



TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

Debates of the House of Representatives

2nd Session . . . 2nd Parliament . . . Volume 9 . . . Number 32

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

THE HONOURABLE C. ARNOLD THOMASOS
SPEAKER

Friday, July 12, 1968

EDITOR: FERDINAND DOUGLAS

TELEPHONE: 54985

GOVERNMENT PRINTERY, TRINIDAD, TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO—1968

CONTENTS

	Column
PAPERS LAID	1231
SAHOYE, Mrs. PHILOMENA—[Mr. A. M. Baksh]	1231
COCOA AND COFFEE INDUSTRY (AMENDMENT) BILL— [Hon. J. H. O'Halloran]	
First Reading	1233
CUSTOMS (IMPORT DUTY) ORDER—[Hon. F. C. Prevatt]	1233
NATIONAL LOTTERIES BILL—[Hon. F. C. Prevatt]	
Second Reading... ..	1306
Committee	1306
Third Reading	1307
INVESTMENT DISPUTES AWARDS (ENFORCEMENT) BILL— [Hon. F. C. Prevatt]	
Second Reading... ..	1311
Committee	1311
Third Reading	1312

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, 12th July, 1968

The House met at 2.05 p.m.

PRAYERS

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

PAPERS LAID

1. The Customs (Import Duty) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1968—[The Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Finance].

2. The Report of the Auditor General on the Accounts of the Queen's Hall Board for the year ended 30th June, 1967—[The Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Finance].

To be referred to the Public Accounts Committee.

3. The Defence (Rates of Pay and Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 1966.—[The Minister of Home Affairs and Personnel].

4. The Old Toco Main Road (Discontinuance) Order, 1968.—[The Minister of Works].

SAHOYE, Mrs. PHILOMENA

Mr. A. M. Baksh: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House under No. 12 of the Standing Orders of the House of Representatives as provided for under (i) of today's Order Paper for the purpose of discussing the following definite matter of urgent public business.

The matter which I respectfully submit comes under this Standing Order relates to the detention of Mrs. Philomena Sahoye for three and one half hours yesterday in the Customs area of the Piarco International Airport by security officials and the seizure of her property.

The matter is definite because it concerns a fixed and definite incident which occurred yesterday between the hours 1.00 p.m. and 4.30 p.m. at the Piarco International Airport.

This matter is urgent because the lady is a prominent citizen of our sister nation in Carifta who has come here for a few days on the invitation of our citizens and her documents are necessary for the execution of her business, and the reflection on the good name of our nation should be speedily cleared.

This matter is public because it is a general observation that citizens and residents of our country have been registered for the purpose of an election in Guyana, that the hon. Prime Minister of that country communicated his point of view last month in Port-of-Spain and that Mrs. Sahoye's visit and material will be shared by the people and her relationship and experience here are international and the conduct of public servants is a matter of general public concern.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Gentleman asked leave to move the adjournment of the House pursuant to Standing Order 12 for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the detention of Mrs. Philomena Sahoye for three and a half hours in the Customs area of Piarco International Airport.

I cannot accede to the request of the hon. Member; it is not within the Standing Order and there has been no departure from the ordinary administration of law.

**BILL PRESENTED
Cocoa and Coffee Industry
(Amendment) Bill**

Bill to amend the Cocoa and Coffee Industry Ordinance, 1961, presented by the Minister of Industry, Commerce and Petroleum; read the First time.

CUSTOMS (IMPORT DUTY) ORDER

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. F. C. Prevatt): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the following motion:

Whereas it is provided by section 6 of the Customs Ordinance that notwithstanding anything contained in section 5 of the said Ordinance the Governor-General may by Order (a) increase or reduce any import or export duty of customs, or (b) impose new import or export duties of customs, and from the date of publication of such order, in the *Gazette*, and until the expiry of such order, the duties specified in such order shall be payable in lieu of any duties payable prior thereto:

And whereas it is provided by section 7 of the said Ordinance that every Order issued by the Governor-General under section 6 shall after four days and within twenty-one days from the date of its first publication be submitted to the Senate and House of Representatives, and the Senate and the House of Representatives may by Resolution confirm, amend or revoke such Order, and upon publication of the Resolution of the Senate and the House of Representatives in the *Gazette* the Resolution shall have effect and the Order shall then expire:

And whereas the Customs (Import Duty) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1968, was

made under section 6 of the said Ordinance and published in the *Gazette* on the 1st day of July, 1968:

And whereas it is expedient to confirm the said Order.

Be it Resolved:

That the Customs (Import Duty) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1968, which was laid on the table at an earlier stage of the proceedings be confirmed.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution seeks to ratify the decision taken at the Kennedy Round of Trade negotiations which started in Geneva in May, 1964. The objective of these negotiations which were conducted within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was to stimulate world trade by an all round reduction on tariffs and other trade barriers. As a result of these negotiations Trinidad and Tobago agreed not to increase the tariffs on 72 items which appear in our Customs tariffs and to decrease tariffs on 41 items. The decrease of 4 of these items has already been provided for in the 1968 budget, and the resolution before the House seeks to make provision for the other 37 items for the reduction of which we made an international commitment at the negotiations in Geneva. In the case of 2 items, numbers of the present customs tariffs should be divided in order to give effect to our commitments which only affect a part of these items. They are now classified, and this explains (b), (c), (d) and (e), of section 2 of the Order.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move.

2.15 p.m.

Question proposed.

Question put and agreed to.

Resolved:

That the Customs (Import Duty) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1968, which was laid on the table at an earlier stage of the proceedings be confirmed.

NATIONAL LOTTERIES BILL

Order for Second reading read.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. F. C. Prevatt): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move,

That a Bill to provide for the establishment of a National Lotteries Control Board for the promotion and conduct of national lotteries, be now read a Second time.

The question of the establishment and operation of a national lottery in Trinidad and Tobago has been extensively debated for several years both inside and outside of this House. Some sections of the population have opposed the entire subject of the introduction of a national lottery, as indeed they have opposed other forms of gambling in the country. We recognize the nature of these objections and we understand their basis, but I believe that even this body of dissenting opinion will agree that the overwhelming body of opinion in this country is against them and is in fact in favour of the establishment of a properly controlled and efficiently operated national lottery, which will assist in the provision of much needed facilities in the country, which will be competently regulated and which will not increase the wealth of any particular operator but rather mobilize resources for development for the national welfare.

It is not therefore necessary for me to repeat the arguments which have been advanced in favour, or against the establishment, of the national lottery. Suffice it to say

that national lotteries are operated in a wide area of the globe in countries with different religious persuasion, different forms of government, and different political systems. At random I may mention that national lotteries are operated in most of the countries of South and Central America, Puerto Rico, Curacao, Santo Domingo and Guyana; in certain States of the United States of America; in France, Spain, Italy and in Mauritius. A national lottery of a certain form is operated in the United Kingdom through the issue of premium bonds.

A national lottery is not different in concept from other games of chance as, for example, sweepstakes, bingos, football pools and raffles. These have had a long and respectable history in this country and in fact they are a particularly familiar way by which most of the recognized and nationally supported charitable institutions raise funds to carry out their very important work.

The introduction of a national lottery, therefore, is not an innovation or the introduction of a new pattern of behaviour in the country. What is an innovation is the introduction of a national lottery as provided for in the Bill now presented to this hon. House, a Bill in which the Government are seeking to harness for national purposes and to bring under national control, supervision and direction, a form of gambling which is extensively practised in this country to ensure equitable treatment to the participants in this game of chance, and at the same time to apply the proceeds raised from participation in this game of chance to promote national development as distinct from individual or sectional development. This is the aspect which, I submit, should attract the attention of this hon. House. I should like, Sir, to draw attention to some of the specific features of the Bill which bear this out.

Friday, 12th July, 1968

The Bill seeks to establish a National Lotteries Board to operate the lottery and it makes provisions for the board to have ample staff and resources to operate. Provision is made for a loan from the Consolidated Fund in the amount of \$500,000 to enable the board to commence its operations and continue in operation until its receipts are adequate to meet its expenses. It is the intention of the Government to ensure that the board is comprised of people of high integrity and ability who will be able to operate the lottery fairly and effectively and to meet all the obligations prescribed in this Bill.

The Bill also provides ample powers in order to permit the board to operate a well run national lottery, and reference to clause 9 will indicate that the board will have adequate flexibility to discharge its obligations. At the same time, however, since the national lottery is being run in the national interest it is necessary at all times for the board to be made aware of its national responsibilities. This is ensured through clause 10 of the Bill which prescribes that the Minister of Finance shall be empowered to give general and specific directions to the board.

Mr. Speaker, it is a common observation of many participants in games of chance in this country that not only is their participation one of chance but the possibility of their collecting their prize money is also very much a question of chance. Many Members of this House will have received reports of extreme difficulty encountered by certain people in receiving their just payments. The National Lotteries Bill gives adequate protection to the participants against this eventuality.

Clause 22, sub-paragraph (3), gives to participants the added assurance that regardless of the current financial position of the

lottery, legitimate and *bona fide* claims in respect of prize money and legitimate claims in respect of expenses incurred by the board will always be met. At the same time, Sir, the Bill ensures that the national effort will not be frustrated by any unscrupulous people. And clause 11 of the Bill provides that any officer or servant in the service of the Lottery Board should be required to give security for the due execution of his duties.

The Bill brings the operations of the National Lottery under the general and specific control of Parliament. It does this in several ways. First of all it provides for any surplus standing in the name of the lottery at the end of the year, in other words, the profits of the National Lottery, to be paid into the Consolidated Fund and therefore to be available for disposition by Parliament in accordance with purposes determined by it.

Secondly, clause 24 of this Bill defines the National Lottery accounts as Public Accounts within the meaning of section 90 of the Constitution and therefore makes the National Lottery subject to examination by the Public Accounts Committee of this House. In this connexion also the Bill provides that the accounts of the National Lottery Board shall be audited by the Auditor General who is responsible only to Parliament.

Clause 25 sub-paragraph (4) requires the Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of this House and therefore lay open to inspection and debate by this House a copy of the annual statement and accounts and the annual report of the National Lottery.

Mr. Speaker, I have made specific mention of these particular provisions of the Bill in order to emphasize the following:

1. It is the intention of the Government as expressed in this Bill to ensure that the National Lottery which has

Friday, 12th July, 1968

received overwhelming support in this country should be properly run and effectively administered;

2. The participants in this game of chance will be adequately protected and will receive their just winnings at all times; and
3. The operations of the National Lottery will at all times bear in mind the national and not any sectional interest.

