambling in the USA had some connection with the criminal underworld. That was his finding in 1952 and it was out of his findings that impositions were placed on the machines. I have said before and I say it now that we have gambling in this country; but the one armed bandit machine is a type on which, I understand, there are only 12 to 15 combinations which actually pay out of about 8,000.
6.30 p.m.

The Prime Minister is very knowledgeable in this particular area and I am certain that if I am incorrect, he will give the correct information; but the chances are very slim that one can get a fair deal on those machines, bearing in mind that they can be so programmed to pay back or retain whatever particular percentage is determined. In other words, they can be controlled. Just as the roulette machines can be controlled by magnetic or mechanical devices, so too these machines, the one-armed bandits, can be controlled, and they are controlled to pay out in profits such a percentage and retain the remainder for those who operate them. I do not believe that this country.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must wind up his speech.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will end right now. I do not believe that we really need those particular machines; we can do without them; we do not need a Commission, and I again advise the Government. I do not know why the issue was deferred from some time before the Commission was actually sworn in, but I think that in itself this matter was before us two Tuesdays ago but it was deferred and in the interval the Commission was sworn in — may be a greater issue because we have got to look at Parliament itself and the influence of Parliament in dealing with national issues. That may be a greater issue which we may have to look at.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity particularly within the confines of the House where I think greater objectivity can be brought to bear on these matters to speak on this subject, and I do so with a little bit of regret at the level to which politics in Barbados has sunk. I understand that it is probably right for both political parties to try to gain political power. The duty of an Opposition certainly is to oppose, to oppose constructively and we hope democratically, and to try to wrest the Government from the Government. I understand that principle; but there is an equal duty on the Government and the Opposition in dealing with public affairs, particularly a subject as emotive as this, to observe certain principles, and one is certainly not to excite the public without a proper investigation of all the facts and circumstances, and give a correct or nearest to

correct as we can get guidance, be it moral, financial, political or social.

I regret to say that when it comes to the subject of gambling the Democratic Labour Party cannot teach this country morals. I repeat that. The history of the Democratic Labour Party with gambling is such that they are in no position, no member of that party is in a position, to take up a moralistic approach on this issue, and I say this for this reason. I am not concerned with the individual personal views of members because I am sure there are members of the Barbados Labour Party who may be totally opposed to gambling, and there are some who may support it. I am concerned with the public view that is taken on this matter. It is a fact that under the Democratic Labour Party's regime all the forms of gambling that are now legalised in this country operated. Let us begin with this. I will go without one fear of contradiction that under the Democratic Labour Party gambling machines or slot machines were operating openly in this country with only one person ever being prosecuted. This is a fact. I like to deal with facts and the public must be reminded of them.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, the Hon. Attorney General might be misleading the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you asking me to decide if he is misleading the House?

Mr. TAITT: I am going on to make the point. The Commissioner of Police in Barbados had a legal position on the operation of the one-armed bandits, and when the Attorney General became aware that the then Commissioner of Police had that particular interpretation, the Attorney General sent a directive to the Commissioner of Police indicating that the open operation of one-armed bandits was illegal, and as far as I know the police took the necessary action to remove them.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I want to deal with that because we have the file. We would have accepted all of that before we came into Government because we did not have access to the file. I want to make it clear that prior to a change of Government taking place in this country, one-armed bandits came into Barbados and the Democratic Labour Party was in a position to know that the laws of this country was being flouted, and I can find only one instance of any reference being made of a prosecution, and that is a man from Jackson. I go further and say that I have seen in the Barbados Workers' Union canteen at the Port one-armed bandits being operated. I had been present there with members of the Union Council because I was at the opening of the canteen with other Executive Members of the Union, and also Mr. "Sleepy" Smith who is not now in this House was there on the premises to make a speech. We are not running

now to win a seat and there is no emotionalism. We are going to deal with the issue.

Now the Democratic Labour Party must make up its mind. Either it is totally inefficient in Government — and this is the Minister who would be responsible which is the Minister for Customs — either it was totally inefficient or the then Minister who is the present Leader of the Opposition, the Rt. Honourable member for St. John, was in bad administration; and he is talking about high ministerial principles in Resolutions. He should have resigned. That did not happen. The Minister for Industry at the time said he did not become aware of it, so I am dealing with the persons who let them in through the airport and the seaport. The Leader of your party, the man who can call people vagabonds, is the man who should have resigned because he was either totally inefficient as a Minister and let in one-armed bandits in this country to create a problem for us who succeeded him, or he had knowledge that they were here, and I think the second thing is what happened. There is no doubt at all that in the City by-election bandits were operating right within the city. Members of the Democratic Labour Party had the closest association with Mr. Parks. Don't come to me with any foolishness. This should be known. All the shouting, you all bringing crowds here and so on, I will tell them the truth. You had an association with Mr. Wright... members of the Democratic Labour Party at the time.

I am not going to be like the Prime Minister. There were members of the Democratic Labour Party who were receiving monies from the gambling operators. Earl Glasgow was being paid by gamblers of this country; he was a leading member and associated with the hon. member for St. John. I am going to talk. I am not hesitating anymore. The time for that has gone. (*Asides*)

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member for my information please let me know the names of those persons.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Perhaps the hon. member for St. Michael North Central does not know that. You see what hurts me in politics is that I have clean hands and nobody can bribe me or anything, and still you must stomach a lot of nonsense that you get from people in this country when they do not put on their thinking caps to think of what is happening.
6.40 p.m.

The Democratic Labour Party has always been associated with gamblers and gambling. Let me deal with it. The West Indies Hospital Sweepstake....(*Asides*).... I am getting back to that too because that was the biggest robbery ever perpetrated on people in this country. The West Indies Hospital Sweepstake which my friend, Mr. Patsy Springer, used to run. Mr. Barrow, the Rt. Hon.

member for St. John, justified it in this country. It was a fraud on the inland revenue of this country, it robbed people in New York, there was money going into the pockets of some members of the Democratic Labour Party which should have gone to the winners that had never been paid out. Let us deal with it. Where was the moral fibre of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, a leading member of the Party, that he did not have the guts to speak out at that time? (A VOICE: He was a civil servant). Civil servant? He was a member of the Democratic Labour Party and in a position of power. Where was the moral fibre? The point is that you are having the greatest form of hypocrisy because it is politically expedient now to get up and object.