And, finally, of greatest importance, it is the intention of the Government that Parliament will be able to examine and keep under continuous surveillance the operation of the National Lottery and the business of the National Lotteries Board in order to ensure that the methods of operation will always be able to stand up to scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move.

Question proposed.

Mrs. L. A. E. Wight: Mr. Speaker, we are positively against an Act to provide for the establishment of a National Lotteries Control Board for the promotion and conduct of national lotteries, and we have no intention whatsoever of supporting it. For many reasons we have come to this conclusion. First, there are far too many loopholes in the Bill; secondly, anything that Government touch is a fiasco from a financial point of view; thirdly, there is far too much unemployment to encourage national gambling; fourthly, we assume this Bill will curtail organizations, despite what the Minister has just said from raising money for worthwhile projects and associations; and fifthly, we do not see the need for a national lottery considering that our income per capita is one of the highest in the world though of course we do realize that our finances are among the worst spent in the world.

Mr. Speaker, let us take some of these points one by one. The matter of loopholes. Some of these loopholes are big enough to lasso a rhinoceros. Let us turn to clause 9 (4) of the Bill. It reads:

"(f) incur such other expenses as may be necessary for organizing and conducting the lottery."

This is far too ambiguous, "such other expenses" could mean anything. It could mean prizes for cock fighting or whe whe. Let us look at another clause—

Clause 20.

"The Minister may advance from the Consolidated Fund . . ."

that is taxpayers money, of course—

" . . . such amount not exceeding five hundred thousand dollars as may be necessary to meet the cost of establishing the Board and the expenses incurred in the promotion and conduct of the first national lottery."

At this stage I would like to add that possibly the amount should be \$350,000 which is collected by Government every year through the sale of sweepstake tickets, rather than dipping into the Treasury. And the clause goes on to say:

" . . . Any advances shall be by way of loan with or without interest as the Minister may determine."

Obviously, we must know whether such a loan carries interest or not.

Clause 22 (3).

"If at any time the sum standing to the credit of the National Lotteries Account is insufficient to meet, either wholly or in part, the payment of prizes in respect of a national lottery or any expenses connected therewith, the Minister may by

warrant authorize the withdrawal from the Consolidated Fund of such sum as may be required to meet the deficit and such sum may be advanced to the Board as a loan with or without interest as the Minister may determine."

Mr. Speaker, how can we be expected to sign a blank cheque so that the Minister may dip his hand, a clumsy inexperienced hand I may add, into the Consolidated Fund in order to pay gambling debts? This is highly immoral.

Clause 25:

"All decisions, orders, rules and regulations relating to the financial operations of the Board and authorized by this Act shall be made by resolution of the Board at a meeting thereof and shall be recorded in the minutes of the Board."

Obviously, we must know something about the rules and regulations of the board beforehand, even if we had decided to support the Bill.

Clause 26 (2).

"All payments out of the funds of the Board except petty disbursements not exceeding such sums . . ."

these words "such sums" turn up so often—
". . . to be fixed by the rules . . ."
another obnoxious loophole.

Let us take the point of Government's fiasco in touching anything financial. We have a very good example with the previous Telephone Company. We know the story very well; I am not going into detail except briefly to refer to it. We know that a few years ago through jealousy—that same jealousy that exists today—and arrogance, the Government decided that the Directors of the Company had no right to make a profit neither had the shareholders a right to dividends, and that all the profits should

go into the Consolidated Fund and they therefore proceeded to buy out the Company.

2.35 p.m.

They decided to grab the goose that laid the golden egg and succeeded in chopping off the goose's bottom, and were left with a bunch of feathers, which left Trinidad and Tobago with the worse run telephone service in the world. And then having made a terrible mess of the finances, and having spent millions and millions of borrowed capital plus interest for capital expenditure and expansion, they then found themselves in a most unholy mess. So on bended knees they returned to the private sector—this time an American Company—and sold 50 per cent of the assets for a paltry ten million dollars.

Here again today we have history repeating itself. Government want to grab all the golden eggs that others may gather to swell the Consolidated Fund, but we say "Not on your life. We will not chop off this bottom or give you the chance to do so".

The third point I would like to refer to is unemployment. Let us face it, Mr. Speaker, the country has reached to its height of unemployment. The destitute and the despairing might well borrow money to try their luck, since their luck is in no other avenue. Today there is not much cash floating around, not like many years ago, when people could take a small gamble. I think a very good indication of this, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that ten or twelve years ago the first prize in the sweepstake was in the vicinity of \$40,000. Today it has fallen into the vicinity of \$10,000. This is partly due to unemployment and partly due to the fact that people no longer have the money they used to have to gamble with, and therefore this Act is extremely badly timed, and obviously will flop.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the Act will obviously curtail clubs and other organizations from raising money for worthwhile projects, institutions, charities and so on. We know only too well, for instance, the Lions Club has done a lion's job in providing for many organizations. I read recently, despite what the Minister who has presented this Bill may have to say, that their fund raising operation was curtailed because of the National Lotteries Bill to be presented to Parliament soon. They have raised hundreds of thousands of dollars. Whether it was to provide refrigeration for fishermen, or to provide for our athletes going to the Olympic Games, or whatever it may have been, it was a wonderful job wonderfully done by a band of people who worked voluntarily and gave of their free time. There is no body going to give of their free time with regard to the National Lottery.

Also, Mr. Speaker, what about the sweepstake tickets run by the Trinidad Turf Club? We cannot forget their contributions to worthwhile causes. This Bill tells us nothing about what percentage of the takings on the sales of tickets will be given to any such cause or for that matter be given as prize money. Perhaps Government could take a pattern from the Turf Club in this instance.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Minister who will run the national lottery to include percentages as a guide to the public, because the public is not aware as to whether 1 per cent of the takings or 5 per cent of the takings will be given as prize money. I am therefore suggesting that they could use as a yardstick, the Trinidad Turf Club's percentage table. Their prize money amounts to 43½ per cent. Obviously the Government will have to provide prize money. The sellers' commission amounts to 24½ per cent; charity—5½ per cent; expenses 8 per cent; owners of horses

—well of course this is in conjunction with a race meeting, whilst the national lottery is not—9 per cent; and the Club Fund—9½ per cent. So that when you buy a sweepstake ticket you know precisely how your money is spent. But what is extremely important is the fact that the Government collects 30 per cent of the gross takings; that is 15 cents on every 50 cents ticket, which means, 30 cents on every dollar worth of tickets sold. This amount amounted in 1967 to a total of \$309,975. That is for doing literally nothing. This cheque is dumped in Government's lap without their raising an eyelash or a toe nail, or having any trouble of overhead expenses—a gift from the gods without any organization.

Added to that amount they get 10 per cent on every ticket that draws a winning number—that is, every winning ticket. This amounted to \$31,482. Then they also get a charity tax of 10 per cent. on moneys paid out to charities, which amounted to \$3,978. That cheque was paid to the Accountant General. Then there is a development fund which gets 8 per cent and which amounted to \$2,135. So that when you add all these sums together, Sir, it is in the vicinity of \$350,000, actually \$348,000 plus.

In 1967, many organizations benefited to the tune of \$39,780.12. I have been connected, in one way or the other with many of these organizations in the past, and I know that their only little ray of hope and sunshine is looking forward annually to this little hand out, this little gift from the Turf Club. Because without it, in many cases, they would not be able to meet their overhead expenses. And, Sir, these committees could easily be numbered among those who are cut up about the national lottery trying to usurp the functions of other charitable organizations.

I want to read what I think is very, very important regarding the various organizations that have benefited from the sweepstakes. It might take a little time, Sir, but we have spent, in the past, sometimes two or three

2.45 p.m.

This is the prize money from the Tobago Race Club Meeting:

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION TO CHARITIES OF THE AMOUNTS RECEIVED FROM THE CHARITY TAX IMPOSED ON SWEEPSTAKES RUN IN CONNECTION WITH TOBAGO RACE CLUB SPRING MEETING, 1967

	\$	c.
Charity Tax on 50c. Sweepstake	6,121	50
Less 10% Accountant General (118: Deposit (216: Charity Tax (T.T.C. Unallocated)	612	15
Balance to be distributed as under	<u>\$5,509</u>	<u>35</u>
Major and Minor Organisations (Island-wide)		%
1. Child Welfare League	14	771 30
2. Nursery School Association	14	771 30
3. Tobago Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	3	165 28
4. Scarborough Breakfast Shed	6	330 56

Hon. Member: It is tea she is working up to [Laughter].

Mrs. L. Wight: I hope the Members opposite are listening well so that they will know where many of the Tobago organisations get their money from.

5. Mason Hall Breakfast Shed	6	330 56
6. Plymouth Breakfast Shed	6	330 56
7. Church of England Poor	11	606 03
8. Roman Catholic Poor	9	495 84
9. Heart and Hand Fund	4	220 37

Mr. B. Maraj: Nothing for the Hindus.

Mrs. L. Wight:

10. Almshouse Committee	0½	27 58
11. Junior Red Cross	1	55 09

Friday, 12th July, 1968

hours listening to a preamble of the budget for instance the price of Nigerian cocoa in 1902 and so on.

Friday, 12th July, 1968

Mr. B. Maraj: Nothing for the Hindus or the Muslims.