I am not talking about the hon. member for St. Michael South West, I am dealing with the Democratic Labour Party. I can understand the hon. member for St. Michael South saying that as far as he is concerned gambling has been here, there have been religious views and he feels that the Commission is a waste of time, but there are several reasons why I welcome a Commission, because I myself know that the Gaming Act that exists in this country is the 1917 Act, the controls on the form of gambling to which the hon. members are not objecting are inadequate in this country today. The United Kingdom has set up two Commissions in 31 years, and this last Commission cost them I believe something in the region of over £300,000. Slot machines operate in the United Kingdom today under legislation passed in 1961 and updated in 1968, and yet they have found it proper to enquire on what safeguards are necessary in order to prevent people from having any abuses in relation to any form of gambling.

The hon. member for St. Philip North read out the speech of the then Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition. He should have read him when he objected to us coming in here and trying to repeal the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake when Mr. Mottley brought the resolution. Joe Brome is dead now, but the Democratic Labour Party members paid Joe Brome to write an article in the newspaper. Joe Brome told me that. They paid him to write an article in the newspaper trying to heap scorn and said we were preventing people from being employed and robbing the Treasury of taxes. (A VOICE: The man is dead now). But I am only saying he was a journalist and he was doing his job as a paid journalist, I am not running down Joe Brome, I am only talking about how you all are capable of perverting — the Democratic Labour Party, not the hon. members — perverting the form of propaganda to suit your purposes when you want to. You know how to use it and you have just used it effectively, you are using it to destroy people's characters, and you are using it in the country. I warn you all, never unleash things that you cannot stop. I believe that we should have proper controls on any form of gambling, any form that the community thinks it can stomach. As a

matter of fact, those who have read on the subject, and the hon. member for St. Michael South has been doing some research, and he will see that members have always considered it that balancing individual freedoms and idiosyncracies against the wider interest of the community, saving people from themselves, because after all the easy answer to the one armed bandits is for people not to play them if they do not like them, but apparently some people are supposed to be weak so you have to put protection for some of them, just as some are weak in relation to Bingo. Today in England Bingo is a more serious problem than any problems at all with the one armed bandits, and that is why you get an objective enquiry by way of Commissions in order to look at the facts, look at what safeguards are possible.

We have very few safeguards in our legislation for robbery to occur in the racing pools, on the pay out of odds, on making sure that certain standards are obtained, and if there is one reason why we need a Commission it is to give this House and the country guidance on what safeguards there should be. I understand the stand of the Methodist Church, they are against all gambling. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central said on moral grounds he is against all gambling, but having said so he should tell his party, and he should say it from the public platform that his party is in no moral position to criticise because you morally think gambling is wrong and they legalised it in this country in many years. That is the speech I expect you to make, I do not expect you to make a speech merely heaping coals on our heads because we have inherited the position from you. Your correct moral stand is to say 'my party stands condemned as well' for what they did between 1961 and today. That is what we should hear.

It is a long way to go to 1981, we will get there, the system of education will continue because the people in this country do not like to take a little time to think for themselves sometimes. It is easier to have other people thinking for them, and that is regrettable. Obviously, there is a big system of education. In most countries people would have done the research for themselves, they would not be swayed by the few things they hear in a political campaign and a lot of niceties. The newspapers would have done their own research and you would see different views being expressed, but not so here in Barbados, it depends on which bandwagon you think is in the upper star at the time, but these issues are more fundamental for the structure of maintaining democratic government in this country than a lot of you people think. It is not who wins the seat today and loses it tomorrow, it is whether we can save the nation in the long run, and that is the question that we should all be looking at.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, to use a famous remark used in the past, I will not be long. I have been

listening carefully to this debate, and the impression that keeps coming to me from the other side, the Government benches, is that whatever the Democratic Labour Party did in the past they can do now, and I would like to say that two wrongs do not make a right. I would like also to warn them that if they persist in this concept that whatever the Democratic Labour Party did they can do better, we are in for a rough time, this country is in for a rough time.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We have no intention of following the conduct of the ex Prime Minister in not dealing with Joy Edwards. We have no intention of having anybody on this side behave like how Joy Edwards behaved.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, do we now expect them to deal with the other person the same way now, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. No points of order, all fraudulent.

Dr. CADDLE: What I have been witnessing here this evening was an attempt to show who was holier, whether the Democratic Labour Party in the past or the Barbados Labour Party now. What I believe many people in this country are concerned about are the anti-social effects of a particular type of gambling, and that is, the one armed bandits. People have voiced their opinions about the effect which this type of gambling has been having on people, men, women and especially young people. It has in some cases undermined the productivity of some people, it has made some people who were normally honest to become dishonest, and people who were at one time efficient, who were known to value their hard earned money, have been found out now to be throwing it away.

6.50 p.m.

Recently it has been brought to my attention where a lady went to a priest to pray for her because she had lost \$3,000 on the one-arm bandits in one week; the attraction was so strong to play the one-arm bandits. And if you go to Speightstown you would be disturbed at the large number of young people not only playing the one-arm bandits but also engaging in other types of anti-social behaviour. There have been reports where people handling Transport Board money have taken some of the money hoping to put it back by playing the one-arm bandits. There are other reports of people in Barbados considered respectable and level-headed drawing their salary and losing it and then saying that somebody has stolen it and getting their colleagues to raise money on their behalf. This is what people are concerned about in this country. They are not concerned with whether the Democratic Labour Party brought in the machines or whether the Barbados

Labour Party legalised them. The impression I get is that they are concerned with the anti-social effects which this form of gambling is having on a certain section of the community. There may be some value in having a Commission of enquiry into this as it may be able to pinpoint this aspect and bring it to the attention of members of this House and the general public, and at the same time I think you should get away from this type of discussion which has been going on for some time in which one side is trying to prove that the other side is the worse offender in this matter.

As I pointed out on previous occasions, gambling is something that has to be eliminated. Some people will gamble, others will not. I do not gamble, not because of any moral concepts but maybe because I have other interests that overshadow that desire. But I accept that the attraction of winning money without having to work for it is very strong with some people and there will always be people who will see gambling as helping their financial situation. So what we have to be concerned with is the safeguard which we must implement to prevent any form of gambling from generating anti-social behaviour which we will later find difficult to control and which will put a severe strain on our resources in the upholding of law and order and the prevention of various crimes. It has been shown in many countries that when gambling becomes commonplace, stealing and other crimes increase. It has also been shown that in some countries when gambling is on the increase one finds robbery with violence and even murder occurring. These are some of the things we are concerned about. I see the Hon. Attorney General holding up a book and making comments. What he is saying maybe the experience of the United Kingdom, but we cannot hold the experience of the United Kingdom as being the experience of all the countries of the world, and there are other areas where the problems that I have raised have occurred; when you get an increase in gambling you get people wanting money and you get stealing, sometimes with violence, sometimes even with murder, and we have to be concerned that in a society like Barbados where we have other problems like unemployment we cannot expend too much money and energy on exercises which in the long run are not going to help us solve this problem of unemployment or other comparable problems. And I would again like to throw out to hon. members on that side that this exercise of trying to prove that whatever we did in the DLP you can do better, that if they persist with that for too long we will be in serious trouble in this country.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to get into the general question of gambling at this stage but there are a few points I would like to make. During the last bye-election there was a lot said on public platforms about gambling, and I have the distinct

pleasure of seeing the hon. member for St. Michael South Central playing true to form, and anybody who knows the hon. member as long as I have known him would not be surprised at some of the statements he made on those occasions. I am not going to say that the man is a liar, that he is immoral or any of those things but what I would like to say is that some of the statements I have heard on the public platforms of both parties at the bye-election tell me that the hon. member is a director and shareholder of a company called Hayville Limited and that that company owns a building in Nelson Street occupied by a man named Castro who about six weeks ago told me certain things not worth repeating; but I understand the hon. member has an interest in that building which has been rented to some persons for operating a gambling arcade. I do not know the truth or otherwise of this as I have not researched it but I understand that one thing that is correct is that the hon. member is a shareholder in that building and draws rent from a building that runs a gambling arcade.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I believe that I have already made it clear, and I wish to make it clear again today that I am a shareholder in a company called Hayville Investment Limited, and one of the properties owned by that company is a building in Nelson Street. To the best of my knowledge I have only gone to the building twice, once in 1973 and again in March 1977. It is to my knowledge that during the period 1973 to 1977 the operations that took place in part of that building were pool tables and pinball games. This is as far as I am aware and I think it is important to get this clarified.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If I may interrupt, the hon. member is making a second speech. However, it is 7 o'clock and I must report progress to His Honour and ask for leave to sit again.
7.00 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman, has reported progress and has asked for leave to sit again. The time is now 7 o'clock, and this sitting stands suspended until 8 o'clock tonight.
7 p.m.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed. When this sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply, and to that it now reverts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. George South.

HON. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, at the time of the recess the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was giving a very long exposition about some building. I want to say that by the rules, Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Michael South West rose on a point of order which was not a point of order. Please continue.

Hon. L. R. TULL: What is interesting about this particular matter is that the hon. member spoke at some length. I was happy to give way to the hon. member so that he could get up and say that he had an interest in this particular matter, and that was the trap which he was led into; because he has got up and said that he has an interest in a company which owns a building in which people operate arcades with one armed bandits. That is exactly what I wanted him to do. He is a new boy and will learn the rules in due time, I hope.

What he succeeded in doing is to walk right into this; because the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act, Cap. 9 of the Laws of Barbados, Section 30(1) reads as follows: "A member shall not in or before the House to which he belongs take part in the discussion of any matter in which he has a direct pecuniary interest nor vote on any such matter without disclosing the extent of that interest."

Sub-section 2 goes further and says: "Any member who acts in contravention of this section only be adjudged guilty of contempt by the House and is liable to the penalties provided in this Act for such contempt." I believe that under the penalties for this contempt the member could be expelled from this House. I will deal with the hon. member for St. Michael South West in due course. If he wants to have fun, I will give him some later on.

The hon. member spoke earlier in this debate and did not disclose his interest; and there is no provision for any *ex post facto* declaration of interest. That is why I was happy to sit down although he got up on a nonsensical point of order. I did not say it. It came out of his own mouth that he has a pecuniary interest by getting \$1,500 a month rent out of a building in Nelson Street that he rents to Martindale - Castro. I have to say this, because war is declared. I was not here last week when all sorts of welcome were gone through; but let me say categorically here and now that I disassociate myself from any welcome to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. I was not in the by-election campaign. I hear the hon. member talking about morals. Does he have the nerve to get up here and talk about morals? I stayed out of the St. Michael South Central by-election on moral

grounds and lived to regret it. I said that for all the moral reasons in the world I was not going to get into that campaign; and the day after the by-election in the campaign for which I did not take part, would you believe that the hon. member said that he would not speak to me? That is the nature of the man. He gets here and makes these long statements. He reminds me so much of the man that he has succeeded.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We are discussing the Gambling Commission. We are not discussing the member for St. Michael South Central.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will take note of that.

Hon. L. R. TULL: It is neither here nor there with me. That is his standard. He comes here and talks about morality. I am not saying that he is immoral. I am not going to say that at all. I am not going to say that he is a liar; but people heard what he had to say about \$60 million leaving the country in suitcases. I believe that I know that he travels sometimes and he knows what he is talking about. He uses suitcases when he is travelling.