Mrs. L. Wight:

12. Building Fund for the Aged	3	165 28
13. Tobago Advisory Board to the Trinidad and Tobago Blind Welfare Association	1½	82 63
14. Homes for the Aged	8	440 75
15. Development Fund	8	440 75
16. Goodwill Industries	5	275 47
	<u>100</u>	<u>\$5,509 35</u>

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION TO CHARITIES OF THE AMOUNTS RECEIVED FROM THE CHARITY TAX IMPOSED ON SWEEPSTAKES RUN IN CONNECTION WITH U.P.T.C. EASTER SWEEPSTAKE, 1967

	\$	c.
Charity Tax on 50c. Sweepstake	5,563	25
Less 10% Accountant General (118: Deposit (216: Charity Tax (T.T.C. Unallocated)	556	33
Balance to be distributed as under	<u>\$5,006</u>	<u>92</u>

Major and Minor Organisations (Island-wide)	%	\$	c.
1. St. Vincent de Paul Society	8	400	55
2. Trinidad and Tobago Blind Welfare Association	8	400	55
3. Child Welfare League	8	400	55
4. Trinidad and Tobago Red Cross Society	3	150	20
5. Trinidad Legion	3	150	20
6. Tuberculosis Association	2½	125	17
7. Association in Aid of the Deaf	3½	175	24
8. Trinidad Leprosy Relief Association	3½	175	24
9. Belmont Orphanage	3½	175	24
10. Salvation Army	3½	175	24
11. Day Nursery Association	2½	125	17
12. Trinidad and Tobago Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	1½	75	10
13. Belmont Orphanage (After Care)	3	150	20
14. Tacarigua Orphan Home	3	150	20
15. Tacarigua Orphan Home (After Care)	2	100	14

National Lotteries Bill Friday, 12th July, 1968 National Lotteries Bill
[Mrs. L. A. E. WIGHT]

16. Boys' Industrial School (After Care)	1½	75 10
17. St. Mary's Home for Blind Women	0½	25 03
18. The Optimist Philanthropic (Social Workers)	0½	25 03
19. Girls' Industrial School (After Care)	0½	25 03
20. Homes for the Aged	8	400 55
21. Development Fund	8	400 55
22. Goodwill Industries of the West Indies	5	250 44
23. Trinidad and Tobago Association for Retarded Children	1½	75 10

San Fernando and Minors

1. Coterie of Social Workers (San Fernando)	3	150 20
2. La Brea Home for the Aged	2½	125 17
3. Chaguanas Home for the Aged	2	100 14
4. Home for the Aged Committee	1½	75 10
5. Princes Town Welfare Council (School Meals Committee)	1	50 07
6. Mignonette Social and Charitable Organisation (School Meals, Point Fortin)	1	50 07
7. Longdenville School Luncheon Shed Committee	1	50 07

Arima and Minors

1. Arima Community Welfare Council	1	50 07
2. Arouca Welfare Development (School Meals Committee)	1	50 07
3. Coralita Club (School Meals Committee)	1	50 07
4. Arima Charities Organisation	1	50 07
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100	\$5,006 92
	<hr/>	<hr/>

Now we come to the Summer Meeting, 1967. This amount came to \$9,788.63.

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION TO CHARITIES OF THE AMOUNTS RECEIVED FROM THE CHARITY TAX IMPOSED ON SWEEPSTAKES RUN IN CONNECTION WITH T.T.C. SUMMER MEETING, 1967

		\$	c.
Charity Tax on 50c. Sweepstake		10,876	25
Less 10% Accountant General (118: Deposit (216: Charity (T.T.C. Unallocated)		1,087	62
		<hr/>	<hr/>
Balance to be distributed as under		\$	9,788 63
		<hr/>	<hr/>

National Lotteries Bill Friday, 12th July, 1968 National Lotteries Bill

		%	\$	c.
1. Society of St. Vincent de Paul	8	783 09		
2. Blind Welfare Association of Trinidad and Tobago	8	783 09		
3. Child Welfare League of Trinidad and Tobago (Inc.)	8	783 09		
4. Trinidad and Tobago Red Cross Society	3	293 66		
5. Tuberculosis Association	2½	244 71		
6. Trinidad Association in Aid of the Deaf	3	293 66		
7. Trinidad and Tobago Leprosy Relief Association	3	293 66		
8. Belmont Orphanage	3	293 66		
9. Salvation Army	3	293 66		
10. Day Nursery Association	3	293 66		
11. Trinidad and Tobago Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	2	195 77		
12. Belmont Orphanage (After Care)	3	293 66		

I notice the Members opposite are not liking their own medicine.

13. Tacarigua Orphanage	2	195 77
14. Tacarigua Orphanage (After Care)	3	293 66
15. Boys' Industrial School (After Care)	2	195 77
16. St. Mary's Home for Blind Women	1	97 89
17. The Optimist Philanthropic Social Workers for the Blind	1	97 89
18. Girls' Industrial School (After Care)	0½	48 94
19. Homes for the Aged A/C 111/93	8	783 09
20. Development Fund A/C 111/56	8	783 09
21. Goodwill Industries	5	489 43

Port-of-Spain and Minors

1. Society of Les Amantes de Jesus	5	489 43
2. Coteries of Social Workers of Trinidad and Tobago	5	489 43
3. Corpus Christi Carmel (L'Hospice)	2	195 77
4. Beyers & Cellars Unlimited	2	195 77
5. Convalescent Home (Diego Martin)	2	195 77
6. Corpus Christi Day Nursery	1	97 89
7. Women's Auxiliary Talent Club	1	97 89
8. The Oxford Street Home	1	97 89
9. Daily Meals Association	1	97 89
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100	\$9,788 63
	<hr/>	<hr/>

[Mrs. L. A. E. WIGHT]

Now we come to the Santa Rosa Meeting. This amount is \$4,443.86.

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION TO CHARITIES OF THE AMOUNTS RECEIVED FROM
THE CHARITY TAX IMPOSED ON SWEEPSTAKES RUN IN CONNECTION WITH
ARIMA RACE CLUB SANTA ROSA SWEEPSTAKE, 1967

	\$	c.
Charity Tax on 50c. Sweepstake	4,937	62
Less 10% Accountant General (Deposit to Charity Tax 111/26, ...)	493	76
Balance to be distributed as under	\$4,443	86

Major and Minor Organisations (Island-wide)

	\$	c.
1. Society of St. Vincent de Paul	8	355 51
2. Trinidad and Tobago Blind Welfare Association	8	355 51
3. Child Welfare League of Trinidad and Tobago	8	355 51
4. Trinidad and Tobago Red Cross Society	3	133 31
5. Trinidad Legion	3	133 31
6. Tuberculosis Association	2½	111 10
7. Trinidad Association in Aid of the Deaf	3½	155 54
8. Trinidad and Tobago Leprosy Relief Association	3½	155 54
9. Belmont Orphanage	3½	155 54
10. Salvation Army	3½	155 54
11. Day Nursery Association	2½	111 10
12. Trinidad and Tobago Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	1½	66 65
13. Belmont Orphanage (After Care)	3	133 31
14. Tacarigua Orphan Home	3	133 31
15. Tacarigua Orphan Home (After Care)	2	88 88
16. Boys' Industrial School (After Care)	1½	66 65
17. St. Mary's Home for Blind Women (Coterie of Social Workers)	0½	22 22
18. The Optimist Philanthropic Social Workers for the Blind	0½	22 22
19. Girls' Industrial School (After Care)	0½	22 22
20. Homes for the Aged	8	355 51
21. Development Fund	8	355 51
22. Goodwill Industries of the West Indies	5	222 20
23. Trinidad and Tobago Association for Retarded Children	1½	66 65

San Fernando and Minors

1. Coterie of Social Workers of Trinidad and Tobago	3	133 31
2. La Brea Home for the Aged	2½	111 10
3. Chaguanas Home for the Aged	2	88 88
4. Home for the Aged Committee	1½	66 65
5. Princes Town Welfare Council (School Meals Committee)	1	44 44

6. Mignonette Social and Charitable Organisation (School Meals, Point Fortin)	1	44 44
7. Longdenville School Luncheon Shed Committee	1	44 44

Arima and Minors

1. Arima Community Welfare Council	1	44 44
2. Arouca Welfare Development (School Meals Committee)	1	44 44
3. Coralita Club (School Meals Committee)	1	44 44
4. Arima Charities Organisation	1	44 44

100 \$4,443 86

Mr. Speaker: I think I shall spare Members the last two pages.

Hon. Members: Hear, Hear, Hear.

Mrs. L. Wight:

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION TO CHARITIES OF THE AMOUNTS RECEIVED FROM
THE CHARITY TAX IMPOSED ON SWEEPSTAKES RUN IN CONNECTION WITH
TOBAGO RACE CLUB AUTUMN MEETING, 1967

	\$	c.
Charity Tax on 50c. Sweepstake	4,004	00
Less 10% Accountant General (Deposited to Charity Tax 111/26, ...)	400	40
Balance to be distributed as under	\$3,603	60

Major and Minor Organisations (Island-wide)

	%	\$	c.
1. Child Welfare League	14	504	50
2. Tobago Nursery School Association	14	504	50
3. Tobago Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	3	108	11
4. Scarborough Breakfast Shed	6	216	22
5. Mason Hall Breakfast Shed	6	216	22
6. Plymouth Breakfast Shed	6	216	22
7. Church of England Poor	11	396	39
8. Roman Catholic Poor	9	324	32
9. Heart and Hand Fund	4	144	14
10. Almshouse Committee	0½	18	02
11. Junior Red Cross	1	36	04
12. Building Fund for the Aged	3	108	11
13. Tobago Advisory Board to the Trinidad and Tobago Blind Welfare Association	1½	54	05
14. Homes for the Aged	8	288	29

National Lotteries Bill		Friday, 12th July, 1968		National Lotteries Bill	
[Mrs. L. A. E. WIGHT]					
15. Development Fund	8	288 29
16. Goodwill Industries of the West Indies	5	180 18
				100	\$3,603 60

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION TO CHARITIES OF THE AMOUNTS RECEIVED FROM THE CHARITY TAX IMPOSED ON SWEEPSTAKES RUN IN CONNECTION WITH T.T.C. CHRISTMAS MEETING, 1967

				\$	c.
Charity Tax on 50c. Sweepstake	8,277	50
Less 10% Accountant General (Deposited to Charity Tax A/C 111/26,	827	75
Balance to be distributed as under	\$7,449	75
			%	\$	c.
1. Society of St. Vincent de Paul	8	595	98
2. Blind Welfare Association of Trinidad and Tobago	8	595	98
3. Child Welfare League of Trinidad and Tobago (Inc.)	8	595	98
4. Trinidad and Tobago Red Cross Society	3	223	49
5. Tuberculosis Association	2½	186	24
6. Trinidad Association in Aid of the Deaf	3	223	49
7. Trinidad and Tobago Leprosy Relief Association	3	223	49
8. Belmont Orphanage	3	223	49
9. Salvation Army	3	223	49
10. Day Nursery Association	3	223	49
11. Trinidad and Tobago Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	2	149	00
12. Belmont Orphanage (After Care)	3	223	49
13. Tacarigua Orphanage	2	149	00
14. Tacarigua Orphanage (After Care)	3	223	49
15. Boys' Industrial School (After Care)	2	149	00
16. St. Mary's Home for Blind Women	1	74	50
17. The Optimist Philanthropic Social Workers for the Blind	1	74	50
18. Girls' Industrial School (After Care)	0½	37	25
19. Homes for the Aged A/C 111/93	8	595	98
20. Development Fund A/C 111/56	8	595	98
21. Goodwill Industries	5	372	48

National Lotteries Bill		Friday, 12th July, 1968		National Lotteries Bill	
<i>Port-of-Spain and Minors</i>					
1. Society of Les Amantes de Jesus	5	372 48
2. Coteries of Social Workers of Trinidad and Tobago	5	372 48
3. Corpus Christi Carmel (L'Hospice)	2	149 00
4. Beyers and Cellars Unlimited	2	149 00
5. Convalescent Home (Diego Martin)	2	149 00
6. Corpus Christi Day Nursery	1	74 50
7. Women's Auxiliary Talent Club	1	74 50
8. The Oxford Street Home	1	74 50
9. Daily Meals Association	1	74 50
				100	\$7,449 75

Mr. Speaker, I read this purposely because probably 90 per cent of the gentlemen on the other side—I exclude the ladies because we are all social workers—have not got a clue as to what is a committee, or the headaches of a committee, running an organization raised by voluntary efforts and funds.