Further, Mr. Chairman, in this whole business of the morality issue one should consider also the question of credibility, and of who lies and who does not lie. I cannot say that the hon. member is a liar. I would be asked to withdraw it; and believe me, Mr. Chairman, I have no intention whatsoever of ever withdrawing anything that I say about the hon. member; so I will be very careful about what I say. I am not calling him a liar. All that I would say is that the hon. member's affection for the truth is such that if the truth was going across this Chamber at the speed of Concorde, he would still be able to pick out air. That is the way he has always been. He has not changed. However, let us get on with the one armed bandits. He admits that he owns a company.....

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to your attention Rule 28(5) which says: "It shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about members of the House." I am submitting that to use the words which the member used relating to Concorde and the hon. member are offensive. (*Asides*).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not agree with you.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, when words of some importance are being spoken, wise men attend with open ears, and fools attend with open mouths. One would not believe that this man could be called a ninconpoop. I would not believe that; but the hon. member, as I was saying, is much like his predecessor - the man whom he has succeeded.

8.10 p.m.

He likes to run from licks. He gets in here and makes wild, foolish, untrue statements, and then when he is being answered he runs out of the Chamber. He will have a lot of running to do if he continues in that vein in here. He will have a lot of running to do, and I suspect that before long he is going to run from the licks he is going to get from members of his own side, because that is not the standard that they have been accustomed to either. I really have not been in this whole gambling thing, not yet, and I was only asking some questions because I heard about cheques and I have one here before me in which it is shown quite clearly that that company had an interest in that building all the way back in 1976 before the hon. member went to visit. Gambling machines were operating in that building at a date prior to when the hon. member on his own admission said he visited the building; so he must have known, and moreover, Mr. Chairman, it was a big issue in the campaign, but that building still houses a gambling operation, and when the hon. member has got the effrontery to walk in here and tell people that on moral grounds he is against this, that and the other, why hasn't he done something about it? If he did not know before, certainly it was brought to his attention before the election campaign. The election campaign is finished.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And the Commission has begun.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I feel a profound sadness for the people of St. Michael South Central because, Mr. Chairman, anybody, no matter how intelligent he is, can be fooled, and some strange things happened in St. Michael South Central, but I have no doubt that in the fullness of time they will do what they have to do.

I want to make one other point, Mr. Chairman, in respect of this whole issue of gambling because.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You can wind up now because your time has expired.

Hon. L. R. TULL: All right, Mr. Chairman. I only want to make one other point, and for a change it is off the hon. member. I understand that the gambling machines have been operating in Barbados long before the Barbados Labour Party took power, and I heard the hon. member for St. Michael North Central saying that if they were wrong we are wrong too. All I am interested in at this stage is whether it is true all the accusations I have been hearing. I am entitled to ask. I am a representative of the people in here. I want to know. I understand that many people on the Democratic Labour Party's side have been in the pay of the bandit operators and I want them to declare their interest in that regard. It is not fair to come in here and start this almost hypocritical debate.....no, I would not say that. It is not fair for them to come in

here and make these statements without declaring their interest.

In the City by-election I went down in Chapman Lane a Sunday morning and was almost lynched by a man called Parks, the biggest bandit operator in Barbados, and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central who was with him. There is a picture. The Nation, for all its weaknesses, left something for the country to remember, a photograph. It is there. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central was down in Chapman Lane with this big gambling operator, one Parks, and almost lynched me. I am speaking for myself. They confronted me down there; there was a hostile mood down there, and he says he does not know. I understand all of them; I do not mean all the hon. members. There are one or two clean ones over there, but a lot of them had their hands.....(Asides) All of them are clean.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should think so.

Hon. L. R. TULL: They are all clean, Mr. Chairman. That is one thing I like about my side, they always tell me when I am mashing the crease. But some strange things have been happening with them in respect of the money that the gambling operators were making before 2nd September, 1976, and I really wish if they are going to make a serious debate out of this one to get up and tell us all the things. There is still time. I heard the Hon. Attorney General say he is clean; I am clean too. I have not got a cent from any bandit operator either directly or indirectly. I am going to drive home this cleanness; I do not care what they say. I have not had any money from anybody in gambling and I have not had any money from anybody who seeks to influence Government policy through me, and I would like hon. members on the other side to get up and tell us about their role in these gambling operations instead of taking us through this perpetual nonsense or whether we legalised the machines, whether it is right or wrong and so on. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central used to play the horses in England. Don't tell me he does not gamble. He used to play the horses, and if I am not mistaken he used to play the dogs too in the Sixties.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Your time is up. Wind up, please.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I have heard that the word they are using on the platform nowadays is "sanctimonious". He comes in here like some sanctimonious, pious whatever it is and tries to make out that he is so much against gambling, it eats out the moral fabric of the society, he is concerned about the small man and how they take away money out of his

pocket. How long since has he been concerned about the small man in this country? I am not going to say anymore at this stage, Mr. Chairman. We will have a lot of interesting evenings in this Chamber before this year is over.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, it is sometimes strange that no matter what you do in Government you are wrong. Now I am only going over a few of the points because some very able and beautiful speeches were made here today on this side of the House. I do not have to go over them, especially that by the hon. member for St. Philip North. We came into power and found machines. We did what we believe to be right by legalising something that was illegal. It came to the Government's attention that people in this Island were questioning whether they were morally right for the country or otherwise, and the Government decides to set up a Commission to go in to find out the whys and the what-fors of the same slot machines, including other matters of gambling. Do you know that side tried to make a case out of not voting for the money? If they are genuinely concerned that slot machines are wrong and we are setting up a Commission to go into it, they should vote for the money.

Mr. Chairman, these people are catching at everything. Last week in this House the hon. member used two remarks both figuratively, because when he said "this is war", we know that war can only exist between two nations; it cannot exist between two political parties. It was figurative speech; it cannot exist between a man and his wife.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Get on with the Commission, please.

Mr. WARD: I am dealing with that, but I am only showing you how that side catches at everything. They are twisting everything. When the hon. member talked about nobody eating, it was figurative speech, but there is not one journalist in this country honest enough to give the hon. member the benefit of the doubt and to see that when he said "this is war" and that "nobody should eat" that it was figurative language. Nobody in this country has been honest enough to come out....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not now discussing the incident. Let us move on. I think you have made that point.

Mr. WARD: But, Mr. Chairman, we cannot satisfy that side no matter what we do. I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I have known the hon. member for St. James for 35 years, and today has been his greatest hour. A man who has humbled himself and said he was sorry is a great man, and he should not have said it in my opinion because what he said was figurative speech. He was

pushing a point and had no need to apologise for saying "this is war" and "nobody should eat" because he did not intend it literally, and I would like the journalists in this country to develop that point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on with the Commission.

Mr. WARD: Let the Nation Newspaper and Harold Hoyte know that he has done everything possible to destroy that hon. member, but it is going to end differently from that.

Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, to get back to the bandits, that party has no moral basis whatsoever to raise a matter concerning gambling in this country.
8.20 p.m.

They had a man who was Manager of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake who won four first prizes and three seconds. Can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, that a business could be run and people have got hold of the supposed winners and tried to write them to find out if they had the money, and not one could be found? They sent people in the cities to look for where they lived and no such address existed. It was a racket, so how could any member of the Democratic Labour Party raise a moral issue in relation to gambling in this island? And especially when we have had the courage to listen to the minds of the people and to set up a Commission to deal with it, and they say they are not voting for it?

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN rose.

Mr. GREAVES rose.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Does the hon. member wish to speak? I mean, I am ready to wind up the debate. The hon. member for St. Lucy did say he wishes to speak.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.... (*Asides*).... Mr. Chairman, on a point of order relating to the procedure of the House. I would like your guidance, because at the point when the hon. member for Christ Church North Central sat down the hon. member for St. Joseph got up on his feet, so any hesitation on this side of the House was merely because we recognised that the hon. member had got up and we wondered whether the hon. member wanted to speak.

Mr. GREAVES rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It would have been difficult for me to sit here without having to make an intervention in this debate,

and I want to make a point from the very outset that we have been following the rule in this House ever since you sat in that distinguished Chair that in Committee members can speak more than once, so that I was indicating to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central that he need not get too worried or too hurried, because he had an opportunity to speak again, so I just wanted to make that point.

Now I want to address my mind for a brief moment to the item which we are looking at here in Committee. We are being asked to vote the sum of \$25,000 under the Ministry of Finance and Planning — Direction and Policy Formulation, Item 15 — Expenses of Commissions, and the Prime Minister indicated that he was not particularly interested in pursuing the amendment to the note, but the point of the matter is that it falls under Commissions and at the same time attention has been focussed on this question of the one armed bandits.

I heard the hon. member for St. Philip North making reference to a speech which was delivered in here some time in 1964 by Mr. Frank Walcott on the question of an amendment to the Racing Service (Business Registration Premises) Act, 1964, something to do with racing, and he tried to indicate that that position which was taken on racing does not square with the position which the same hon. gentleman has taken on the one armed bandits, because in his view it was all gambling. I would agree entirely that buying sweepstake tickets and taking a chance with the one armed bandits is gambling, but, Mr. Chairman, in my view there is a difference, for the simple reason that there is the whole intent and certainly the whole effect which this kind — if you take the two kinds of gambling — there is a difference in the effect on the personality or the person involved.

Now, I think that anybody who is really honest and sincere would recognise the essential difference between buying a sweepstake ticket and playing the one armed bandits. As the member for St. Michael South Central has pointed out, there is a very deep and important psychological involvement when people play the one armed bandits. I have seen people standing before one of those machines and just literally giving away their week's pay, and there are hundreds of cases all over this country of people who have lost their week's pay on the one armed bandits. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that just about two weeks or so ago there was a woman who was convicted in the law courts in this country, and I believe that the Minister of Communications and Works would be aware of this, she was an employee of the Transport Board and she spent the money which she collected on the way bills, about \$700, all on the one armed bandits. That is just an indication of the kind of effect which this could have on people in this country.

I want further, Mr. Chairman, to make the point, and certainly to refute the kind of slant and the kind of impression which was created by the hon. member for St. Philip North and was started by the Hon. Attorney General. Now, let me deal with the Hon. Attorney General first. He indicated when he was referring to the workers' canteen at the Bridgetown Port that he attended the opening of the workers' canteen at the Bridgetown Port and that there were machines in the building when that workers' canteen was opened. Mr. Chairman, I was also there, the Attorney General was there, he was not Attorney General then, and the former member for St. Michael South Central who was then the Minister of Communications and Works was also there, as well as a number of people, and I want to state categorically that at the time when that canteen was opened there was not one one armed bandit in that building, and that can be substantiated quite easily.

8.30 p.m.

And I want to state categorically that at that opening there was not a one-armed bandit in that building. And that brings me to the point which the hon. member for St. Philip North has made, that he finds it difficult to understand the position which has been taken by the Barbados Workers Union on one-armed bandits and the Gambling Commission and that the Barbados Workers Union is the owner of a building in which one-armed bandits are installed. I want to state very clearly that the building in question is the building owned by the Barbados Government and rented...