I have never seen a man at a "Bring and Buy" sale or stirring a sugarcake or toolum pot to make a few cents, so they do not have a clue as to what the Turf Club money means to these societies. In many cases these societies depend on this money to carry on and they know they can depend on this income, but they do not know whether they can depend on receiving anything from a national lottery despite whatever verbal goodwill that lottery may have. I know from experience that many wonderful bodies get subventions from Government every year, and I also do know, Sir, many cases, over the last ten or fifteen years, when these subventions have not been increased by one farthing. The Government are fully aware of devaluation and the rising cost of living, and these brave and wonderful people keep on working and working for funds by raising money voluntarily, but these subventions remain at precisely the same sum. So, Mr. Speaker, the

Government is saying to them—"carry on as best you can; we could not care less."

2.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the hon Minister in presenting this Bill referred twice to the word competent. I did not think the other side knew the meaning of the word. He also referred to many countries which run national lotteries. The Irish sweepstake, for instance, is run in aid of hospitals. There is a definite objective. He also mentioned that there is a type of national lottery in the United Kingdom based on premium bonds. A number of people hold premium bonds, a person gets a prize if his bond number is drawn. We are quite aware of this. But the point I am making is—whatever the type of national lottery, there is a definite objective. But, Sir, in this Bill you will appreciate that no objectives are mentioned except that it is to be run in the interest of the country. In the interest of the country—this is very ambiguous. We would like to see the objectives in black and white, if you do not mind, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Speaker, one likes to be charitable and I expect the other side will say that a

[Mrs. L. A. E. WIGHT]

national lottery will create employment. If that be the case, it would be the only saving grace. On the other hand, Sir, I sincerely wish that those who make it their employment will not be retrenched too soon from this "People's National Lottery", because it is obviously heading for a flop. For I have met no one, literally no one, who is keen on this lottery for the many reasons that I have already given.

Everytime I buy a sweepstake ticket I know how the money is being spent and that part of it is going towards a worthwhile cause. We are told that the proceeds will go into the consolidated fund, and we know that the idea is meant to swell the coffers of this country just like the money from rate-payers for telephones was meant to swell the Treasury, but it had the adverse effect. And so, we have no intention, as I said already, of touching this Bill with a five mile barge pole.

Mr. B. Maraj : A ten mile pole!

Mrs. L. A. E. Wight : I would say 20.

Mr. A. M. Baksh : Mr. Speaker, the Bill before this House sets out in the Minister's words—if at the end of the financial year there is a surplus, that money shall be taken into a consolidated fund. If at the end of the financial year there is a surplus—judging the Bill in the context of what obtains in our country, there shall be no surplus at the end of the year and the purpose of the Bill shall be defeated.

If he had set out in this Bill an intention, for example, the raising of funds for special projects like education, or health as is done in other countries, there would have been reasons for support. But we believe, however, that this Bill sets out an objective to

exploit the masses of the country who are in most cases unsuspecting of certain kinds of procedure. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House believe that this Bill expects failure, for to use the Minister's words, it sets out to give fairplay participation in games of chance. How can you expect to get fairplay participation in games of chance? Or is it the last gamble?

Mr. Speaker, democracy connotes special attention to the views and needs of the minority in every country; and today we, on this side of the House, are very surprised to see that certain hon. Members on the other side whose convictions, I am sure, tell them they must not support this National Lotteries Bill, have walked out of the House. We believe that their opinions should be voiced here, and should go a long way to put on the records of this country very straight once and for all, that certain minority groups in this country are opposed to a national lottery on many grounds. Certain religious organizations have come out very fervently from time to time against the setting up of a national lottery. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House, believe that the religions of our country have a most important part to play in the development of the outlook and the attitude of our people. Many of our religions tell us that gambling, and games of chance are the devil's work, and we are told that we must shun them . . .

Mr. V. Jamadar : They are the devil's work.

Mr. A. M. Baksh : Mr. Speaker, if there are ills in our country; if the people of this country are by nature tempted to indulge in games of chance; if the Government feel that the weakness of the people is such that they indulge in games of chance, it is the duty of

the Government to remove this weakness from the people instead of encouraging it.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill before the House sets out not only to encourage the weakness of the people but to push it further. How do we expect that the unsuspecting people of the country, or the ordinary people would find it easy to understand that a national lottery is for those who can afford the extra money? We know that if the Government of this country legalize betting and gambling, everyone will believe that it is his duty to take part in it, and we fear that sooner or later the people of our country because of living in false hope will find themselves so frustrated, that they will take things into their hands. I wonder if Government's intention really is to develop a certain kind of anarchy in this country, so that we can divide and rule for very long.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that in this country there are many forms of gambling which satisfy the need and curiosities and indulgences of certain people. We have horse racing; we have cards; we have the betting shops; and we know the people who want to involve themselves in activities of this kind would find it easy to go to those places which are regulated by Government in most cases to indulge in such activities.

3.05 p.m.

We ask the Minister: How does this National Lotteries Act relate to things like the sweepstake and raffles run by clubs all over the country who need funds, to large charitable organizations who have large raffles? Or how is it going to relate to a man like the hon. Member for Chaguanas who is involved in activities in this country which put into the coffers of this country a lot of money?

The hon. Member for Pointe-a-Pierre mentioned that Government have been getting for a long time now a tremendous amount of revenue from the sweepstakes and things like that. We fear that because of the National Lotteries Act the amount of revenue Government are going to receive from these kinds of activities is going to dwindle and dwindle. There is much we can say about it, but we want to go on record as saying that we believe gambling is a luxury the people of this country cannot afford. We believe gambling is a risky undertaking. If it is an attempt to satiate people's desires, do it another way. We fear that anything can happen as soon as the national lotteries get going and funds cannot be found to run the national lottery. The speculation, the manipulation involved and the desire to get something, if something happens, are too much for us to take. We believe that the preponderance of harm that will be done will far outweigh the advantages that will be gained from a national lottery. We stand opposed to a national lottery because we believe that a national lottery is a creation of a certain class of people who want to continue to keep the ordinary people in a state where, because of fear, they shall have no future. We want to advise the Government before they formally push through this National Lotteries Bill to read the great writer, Bernard Shaw when he says:

"The human energy, audacity and cunning wasted on gambling would, if rightly directed, make an end to our slums and epidemics and most of our prisons in fewer hours than it has taken days of capitalism to produce them."

Mr. R. Bhoolai : Mr. Speaker, I stand here this afternoon to oppose this Bill. I feel it is a duty of mine as a representative of

the country, if something is not in the best interest of the country, to give my views. I heard the Minister of State when he was presenting this Bill make mention of a few countries. He made mention of the United Kingdom, and it was very surprising to me, because this is the first time I am hearing that the United Kingdom is having a lottery. As far as my memory serves me, and as far as I have seen myself, for the last few years there are bookmakers. He went further and he said France. I am still to know. I believe France carries Casinos. Miami also carries Casinos. But are we moving along with the South American people? It is in South America that you have all these types of national lotteries; you have Argentina, you have Brazil, you have Monte Carlo and those places; but you must remember that in those countries there are millions of people, not only one million as in Trinidad. Why are the Government of this country interested in bringing this Lotteries Bill before this House today? Is it that they have something against the turf clubs of Trinidad, the clubs of Port-of-Spain, Arima and Union Park? Are not these people to be complimented for building an industry in this country? Just to come and knock them off like that and say Government intend to carry it on, I wonder if that is fair.

I have not heard the Minister mention pools, and I would like him to mention them when he is replying, because I am afraid one day we may see no more pools. What do you intend to do? Are you going to close the pools run by these people and run them yourself, or are you going to have these national lotteries all over Trinidad selling tickets as we now have the selling of sweep-stake tickets? As I see here, in the Bill, you will have agents employed all over the place. What do you intend to do? Business? Are

you trying to help this country? Then you are failing in your approach. As the hon. Member for Pointe-a-Pierre rightly mentioned, you are failing. You have not got the people in Trinidad—one million people up to now, and unemployment is so rampant. What are you trying to put on the people? What are you trying to make them? Gamblers? You want the children to born in gambling and to remain in gambling all the days of their lives?

Government have tried in the past, agriculture, when the Agricultural Credit Bank was introduced in this country. I do not blame the PNM Government; perhaps few of them know it. When that came into being what happened? The people that borrowed the money could not pay and Government took over and they failed. They could not run these estates and these lands remained abandoned and most of them were cut down during the war. You had the lands for the Grow More Food Campaign, and some of them went back to the owners.

Buses. You have taken over the bus companies—not you the last Government—and they tried running the buses and they failed. Then came this Government; I cannot blame them, because they are trying to see how much they can make; and they said the private sector is making so much money, we are going to run the Transport Service, and they took it back from the people. I understand one owner has not yet been paid. Tell me, Mr. Speaker, whether the Government are moving in the proper direction. You have taken the transport of this country and you are trying to run it to make a profit. That is what I feel, that you intend to make a profit not a loss. But this afternoon I was very surprised to hear the Minister mention that it would take a few years, but now we do not know whether they are making any-

thing, or whether they are losing money, whether they are paying or not. I understand they owe Neal and Massy for over 100 buses and that has not been paid yet.

3.15 p.m.

This is the type of thing going on in this country. You have been trying these things and you have failed. You have tried the Telephone Company. Mr. de Nobreiga was making money; the telephone company was paying him; the service was A-1. But now what is happening? When you pick up the phone and ring, no operator will answer you sometimes, and at other times when someone answers you she is so rude to you that you have to be the opposite. This is what is happening in this country. But you are going to bring in the same type of people in this national lottery and employ them. Why? I wonder if these people will pay due regard to the people of this country and give to them their reasonable due and run the lottery in a business-like manner. No, but the telephone company, Sir.

The Government have failed, and when I say failed I mean that they took it over from de Nobreiga saying, "It will pay us". The people went on strike and the Government said, "We will purchase it because we want votes. The people have put us in this House and we want votes therefore we will buy the company. And we will give the workers a little more money so that we will be able to get the workers' votes in the next election and continue to run this country." What happened after that? The Government failed again; the same people turned against them as they were not satisfied. So the Government found themselves in difficulty and said, "We will now sell the company." And they negotiated with some buyers and got half the value of the company. May I state the amount they received? Ten million dollars.

And they went further to state that when they purchase in 1981 they will do so, on the basis of the book value and not the assets of the company as appraised when stock is taken. There are a few business men on the other side but it seems as if the Cabinet does not listen to them. Tell me; the audacity in these people in buying at the book value! Is that business? Woe unto Trinidad if this sort of thing continues.

You have the Electricity Commission and there is strong rumour that sooner or later that too will go. They cannot run it. They are increasing the rates so that the poor man is now paying double and treble what he used to pay. The hon. Member cannot help it. You are unfortunate, you have been used. Why cannot you be like us—do not be in the Ministry?

Mr. Speaker, I am coming to the point. I was speaking about the Electricity Commission. I want to repeat again, perhaps I forgot where I was—yes, the Electricity Commission; that too is going and it will be gone very soon. I was saying that they want more money and they have increased the rates. The rates are so high that the people are about to rebel. They want to ignore electricity bills, have their electricity cut off—no lights, and they will go back to kerosene lamps, gas lamps and that sort of thing.

Along with the Electricity Commission there is a Commercial House. Many Members may not know this but there is a commercial house on Frederick Street. I believe it is at the corner of Frederick and Oxford Streets. They have fridges, stoves, electric cookers and other such apparatuses. They are trying to compete with the business sector, but I wonder. I have been in this House for about a year and a half, and I happen to be a member of the Public Accounts Committee but I have not seen any accounts to tell me

whether this business is making a profit or not. Is this the way Government intend to run this country? And they want to get into business. Then I am afraid this country will continue to go lower and lower.

I am speaking about the Minister of Finance. This is what he should have advised the Cabinet to do; get men of experience from the business sector in all walks of life, form a committee, and let them advise you how to run this country if you are failing to run it properly. Take their advice. When I say business men you have to include agriculturists, trade unionists even the fish vendor; you have got to include the man who works on the road who will be able to give you some advice. But the Government feel they do not need any advice. They feel they can run this country by themselves without the help of anyone. But if they continue this way then they cannot progress; they will continue to fall and the situation will be worse than ever.

Let us take the Carnival Development Committee. Are you making money? And you want the Lottery Bill . . .

Mr. Speaker : I stand only to remind the hon. Member that there is a Bill before the House.

Mr. Bhoelai : I am sorry, Sir, I accept your ruling. If you say it was irrelevant I appreciate it, but all I wanted to do was to make a comparison with the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and to show that anything they have put their hands in has failed.

Mr. Speaker, the national lottery will be a failure in this country. Our country is not so big. Mention was made of Argentina, Brazil, Monte Carlo, and other places, but if you are bringing the lottery here you will not progress by it; you are going to lose money.

And the country on the whole is not in favour of it. Perhaps a few of us who indulge in the purchasing of tickets, and visit the pools, and participate in different games, may appreciate it but the majority of the people are not happy about the introduction of a lottery.

If the Government will not leave this matter as it was in the past and allow private people to run it then they will not make money because they have protected themselves in this Bill. If they happen not to have enough money you are going to loan them the money and hope that this money will be paid back with interest but you are not sure whether they are going to make any money at all. You have the Minister of Finance and economists at your disposal; why have you not anticipated, as you have done already in the case of your budgets, what you are going to get? They should be able to say that the lottery is going to make so much every month or so much at the end of the year. And this will be our responsibility. You have done it already. Why are you not telling us? I hope the Minister will tell us in his reply how many people the lottery will employ and what the scope and function of the lottery scheme is. I want him to tell us.

I was about to ask just now—I did not make the point as my attention was drawn to something else—what is going to happen to the pools? How do you intend to run this lottery—on a sweepstake basis? Are you going to run it as you run bingos and so on? This Bill says nothing about that. Mr. Speaker, the pools today employ over 400 people. There are seventeen pools in this country. They must be considered because they have built up a good industry in this country. These pool operators took their chances and they have built up what we

may call a racing industry in this country—I do not want to call it a gambling industry—in which over 400 people are employed. I am not taking into consideration those racing clubs who also employ a number of people on racing days. They, I am afraid, if the Minister does not state to us clearly here this evening, might be out of jobs. These are the type of people who are employed, the 400 odd, men and women who like myself have not had the opportunity to go to a secondary school. And they cannot find Government employment, perhaps in the Bill you will state that a person must have a Senior Cambridge or a General Certificate before he can be employed. If this happen and the pools go out of existence what will happen to these people who happened to reach sixth or seventh standard and the first form? What will happen to them? Are you going to protect them and give them employment? You are not going to do it because you have today all over Trinidad, boys and girls with School Leaving Certificates roaming about and not getting jobs. I have said that in the past.

3.25 p.m.

The Minister must tell us how many people are going to be employed. He must tell this House that he is going to employ so many and what money will accrue from it. I believe every two weeks he intends—I am only anticipating, I am not sure—I understand that every two weeks you are going to give out prizes. Tell us what you intend to do. Because I am sure you have it to yourselves. Tell us how many people you are going to employ; tell us how much money the country will be able to get and how much will go to unemployment to save this country.

This Bill is a very wicked one. It is dangerous. This is something that will make this

country worse, and send it to the gutter, to the stage where we will not be able to show our faces anywhere in this world. This is a most dangerous Bill. I am afraid that sooner or later the insurance companies will go, too. Because they are making money. I am sure you are coming to that later or sooner because they are making money and you want all the money. If you continue that way what will you be coming to? Will it not be communism? What are you moving forward to? You want everything in your possession. You do not want the private man to be able to do something for himself and employ people. The private sector of this country has given very good service. Even the employees of the private sector accord you the highest respect and regard whenever you go. Go to a bank and you are called mister and asked what can I do for you, Sir. Go to one of the stores and see the attention that is being paid to you by the workers because they have been lectured to; they have their relations officers who tell them how they should speak to people and how to approach them. The Government are failing badly in that so far. Some of them are big bosses as I have said already. There are some very decent and good gentlemen among them. They can be made to lecture to these people these 'big bosses'. I have found myself all over this country, even to all your offices in shirt sleeves, casual attire, and I can tell you much of it. I have a friend who is inside here, I do not want to call his name, he is opposite; he has been doing the same thing and I want to compliment him for that. Perhaps he cannot open his mouth, but I could. I have the opportunity.

These are the things that the Minister of Finance has to start with. I know you are going to pass this Bill because you have 24

[MR. R. BHOOLAI]

and we have just 12 around here and if the Member for Chaguanas happen to go over with you we will have only 11. But you are doing an injustice to this country. This is a Bill that you should get unanimous support on but you are not going to get it. I know the Ayes are going to have it. I want to conclude by saying that this country does not deserve this type of Bill yet, this Lottery Bill that is before the House. This should be left in the hands of the private people, the private sector of this country.

And with these few words, I do not think I want to say much more, let me thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I do hope I have not hurt anybody, but I am making representations as far as I was told to do by my constituents, in accordance with the views of this country, and also with the dictates of my conscience.

Mr. K. Lalla: Mr. Speaker, I have been wondering what motivated Government in bringing such a Bill before the House. I have tried to consider all the aspects of Government's activities and it seems to me that it may have been prompted out of concern for raising funds for the purpose of running this country. Such concern is indeed worthy of some sympathy, but one ought not to be sympathetic; one ought to consider the pros and cons, merits and demerits of such a Bill before it receives support from this side of the House.

A very essential aspect of this Bill is that it tends to bring about a certain cultural approach. In this era of independence I do not know whether this is one of the aspects of culture we should plunge our people into and that is to consider gambling in this country as a national pastime. And as I am on this, there has been a very comprehensive programme on the part of Government to

establish community centres throughout Trinidad and Tobago for the benefit of promoting a better village life, and so often I have heard statements from hon. Members and hon. Ministers from that side of the House denouncing the indulgence on the part of villagers in the games of cards such as wappie, and other sorts of gambling in these buildings. And now it is a bit astonishing to find that Government are going a bit further to encourage these people and I feel sure that many of these buildings are going to be used now as centres for the purpose of distributing tickets in connection with this national lottery.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the hon. Minister of Finance present his Bill but I am yet to be convinced that what he has said is sufficient to justify the passing of such a Bill in this House. I believe that he has been in no small measure enthused by what is going on in other parts of the world. He has mentioned places like Spain and South America as shining examples of countries promoting national lotteries, but I do not think we ought to use these countries as a yardstick to run our own country. We ought not to rely on and proceed to ape these countries in whatever they undertake if what they do will not result in the benefit of the people of our country. I do agree that if certain projects or certain machinery set up in other countries assist those countries in advancing the well being of the people of those countries then by all means I should certainly support any Bill which seeks to emulate those efforts.

A very vital point raised here by the Member for Nariva was the question whether Government have in any way endeavoured to ascertain the proceeds or the revenue to be derived from this project. I know that Government would not want to plunge tax-

payers into projects of this nature unless and until there is some rewarding return; but nothing has been said to us, no estimate of what is expected from the running of the first lottery has been given. And this is indeed amazing. This is why I agree with the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre that the Bill before the House is highly deficient, deficient in the sense that it is very vague and ambiguous; it says nothing in any specific terms.

3.35 p.m.

Now, this is indeed a most unsatisfactory way of presenting a Bill to the House, Mr. Speaker, because we are all concerned with the welfare of this country, and it is our concern to ensure that those who are not in a position to voice their opinions here, should have it done for them by us.