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. There is a fundamental legal difference between the owner of a building and the lessee. In the course of my remarks I made it clear that the Barbados Workers Union was the lessee of the building and I want to make that abundantly clear to this House, because I cannot understand how they can talk about gambling when they had seventy-five different kinds of gambling last May day at Mangrove.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is taken.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I will not be sidetracked by that particular issue. The fact of the matter is that there were no one-armed bandits up there. There might have been bandits but not the one-armed bandits we are talking about, so that point by the hon. member is not significant. But the fact of the matter is that the Barbados Workers Union had been making representation for a recreation hall and a place for the workers at the Bridgetown Harbour to have luncheon facilities for a number of years, and when the Government indicated that there was a building which the workers could have for this kind of purpose, the building was rented. The Barbados Workers Union has nothing to do with the administration or rental of the building. But as the hon. member knows — and if he does not know the Ministry of Communications and Works can inform him —

I do not believe you will ever see a cheque from the Barbados Workers Union payable for the rent of that building; we have never operated the building. When the building was opened as a workers canteen, the first person renting it was a man by the name of Chester Jones and whatever profits were made out of it were his. The Barbados Workers Union got nothing out of it because it was purely a facility established for the workers. I believe it is now being operated by a man named Shirley Bryan. The Union has no particular involvement and Shirley Bryan pays the rent. I believe that since the Barbados Labour Party came into power the rent was raised from \$600 a month to \$1,000 a month. The Barbados Workers Union is not involved, so I do not understand the point the hon. member for St. Philip North is making. It seems that this has surprised even the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister; if they were not aware of this I am glad to have given them some indication of the matter. So now that we have got that straightened out we can move on with this debate and the matter we are really concerned about.

It is fairly clear that we have indicated from this side that we will vote against this Resolution for the simple reason that we feel that all these Commissions — and this Commission in particular — is a waste of public funds. It seems to me that the Government has got on to this Commission idea and that whenever there is a problem they are confronted with which they do not want to face squarely they pigeon-hole it into a Commission of Enquiry. And one got the impression when this Commission was set up that the Commission would report in nine months time, but I was privileged to hear the Prime Minister say today that the Commission will not necessarily report in nine months; it could very well report in the next eighteen months or at any time up to 1981 and report from time to time on any matter on which it has formulated an opinion. So we have to look at this thing in a very clear and distinct manner. There is no doubt in my mind that the issue of one-armed bandits has a very serious social and economic effect on this community and on a large number of people who have been drawn in by these monsters, and I would like the Prime Minister to take a very serious note of this. I believe he is aware of this already because, Mr. Chairman, as you may very well know, for the operation of one-armed bandits Barbados is divided into territories. There is a man who lives in St. Lucy, somewhere above Connell Town, and I was privileged to hear a conversation between himself and a friend of mine, and he said he has permission to bring in 42 bandits and his area of operation is St. Peter and St. Lucy. And I am saying I am very concerned, when, for example, I see in Pie Corner the way in which youngsters are attracted to these machines. And this is happening in all the rural areas previously untouched by this kind of social evil; and now we find that these bandits are spreading their deadly tentacles throughout this country, and I think we ought to sit up and take note.

Mr. Chairman, just let me give you another indication of the kind of effect which this is having.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You can get ready to wind up; you have about a minute and a half.

Mr. GREAVES: Very well Sir. I have a friend with whom I operate programmes on a regional basis and when he comes to Barbados he normally stays at the Caribbee Hotel. He was here in June and was back in July. When here in June he told me he did not realize that the one-armed bandits had this kind of effect on people and he was amazed to find that the service at the Caribbee Hotel had dropped considerably because what was happening was that the people working at the hotel involved in serving the guests, whenever they got extra money they would go to the one-armed bandits and neglect the guests. And he was further appalled to find that young children of eleven and twelve years old were going into the hotel and playing the one-armed bandits. You can stand outside and see the bandits.

The last point I want to make: we heard a lot about the Truss affair and one-armed bandits and I do not think we ever got a proper explanation on the floor of this House about this matter, and I think the Prime Minister owes it to the country his party and himself to give a proper explanation of these one-armed bandits involving Mr. Truss and the subsequent resignation of the Comptroller of Customs.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to repeat anything I have already said today. I have already spoken very clearly on my moral position in relation to the operation of one-armed bandits in this country. I have also made it perfectly clear that it is a very serious....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The previous Parliament used to restrict Committee deliberation to one speech by a member. We speak twice if there is more than one Item. There is only one Item in this Resolution. We raised this at the start of Parliament and it was understood that no member should speak more than once on any one Item — the Rules say at any one time.

8.40 p.m.

While I have no desire to muzzle the hon. member, the debate must have an end, and I must be given an opportunity to wind up the debate. He may be able to make a point of explanation at the next meeting of the House, and it may be better because I would not be able to answer that. (Mr. TAITT: You cannot bully anybody) I am not trying to bully

anybody. I am just suggesting that this is a one-item Resolution. I would not be surprised if the three hours have not passed — what time did the debate start?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would have to check with Mr. Clerk.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: This is a one-item Resolution. We are not going to abuse the generosity of the — I hope that the hon. member is not going to delay the time so as to abuse the generosity of the majority, so to speak, Sir. I think that by leave he can have a chance to speak again; but I would like to wind up the debate.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what?

Mr. TAITT: On the question of the procedure of the House. At the beginning of the session, Sir, it was agreed, and the Chair ruled that a person may speak more than once in Committee. Full stop. I think that it is out of order for the hon. member to get up now and talk about a one-item Resolution. I have never heard the question of one item until tonight. We cannot have rules laid down and set out by the Hon. Prime Minister, however it might be that he has a majority. The Chair ruled, and our understanding was and is that you can speak more than once. Now he has come in here with an additional point to the Rule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is taken.

Mr. TAITT: Thank you.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to deprive the hon. member for St. Thomas from speaking, as he seems so anxious to do. I just want to make it absolutely clear that my position on the moral, social and economic consequences of having the one-armed bandits in Barbados, as I have said today, is a total disaster for this country and should be banned at once, commission or no commission. There is only one other little point that will only take me a minute or so. I will on this occasion, and on all subsequent occasions, ignore any personal attacks on me by the member for St. George South. I would just simply like to say this: I certainly have absolutely no financial interests in any one-armed bandit operation of any kind in this country. I am a shareholder in a company that owns a building in Bridgetown. We have never given permission to anyone to operate one-armed bandits in that building. The situation is that it is now a legal position despite the fact that they

had a clause in the lease saying that no illegal business could take place in there; and there is nothing we can do about it until the lease expires next year, and at that time they will no longer be able to continue that business in that particular building.