A great deal has been said about the inefficient manner in which Government have been administering the affairs of this country, and I do not think that I would like to belabour the point, but it is very interesting to hear the hon. the Minister of Finance point out that it is Government's concern that there should be an equitable distribution of the rewards of these lotteries. I do not really quite conceive or understand the interpretation of the words "equitable distribution." I do not know whether he means that the amounts obtained as a result of these lotteries will be better distributed to one winner or whether Government hope to accumulate so much wealth out of these gains that the moneys will be spent for providing amenities.

It may well be that Government have been of the view that a tremendous amount of money is raised by those who promote these games, and because of this, Government feel that they too could now proceed to do this, and take the very money that goes to private enterprise. But this will bring about a great

deal of frustration to the minds of the people who out of sheer concern for other people spend some of their time in raising funds through voluntary efforts, for the purpose of providing institutions and other bodies with funds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have heard speeches by hon. Members on the other side of the House, urging members of the public to become more associated with voluntary movements because Government cannot by itself provide everything for the people of this country. If you are going to frustrate the very will of people who find some time to come out and associate themselves with voluntary movements to raise funds to promote school buildings, churches and other similar projects, how could you really in the other breath say something else. Government have said: "We would like you people of this country to become more voluntary in your dispositions, to become keener in raising the levels of your villages; raise funds and build your community centres, Government will contribute a part of it." And what are the methods resorted to by these people for the raising of funds, Sir? I see the Lions Club has now had to resort to another way of raising funds.

However, Sir, not very long ago, I had the pleasure of witnessing the handing over of some instruments to the Couva District Hospital by the Lions, and I was very pleased indeed to know that Government have not in all these years been able to provide what the Lions were able to provide for that institution. And this is not only for Couva, but this has been for other places as well. I wonder whether Government will do this very thing which the Lions and other social organizations have been doing.

So that the question of the equitable distribution, Mr. Speaker, is meaningless.

There will be no equitable distribution here, because we do not know whether we are going to gain or lose. In fact the very nature of the Bill is so designed to protect Government whenever they lose, in that we will resort to the Consolidated Fund in order to ensure that the public interest is protected. But the public interest will not be protected because it is the taxpayers money that will be going back to them. They will be the ones contributing to the Consolidated Fund, and in the event that the project proves to be a failure then they will be receiving their own money in return. What will be very lamentable here is that instead of utilizing the funds for some more useful purpose Government will be spending the money for promoting national lotteries, which in itself is a most reprehensible thing.

I wonder what the youths of this country will be told when they come forth and ask for some form of guidance. Will they be told that they should now mobilize their forces and support the national lotteries in order to improve the welfare of the people in this country? I would have thought, Sir, that Government Ministers were quite busy with matters affecting the welfare of the community, such as health—and we do have a great deal to be done in that direction.

The question of water is something which I think is in a very hopeless state at the moment, and many of us will be happy to see Government Ministers mobilizing a little more of their forces to ensure that the people are looked after in this regard.

There are so many other things that one would expect Government to be associating themselves with rather than national lotteries. Education for that matter, Sir. Our people in this country are not provided with the type of educational system they deserve. I do not know whether gambling is going to

Friday, 12th July, 1968

assist us to promote the educational facilities of this country.

I have heard mentioned that in Ireland there is horse racing for the particular purpose of raising funds for health purposes. Now if Government had specified somewhere in this Bill that this national lottery is being run for the particular purpose of improving the educational facilities in this country, then certainly I think that everyone would come forth to contribute, not with the hope of winning, but with the feeling of national pride. Because then every person would hope to have some improvement in the educational opportunities provided here at the moment.

Leaving this Bill as it is without any purpose certainly will certainly cause it to meet with a great deal of concern from the public. No one knows in what direction the money will be spent; I for one will wonder whether it is going to subsidize BWIA. In that connexion I will not really enjoy any benefits, because BWIA, as I know it, has not been running at a profit at all. If this is the purpose, then, by all means it should never receive the support of anybody. What we want is improvement, not improvement of an airline which has not brought us any benefits since its operations.

3.45 p.m.

I probably would like to deal with one or two aspects of this Bill, and if I may refer to clause 29 on page 12 which reads as follows:

“Legal proceedings may, in any court of summary jurisdiction be conducted on behalf of the Board—

- (a) by the Secretary or the Manager;
- (b) by any other officer of the Board authorized so to do by resolution of the Board, a copy of which pur-

Friday, 12th July, 1968

porting to be certified under the hand of the Secretary shall be sufficient evidence of the contents thereof.”

I would have liked to see a corresponding provision stating that in the event that a member of the public disagrees, he too could have some recourse to redress in the courts of this country. I cannot see any justice being done to members of our country at all when a Bill such as this provides a one-sided approach—legal proceedings against any member of the public, but no member of the public is provided with an opportunity or any right of redress to go to court.

Certainly, if we are to say that we believe in the universal declaration of human rights, which rights are established in our Constitution, I would think that Government should, by now, understand that although Government have not yet proclaimed the Crown Liability Proceedings Act that some protection should be afforded to members of the public when Bills of this nature come before the House. I do not think it is fair, just or reasonable. I do not think it really establishes this feeling of confidence in the rule of law which is so often mentioned at all levels that people should enjoy this right under the rule of law.

What does the rule of law mean to the man on the streets if he is injured through the negligence of a Minister and has no right of redress? Of what good is it? I am not only today pointing this out but this is so since our independence, and so many years have gone by since our independence, even until today, we hear nothing about the Crown Proceedings Act. If Government hope to establish this confidence in the hearts of the people, and if Government would like to make one and all feel that they belong to this country, then certainly Government must

manifest some true spirit of goodwill not in the way of taking advantage of the democratic procedure of the majority votes.

By all means, Mr. Speaker, a Bill of this nature—whether Government accept its deficiency or not—will go through this House by virtue of the fact that a majority will ensure its passage. I would think that Government would not want to take advantage of that right but that Government would want to instil a certain degree of confidence in the minds of citizens of this country and that while Government are in fact a majority, the Government will not do anything which will erode the rights of people.

Mr. Speaker, there is the other provision here which I propose to deal with in this Bill and that is clause 30 subclause (2) on page 13, and it reads as follows:

“The Minister shall, on presentation of proof to his satisfaction by the winner of any such moneys, that such winner is entitled to the moneys, authorize the payment and distribution of the amount of such moneys to the winner thereof, and the same shall without further authority be paid by the Treasury.”

Mr. Speaker, as I see it here, the Minister becomes a judge in his own cause. Now the Minister, on presentation of proof to his satisfaction by the winner of any such money, that such winner is entitled to the money will authorize the payment and distribution of the amount of such moneys to the winner. What the Minister will be doing here is adjudicating on an issue. The Minister will be saying, “All right, I judge you the winner”. And what he says—it is provided here—will be the final determination of the whole matter.

I can understand that in modern times efforts are being made to provide Ministers with wider administrative powers, and this is

by all means to reduce litigation and where possible to provide the Minister with a greater scope and magnitude in the discharge of the duties of his office. But when it comes to encroaching upon the rights of individuals and to diminish the importance of the courts of our country, I certainly would like to protest very vigorously against this provision.

The winner here may be a person—I do not know—in such good standing in the mind of the Minister that he may well be influenced by his association with that particular winner. There may be another person who believes genuinely that he or she is also the winner. Now there is a distinction between a decision—a judicial decision—a quasi judicial decision and a decision on a question of policy. It seems to me there is some misunderstanding in this Bill as to the duty to be devolved on a Minister in such circumstances as these.

A decision of policy by a Minister will affect say, the making of a hospital, a central hospital more equipped with facilities or better equipped than another hospital which is not situated in such a highly populated area. That would be a question of policy. Nobody can tell the Minister then, "You should not do that" because he will be determining a question on the basis of what is good for the people of certain areas. And so too, if a road is to be passed through some residential area, the Minister decides that on a question of policy. Compensation obviously will arise and when such a question arises the Minister makes an award and in that question of compensation the citizen has a right to question the quantum of the compensation if he is not satisfied. This is how this question of decision and policy works. But you do not allow a Minister to adjudicate on the winning of a prize without any redress to the courts.

I think that this provision is indeed one which should never have appeared here.

3.55 p.m.

Since this is a matter of winning, all questions affecting the winning of a prize if in dispute should be referred to a Court of Law for adjudication, and therefore no Minister should be allowed to give a final decision on this. To seal the whole thing, Mr. Speaker, section 30 subsection (3) goes on to say:—

"Where payment is made by the Treasury in accordance with subsection (2) the validity thereof shall not be enquired into by any court and no action shall lie or be maintained in respect of the lottery that resulted in the payment aforesaid."

I do not think it is the intention of the Government, in the building of the country, to deny the citizens of this country their right to resort to the courts of law in our country. And while I would like to think so having seen this position here, I am now convinced otherwise—that we are whittling down the importance of our Judiciary in this country. We are now trying to invest our Ministers with the overall power to make decisions not only on questions of policy but to allow them to adjudicate on matters which should be more properly dealt with by the courts.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I see anything that justifies support of this Bill and I certainly hope that good sense would prevail resulting in withdrawing of this Bill.

The Minister of Industry, Commerce and Petroleum (Hon. J. H. O'Halloran): Mr. Speaker, one would have imagined that such a simple Bill would not have generated so much discussion. But in this House, being the debating House that it is, one would

understand that parliamentarians are paid to speak and so we have been made to listen to a lot of arguments this afternoon that one cannot really term fundamental arguments against the Bill.

I would refer to the hon. Member for Nariva who while opposing this Bill suggested at the closing of his discourse that he would be prepared to support the Bill if private enterprise handled it. So I take it for granted that fundamentally he is not opposed to the Bill but opposed to the fact that Government have decided to do it.

Now the hon. Lady Member for Pointe-a-Pierre very feebly, Mr. Speaker, roamed all over the world and even thought it fit to mention the word 'cock-fighting' in this debate.

Mrs. L. A. E. Wight: A guilty conscience.

Mr. J. H. O'Halloran: Little does she know that perhaps the majority of her constituents in Pointe-a-Pierre are cock-fighters.

Mr. B. S. Maraj: What kind of cock-fighters? Please tell us.

Mr. J. H. O'Halloran: I can assure her that if ever she had the experience of seeing a good cock in action she would become a fan, for it is a noble and old sport. What I do know about breaking the law is a matter of conscience.

Mrs. L. A. E. Wight: But you have none.

Mr. J. H. O'Halloran: That is the Lady's opinion, but I know many other people think otherwise.

Now the gambling industry, Sir, for the purpose of giving this hon. House some information, represents a turnover in this country of \$40 million annually. And I repeat, the gambling industry in this country

enjoys a turnover of \$40 million annually; and the Government of this country by arrangement collects a meagre \$2.5 million annually. I think in the peak year they collected something like \$2.8 million. Now where does this \$40 million annually go, Mr. Speaker?

One of the main avenues where this money changes hands is through the gambling shops of Trinidad and Tobago. There are some which are situated in better areas than others, and so they enjoy a much larger percentage of the take. And when the Minister who presented the Bill suggested that the intention of the Government was to ensure a more equitable distribution of the gambling funds of the country, this was what he meant. I believe I am right in saying that there are sixteen betting shops in the country through which this \$40 million pass. The estimated revenue on the launching and implementation of the lottery is \$10 million. This is what the Government hope to collect from the national lottery annually.

Mrs. L. A. E. Wight: You hope?

Mr. J. H. O'Halloran: It is better to live in hope.

Mr. Speaker, on this aspect of the Bill you will appreciate the fact that this is the right approach, for the people in this country, whether you like it or not, are gamblers by nature and they will gamble whether you put them into prison or not.

Mr. B. S. Maraj: Even in prison.

Mr. J. H. O'Halloran: I agree with you, even in prison.

I would say in many many countries of the world they had been used for financing all sorts of Government projects. And in

practically all instances Governments who launched lotteries had specified at the beginning in what direction the profits of the lotteries would be spent and in many instances the funds are allocated to education, to hospitals or what have you. But we have been advised by the Governments—because most of the Governments were consulted before we decided to do this—that it is better to leave the Government flexible in things of this nature so that in the presentation of its annual budget a decision can then be taken as to what avenue the profits of the lottery would be put into. And it is for these reasons and only these reasons that in the Bill we did not think it advisable to tie the hands of the Government in any one direction so that at the end of the year they would not be in a position to decide in what direction the money could be spent more advantageously.

4.05 p.m.

Lotteries are operated very simple. The head office is situated more often than not in a Government building, and situated in a place where parking facilities and so on are available. The country as a whole is divided into several sections. For example, Port-of-Spain could be divided in, say, ten sections based on population, and agents appointed in those areas for distribution.

One of the very good features of a national lottery is that it is a cash transaction so that you cannot lose at all. Payments are made on the basis of cash received so that the fear that has been expressed that it is possible that at the end of the year Government might find themselves at the ugly end of the stick is a result of not understanding the operation properly. The appointed agents would all have to undertake to purchase their allocations of tickets for cash. They in turn will

Friday, 12th July, 1968

hire huskers or where they choose to sell the tickets themselves they may do so. But on the question of hiring huskers, this is where some of the better virtues of national lotteries lie. It provides job opportunities for thousands and thousands of people, be they old people or be they young people, who are prepared to work and to sell tickets in a way that provides them with a very handsome income weekly or monthly.

This, Mr. Speaker, in addition to having millions of dollars injected into the country for further development, would then provide more jobs, because if we decide to build schools or we decide to build hospitals or we decide to build roads, the injection of these funds would again provide more employment.

These huskers are usually compensated quite handsomely. The agents themselves would find it very profitable to be agents, to have established these agencies. So this is a revolving motion in which the funds of the people, channelled into the Treasury of the Government, could be reinvested into development, or for providing education or providing health facilities.

Now, I personally have had a lot to do with the idea of introducing a national lottery into the country. As I said before, we selected most places in which lotteries were operated and we have selected the better aspects of most of the areas for introduction here in Trinidad. I have no doubt that when the lottery tickets have started to circulate and results are made known weekly or fortnightly, whichever is the case, hon. Members opposite themselves will find it advisable to try their hands at a ticket here and there, not only in an effort to win themselves a handsome sum of money, but with the thought that they will be subscribing to a

Friday, 12th July, 1968

worthy cause. I have no doubt whatever that the charitable organizations which the hon. lady Member of Pointe-a-Pierre took a long time to spell out and which, I presume, took the Turf Club a long time to prepare would also benefit from the funds of the lottery.

This is a Government for the people, and a Government which has the best interest of the people at heart.

I have heard mentioned on two occasions the Lion's bingo; and the fact alone that the Lion's bingo has been so successful is to me an indication—and I have no doubt about it—of the absolute success of a national lottery.

Mrs. L. Wight : The people like playing bingo.

Mr. O'Halloran : People would like playing lotteries. I have seen countries where people think it a religion to purchase a national lottery ticket.

The other Members who spoke, as I said, did not really object.

The various ramifications of the operation of the lottery will be dealt with in the regulations which will be provided sometime in the future.

The hon. Member for Couva talked about Government denouncing card playing in the various centres. I think that this should be so because no one can consider a game of cards as a game of chance. Games of cards are obviously games of skill, and through their skill card players can always take advantage of the beginners or the innocent card player.

4.15 p.m.

And he made the point, quoting a certain section where he claims that the Minister would be the sole authority in deciding who

the winner should be. This is very necessary, Mr. Speaker, because very often people will make false claims and present tickets purporting to be the winner of the lottery. Therefore it is absolutely necessary that when these claims are made somebody possessing the identification secret about printed tickets must be the sole authority to judge whether those tickets are legitimate or not. And it is simply for that reason that this clause was put in.

Very often in many countries false claims were made. Even here in Trinidad and Tobago from time to time we have had similar incidents. The hon. Member opposite is a lawyer by profession and I am sure he will appreciate the fact that even in the case of ordinary sweepstakes which we run here there have been occasions in which two or three people made claims to have the winning tickets; and when they are not satisfied with the decision of the Turf Club they usually take the matter to court. I am not in a position to say what the legal aspect of the Bill is in that respect but I doubt very much that this would preclude anybody going to court on a matter such as that. Because one of the necessities for the successful operation of this lottery would be the fact that everything would be above-board and that anybody purchasing a ticket would have the protection of the law of the land. About this I have no doubt in my mind but perhaps somebody better qualified than I would be able to say where this applies.

So, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House feel, like many other governments all over the world, that lotteries are very profitable to the state and in particular to a society such as ours, where by natural instinct the Trinidadian loves to gamble. Then, in addition, from information received, we

note that millions of dollars change hands annually, and these millions are restricted to a few people who very often do not invest their moneys here but prefer to invest them elsewhere. I strongly agree that the Government should do something whereby some of these moneys could be arrested and channelled into the coffers of the Government for re-injection into the funds for the development of the country of one kind or another.

And for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I stood up here this evening to champion this Bill in the hope that after I have spoken, the opinions on the opposite side would have changed. I have no doubt whatever that very shortly we all would take pride in purchasing a lottery ticket with the knowledge that the fund is going to be spent for a worthy cause.

Mr. S. Shah : Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can ask the question which my Friend the hon. Member for Couva was about to ask of the Minister. My hon. Friend wanted to refer the Minister to clause 30, subclause (3) of the Bill which says:

"Where payment is made by the Treasury in accordance with subsection (2) the validity thereof shall not be enquired into by any court and no action shall lie or be maintained in respect of the lottery that resulted in the payment aforesaid." Subclause (2) says:

"The Minister shall, on presentation of proof to his satisfaction by the winner of any such moneys, that such winner is entitled to the moneys, authorise the payment and distribution of the amount of such moneys to the winner thereof, and the same shall without further authority be paid by the Treasury."

These, Mr. Speaker, are the provisions to

which we object. It puts the Minister in the position of judge, jury, prosecutor, defendant and everything at one time because he will have to consider not only the legal aspect but the political aspects in paying the money. These are what we object to.

We have heard a lot of talk on this Bill. The hon. Minister of Industry has told us that in the operation of a lottery there will be no losses. He says that there is fear on our side of the House that moneys will be paid out of the Consolidated Fund; but that is not our fear; this is a fear which is written into the Bill and is reflected by the words of the Bill. If there is any loss the loss will be paid out of the Consolidated Fund. That is what the Bill says. If there is going to be no loss, if the Minister is truthful, if he is experienced in the running of lotteries and there is going to be no loss, then why write into the Bill that if there is any loss the moneys will be paid out of the Consolidated Fund? This is not our fear, this is a fear inherent in the Bill itself. If by the running of the lottery there is no loss, then where would the loss come from? Will it be another case of \$56,000?

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister who presented this Bill told us that there is a body of opinion in this country which is against the Bill. He also immediately thereafter told us that this Bill is in favour of the national welfare. These two things are a *non sequitur*; if people are against the Bill to a substantial extent then the benefits of the Bill will go not to the national welfare but perhaps to the majority of the national welfare.

Mr. Speaker, what are we offered in Trinidad and Tobago? What is the aim of our people? What are their moral and spiritual aspirations? Have we as exponents in this

Parliament a clear picture of what we envisage for the people who comprise our beautiful nation? Are the provisions of this Bill conducive to the attainment of excellence? For surely it is people of excellence who build greatly and lastingly. Long ago Egypt had millions of people living upon the most fertile land in the then known world. Athens had 200,000 people living on the Rocky Plains but today you remember Egypt because of Cleopatra but you will remember Athens because it gave birth to democracy. So you see, what we need are people of excellence and quality. You can visit all the manufacturers, you can give them as many \$350,000 as you like, you will never be able to have them mass produced excellence and character for distribution to the people of Trinidad and Tobago.

4.25 p.m.

These are matters of personal acquisition and attainment. Mr. Speaker, let me borrow the words of a recent publication to which I pay tribute. I quote:

"Character is a positive thing; it is not protected innocence but practised virtue. It is not fear of vice but love of excellence."

Let us aim our legislation in building citizens of character, people who possess character, discipline their passing impulses so as to keep these from getting in the way of proper performance. They do their jobs better than just enough to get by. People need something to believe in. Great scientific discoveries may shake the world but principles of behaviour keep it stable in order to be able to enjoy these great scientific discoveries. I do not refer to the do-gooders, I do not refer to starry-eyed reformers as being necessarily principled; there are

certain fundamentals in which one must believe or civilization must disappear today as was done in the past. There are permanent truths which though deep-rooted in antiquity remain important today.