There is one other point I would like to make, and it is that the company which operates the one-armed bandits in that building — a company called Dorson Amusements Ltd. — I think it is — is not the person to whom the building was let. So in point of fact, the entity that operates the one-armed bandits is not the person to whom we rented the building anyhow; and nothing comes to that company except in terms of rental of the building which is well below the average rate of rental for buildings in the Bridgetown area.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this debate and the course that it has taken has disappointed me in a parliamentary sense, but it has not surprised me in the light of what I expected from the Opposition. The hon. members ignored the Bill about one-armed bandits and amusement arcades and chose to take their ground on gambling generally; but when they had the opportunity to talk about gambling generally, they talked about the one-armed bandits.

Why they did this I cannot tell. They could have made half hour speeches on Order No. 2 and then spoken on every clause in Committee and made all their points clear; and I am a little disappointed because I had expected when they ignored the first Bill they would talk generally about gambling on the second, rather than talking about one-armed bandits. I would like to say that I appreciate the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael North Central. Of course I thought the speech of the hon. member for St. Philip North was very outstanding; and also the speech of the Hon. Attorney General and the speech of the hon. member for Christ Church North Central. If I had to reserve special praise, however, I really would have to thank my colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister, for the demolition job that he did on the absurd pretensions of the latest addition to our ranks.

I have seldom in my life heard a more irresponsible speech than the speech I heard from the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. I tried hard to recall when in here I had ever witnessed or listened to a speech in which unproved allegations were thrown about so casually, and in which the Hon. Leader of the House so pointedly said, a man confessed to having knowledge of criminal offences and yet has not brought them before the appropriate authorities. For his information, knowledge of an exchange control offence can be conveyed to the Exchange Control Authority who is the Minister of Finance, and who has delegated his powers to the Central Bank.

8.50 p.m.

I expect that from the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and if he does not do it, he can expect something from me. He will either withdraw his allegation that he has certain knowledge of Exchange Control offences, or he will have to face something in here relating to his conduct. You cannot come in here and talk about \$60 million. I would be glad to know the sources from which he can make his estimations. The Commissioner of Inland Revenue would be glad to know. Never mind the bad economic method. He is an economic innocent. His expertise lies in a field where you have to make instant diagnoses, were on very little evidence you have to come to conclusions and indeed it is an expertise which is admired in this and other societies, because you have to come to conclusions in matters of life and death. In matters in which we can take a more leisurely look at facts, we tend to go on the principle that before we say something, we check it carefully first.

I do not believe that the hon. member can for a moment substantiate any figure relating to \$60 million; but even if he could substantiate such a figure, his economic innocence shows through when he ignores the fact that out of the \$60 million over five years you have to pay staff, you have to pay rent for premises. In many premises you have to pay 25% of the gross to the owner of the premises as his proportion, because many agreements have been submitted to the Gaming Committee. The Gaming Committee calls for these agreements and they are submitted showing that generally that is what is charged by the owners of the premises. You have to pay the licence fees; you have to pay \$2,000 per machine per year, and you have to pay the employment levy. The Corporations that run gambling are paying thousands of dollars every month employment levy on the taxes of their employees; so the fancy figure of \$60 million, which is not true, and even if it were true, the fancy figure being bruted about is a gross figure which has to be netted down to an ultimate figure that might represent the true return. That is all I can say.

The hon. member said there is starvation in this country. All I can say is that I have no evidence of starvation in this country. He is a doctor. If he knows about it, he should submit it to the Minister of Health. I believe he would find a more sympathetic audience even in the present Minister of Health than he ever found in the hon. member for St. Michael North Central who so mercilessly exposed some of his falsehoods on previous occasions when he was not a member of this House, who so mercilessly dealt with him at the Medical Association only to discover that he was dealing with the second most powerful man in Barbados at that time. They are the ones who will deal with him, the hon. member for St. Michael South West and the hon. member for St. Michael North Central. I do not have to spend time dealing with him.

The hon. member said "I object to the introduction and particularly to the legislation of the one-armed

bandits". Do you know what that means? That he wanted them left illegal. He objected to the introduction and in particular to the legalisation. I copied down his very words; that is what he said. Well I cannot deal with a man who says that he thought they should continue to be illegal and going on paying him the rent in Haymills. I must tell you, Mr. Chairman, that not for one moment do I believe that he did not know that there were bandits in Haymills in 1974, 1975 and 1976. I believe that in 1973 when they began to come to this country that Mr. Martindale, known as "Castro", was contacted, and I believe that Mr. Martindale made contact with the Leaders of the Democratic Labour Party including the hon. member who then had the old Democrat building in Nelson Street under his control; and I believe that the entire going into that building in Nelson Street was for the purpose of expanding the operation of the one-armed bandits. I believe so. I believe Castro Amusement Centre was set up in Nelson Street to have a bigger stage for the operation of the bandits when they were illegal.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I think that the hon. member for St. Thomas is suggesting that I was in some way involved in an illegal activity in facilitating the setting up of an illegal one-armed bandit business in Nelson Street. That would seem to me to be quite wrong, and certainly totally untrue.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. If the hon. member thinks I am accusing him of facilitating it, perhaps I am using language that is imprecise. The police actually said in those days that the machines were not illegal; they were in limbo. I think all hon. members will agree that the position of the machines was in a limbo for a length of time. There are all sorts of unanswered questions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are getting very close to 9 o'clock.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I know we are getting close, and I am sure hon. members will let me deal with it. We have had examples of a speech made on the platform by the Leader of the Opposition in which he could say he could give the address and telephone number of the whereabouts in Miami from which the one-armed bandits were supplied to Barbados, and he could say what the people in the warehouse looked like. He could say that the machines were packed up there and marked personal effects and sent to Barbados, and he was the Minister of Customs. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition knew that these machines were coming into Barbados at that time. I did not know anything about any warehouse in Miami until I heard the Leader of the Opposition's speech. The first I know of the address is

when I heard his speech, and I think that the fact that he was in Miami for six months at the end of 1973 and the bandits were seen in this country in numbers early in 1974 is no coincidence.

Anyway, the hon. member for St. Michael South West spoke about the Churches, spoke about the amount of employment and said that the Mafia comes in. This is a point I really would like to make before I have to stop. The point is this. The Mafia always comes in when they are illegal. That is an invariable rule; the criminal element. When you legalise them, experience does not bear out his statement, and I would like to read paragraph 24(6) from the British Royal Commission on Gambling — I will have a copy laid in the House in due course — under Lord Rothchild. This is what they said about the slot machines:

"The great up surge of controlled gaming in the mid-sixties was accompanied by criminal activities associated with the supply of slot machines, particularly the jackpot variety in the rapidly multiplying casinos. Because of their profitability the machines lent themselves to protection racket under which club proprietors were compelled by means of threats to install them on profit sharing terms although even before the 1968 Act these were supposed to be illegal where jackpot machines were concerned. The abuses dictated the nature of the remedies applied by the Act. They were mainly of two kinds: first, a requirement that those who sold, supplied or contracted to maintain machines within the meaning of the Act should be certificated by the Gaming Board."

And then it goes on to set out the second reason. Now we have in this Act that we have dealt with earlier today tighter conditions than they have in Britain. The criminal activities have been eliminated in Britain by the certification and inspection procedure, and we actually have tighter conditions. In Britain you can import a machine freely; not into Barbados. You have to have a licence. In Britain the only consideration is the character of the person applying; in Barbados there are certain directives that foreigners cannot operate them and so on which limit it even more. We have already many of the things that the Royal Commission is recommending for Britain. It has succeeded in stamping out criminal activity in Britain, and I myself believe that there is no criminal activity in the bandits at the moment. There are something like 400 machines in Barbados; there are 33,000 gambling machines in Great Britain, and I believe that if they have managed under these conditions to keep it down that we have also managed and perhaps can manage, but I do not want to anticipate the Commission. 9.00 p.m.

There is one final other point which should be made in answer to the member for St. Michael South. It is really quite absurd to speak of wasting taxpayers' money

on this Commission, because the gambling machines bring in, gambling brings in in revenue over \$2 million a year. If the machines were not there we would not have the money, if you say close down the machines you are putting a much greater burden on the taxpayers than if you spend \$25,000 to investigate their usefulness. That is completely out of it, because if there is one thing it is that gambling can pay ten times over, a hundred times over, for the cost of the Commission. Nearly \$2½ million probably comes in from gambling, we are spending no more than 1% of the revenue from gambling on this Commission, and it is the worst kind of argument to say that it is a waste of money.

Did you read what Mr. Crichlow said, a great friend of the hon. member for St. Michael South West? He can no doubt confirm its truthfulness. Crichlow said that he pays \$42,000 every six months for his machines. Well, he is paying for the Commission and even some left over, and he is only one operator.

Last of all, Sir, hon. members seem to have forgotten that a review of gambling legislation in Barbados was promised in 1977 at the time that the Betting and Gaming Duties Act was introduced into the House. The Gaming Act was passed in 1917, and it contains a lot of archaic provisions not socially suitable for the Barbados of today, and it is time that the general law on gambling was reviewed over and above the taxing provisions, and we have new forms of revenue which fortunately allow us to have a little cash in hand to undertake the work of this Commission which I urge on hon. members.

A final point not related to my speech. I am asking you to advise the hon. member for St. Michael South Central that while subjectively he may not feel that he has a direct pecuniary interest in the matter under consideration, the objective view of the Director of Public Prosecutions may be otherwise, and advise the hon. member that section 30 of the Parliamentary Privileges and Immunities Act is a serious penal section. My humble opinion, it may be wrong, is that he is already in breach of it in having spoken without revealing his interest. If he now votes he may be in a very sticky situation indeed. I am just suggesting this, it really is a matter of order than any thing else, he has admitted in here that he is a shareholder in a company which owns a building in which an amusement arcade is situated. He has admitted that, in his own interest he should take care, sit down, abstain, whatever — it is not for me to give him advice — in his own interest he should take care, otherwise let his fate be in his own hands. This is his second day in here, we do not want to take any unfair advantage of him, he has done a very foolish thing, but he probably lacks advice where he is sitting down. He has done a very foolish thing, I do not believe any hon. member really deeply wants to see him led into more foolishness.

I beg to move that the Resolution 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^{bles}. H. B. St. JOHN, H. deB. FORDE, L. S. CRAIG, C. L. BOLDEN, L. B. BRATHWAITE and L. R. TULL; Messrs. BRADSHAW, SISNETT, CHELTENHAM, SIMMONS, WARD and JOHNSON; His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE – 14

NOES: Messrs. CADDLE, TAITT, GREAVES, HAYNES and SANDIFORD – 5

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move that this Resolution be now agreed to.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

AYES: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon^{bles}. H. B. St. JOHN, H. deB. FORDE, L. S. CRAIG, C. L. BOLDEN, L. B. BRATHWAITE and L. R. TULL, Messrs. BRADSHAW, SISNETT, CHELTENHAM, SIMMONS, WARD, ODLE and JOHNSON; His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE – 15

NOES: Messrs. CADDLE, TAITT, GREAVES, HAYNES and SANDIFORD – 5.

9.10 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today. It is planned, Sir, that there will be two more meetings of the House before the recess, but that depends on what matters may arise, but that is our present intention.

I beg to move, Sir, that this House do now adjourn until 1st August, 1978, at 12 Noon.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

The question that the House do now adjourn until 1st August, 1978 at 12 Noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

9.15 p.m.