What is the relevance in the context of our present political development of so many marches, demonstrations and demands? Do we honestly believe that these are due only to poor economic conditions and political injustices? Not at all. These are merely the forces of empty directionless lives. A demonstrator, a worker does not want work purely for the sake of working. He wants to provide for himself and his family a full and interesting life. He wants to contribute to his society and he needs to be respected by his society. Is an invitation to him to become a member of a national gambling society a step in furthering his needs and wants? The situation is sufficiently bad but at least it is limited to the private sector and there is no high pressure advertisement. The present situation is to be differentiated from the call and urging upon the citizen to provide health and educational facilities by gambling his money with the hope dangling before his eyes that one day he might become rich.

Let us not be disillusioned. I have visited countries where national lotteries are carried on and the experience of these countries shows that it is the poor and the weak who succumb to the temptation to spend money they can ill afford. Where are the whe whe turfs of this country? You do not find them in Valsayn or in the posh areas of Woodbrook and St. Ann's. You find the whe whe turfs of this country in the depressed areas of La Romain, Cocoyea Village, Brothers Road and Fyzabad. Because these are the areas where the poor people live and it is

[MR. S. M. SHAH]

the poor whose money is fleeced from them because it is the poor who succumb to the temptation of gambling.

This country has less than five hundred thousand adults and a comparison with countries where several millions of people reside serves to prove very little so far as the purported success of a local lottery is concerned. If you have a very big sponge full of water you need to squeeze it very little to get a cup full of water, but you take a small sponge and you have to squeeze it almost dry to get the same cupful of water. A dollar to a rich man is nought but to those who sweat and labour a dollar is often two day's sustenance. This is the question which we have to address ourselves to.

4.30 p.m. : *Sitting suspended.*

5.07 p.m. : *Sitting resumed.*

Mr. S. Shah : Mr. Speaker, it is the young people of this nation who should not be urged upon this road—this road of gambling. After all, from among them we must find our future political, financial, legal, medical and agricultural leaders. Gambling must not be a way of life for them.

It is often that those who are in need of help, both financially and spiritually fall for the temptation. They use faith as a medium of exchange whereby they may acquire the goods and riches of this world. We have a perfect example of this in the House today: The Mohammed brothers and Mrs. Fatima McDavidson; the hon. Minister for West Indian Affairs, the hon. Member for San Juan East and the Member for Fyzabad, have left this hon. House immediately upon

the inception of this debate. They would rather not be present than be present to raise their hands against the Bill which goes against their consciences.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like at this stage to congratulate the Member for Princes Town, who today made what is his maiden contribution in the House; galvanized into action by this Bill. I do want to congratulate him, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, of both wine and gambling are great evils and are some benefits to man. But the evils of them are far greater than their benefits. In thirteen years—and these are the figures I have been able to verify—from 1895 to 1907, there were 156 suicides in England due directly to betting, as well as 719 cases of theft and embezzlement, and 442 bankruptcies. Gambling, in fact, must be indicted as both injurious and conducive only to individual and national demoralization.

Young people should be encouraged to inculcate the higher values of life and then bring to fruition those values as far as practicable in their day to day life.

I quote, Mr. Speaker:

"A character of any man is but the aggregate of his tendencies, the sum total of the bent of his mind. We are what our thoughts have made us. Each thought is a little hammer blow on the lump of iron which our bodies are, manufacturing out of it what we want it to be. Words are secondary. Thoughts live, they travel far. And so take care of what you think."

Mr. Speaker, what are the thoughts of a poor man? A man who has bought tickets week after week after week, and has lost week after week after week? What are the

thoughts of his family, whom he has deprived of bread in order to support a national lottery?

Nothing will protect us from external pressures and compulsions so much as the control of ourselves based upon ideals and fundamental truths that have withstood the test of time. Much has been said in praise of endurance, and indeed much ought to be said. Because being able to bear up manfully under stress and hardship is a great accomplishment, but self-control is different. It is not continued resistance, but actual mastery. It enables us to say "yes" and "no" to other men, not prompted by blind obedience to a code but with assurance derived from a conscious evaluation of relevant alternatives. And to this Bill, Mr. Speaker, we have alternatives. Let us not only endure our hardships; let us master them.

Sometime ago, Mr. Speaker, I read with some pleasure, that casinos were to be disallowed in this nation, and I felt that morally all was not lost with this Government. But my pleasure was short-lived and my attribution of pure motives misplaced, for with the enactment of the Gambling Act and now this Lotteries Bill, it seems that Government are not so much against gambling, as they are in favour of themselves being the greatest sponsors of gambling. "We are against casinos, not because of the principle involved, but because casinos will be a competitor to Government's gambling."

Pressed as the Government are by their own failure in the economic field, having set this nation on the road to bankruptcy, following a damning policy of favouritism of one sector and pressurization of another,

they now seek to redress the rape of the nation's economy by becoming a big banker in a game of chance, where the odds are a hundred times more difficult than any game of whe whe; where a few will win to the detriment of many; and an entire nation held up to ransom and urged to make obeisance to the pagan god of chance.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, am I moved by the argument that many hundreds, thousands or millions of dollars already change hands each year by way of horse racing, sweepstakes and the like.

One must expect in every society, especially one based upon what has been called Western philosophy, some vice and some corruption, but this is no reason to perpetuate and magnify same. The fact that thousands and thousands of people are killed in the United States of America each year is no reason, no justification, for the deaths on our roads. Nor is the fact that there are some clubs here any justification, any argument, in favour of urging the citizens of the entire country to be participants in national gambling.

I have viewed this Bill, Mr. Speaker, from many angles, and viewed from the metaphysical point of view this Bill rests upon a depressing materialism; from the psychological point of view, on rank disillusionment; from an ethical point of view, on depressing expediency; and from an economic point of view, on mass exploitation.

Mr. Speaker, we must be careful not to fall into the clutches of an ideology where the physical value is the most basic, while the mental and the aesthetic are conjoined as subservient values, and the moral value is viewed in an utilitarian perspective and as a matter of expediency only.

I make no apology, Mr. Speaker, for calling upon Government to orientate human activity in such a perspective that established morality prevails, and the vices that corrode human character are opposed; and further to assist to the maximum, efforts to integrate human personality on the basis of the purest accepted values and permanent truths. Let Government, Mr. Speaker, set the best examples.

5.15 p.m.

Mr. B. Maraj: Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the contributions made by hon. Members in this House, I must at the outset make my position superlatively clear that I propose to support the Bill before this House, and the arguments presented by both the Minister of State and the Minister of Petroleum, Industry and Commerce, are substantial evidence, apart from my personal knowledge of the game, that this is a worthwhile Bill and that this House should support it in its entirety.

I have no grouse with the Members who are sitting on the Opposition side like myself. When I believe Government are wrong and they deserve a proper thrashing you will not find me wanting, but when I find them doing something that is in the interest of the people and not inimical, you will find me supporting.

What was the argument presented on behalf of the Opposition? The hon. Member for Nariva said that he would support this Bill if this lottery were to be run by private enterprise; but because Government are sponsoring it, he would not support it. I do not intend to be critical, but it must be viewed in the light that he was expressing the sentiments and feelings of his party.

On the other hand, I have in my hand a newspaper. The Opposition do not intend

to support Government in this Bill; they are saying it is wrong teaching children to gamble, getting children in various moods at various times, and they ask if this is the way we have to build our economy. It is a pity the hon. Member for Pointe-a-Pierre is away, because I would probably be able to let her know why it is necessary for us to support this at some time.

While the hon. Member for Nariva said he was agreeing and they all agreed, other Members spoke saying they did not agree with the Bill in its entirety. Some Members spoke on the legal aspect of the Bill. That is what the hon. Member for Pointe-a-Pierre said, that Government are immoral and bad, that Government is no good. Yet you find the "whip" from the party asking the same Government—and he files a motion to control the local press. Who will control the Press? He or his party, or is he asking the Government to set up the machinery to control the Press? Who is going to do it? It is simple, ordinary common sense. They know they cannot get the bloody motion through. They will depend upon Government to get the motion through and this is the way they are trying, indirectly, to make this country a one-party state. They are giving the Government the lead as to making Trinidad a one-party state.

This is the first time—and I challenge them to produce any authority to the contrary—that the Opposition in any country in any part of the world ask to control the Press. The Government always ask in countries in different parts of the world to control the Press; in this case it is the Opposition.

Mr. N. Muradali: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. Motion No. 20 of which we got notification today deals with the very

substance which the hon. Member for Chaguanas is dealing with in detail, questioning the intention of the motion as far as the Press is concerned. We on this side of the House believe the hon. Member is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. Member has a point there.

Mr. Maraj: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was waiting on him. This is the trap I set for him—his inexperience. He can hold a hog's foot as a Muslim. It is against his religion. He has taken an oath in this House with the Koran, and here you have him holding the leg of a hog. That man cannot have the courage to stand up and say I am out of order. Get out.

Hon. Member: You cannot hold the hog now?

Mr. Maraj: We are coming to that just now.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. Member is going beyond the limit now.

Mr. Maraj: Mr. Speaker, I shall not challenge your ruling at any time, but after all, when I know that as a Hindu certain things are forbidden, and as a Muslim certain things are forbidden, and a Muslim who takes an oath in this Parliament holds the foot of a hog, I must draw your attention and this Parliament's to it because he is opposing the lottery now. That is the reason why.

This is this virtuous man. This is the man of virtue and character, holding the leg of a hog and taking a picture. So help me, God, he should say *Toba Toba* a thousand times to save him from the sin he has committed in accordance with the Koran. I shall not

bother with him because he has descended below the gutter. If one goes in the cesspit, he would like to go below the cesspit. He is accustomed to doing that and I shall forgive him.

Mr. Speaker: I am asking the hon. Member for Chaguanas to make his contribution on the Bill.

Mr. Maraj: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But they are saying that this lottery is a bad thing; it is no good. The Member whom I have just spoken of lives nearly opposite to my pool in San Fernando, and I know he used to come into my pool. That is the trouble.

Mr. N. Muradali: Mr. Speaker, on a point of correction. The hon. Member is speaking an untruth. I went to his pool on one occasion when he called me and asked me to assist him in getting the licence for the pool. I do not gamble as far as pools are concerned and I have never been to his pool. He is giving a wrong impression. He must not tell untruths in this Parliament.

Mr. Maraj: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; again we see how people are strangers to the truth. Not that I am telling an untruth, but he is the competent authority. He gives licences. I have to appeal to him to get a licence. Look where it reach to! That is why I say you have to forgive him. Sometimes I have to ask him and appeal to him to get me a licence!

I am the first man in Trinidad who operated pools when Government saw they had 200 odd pools in Trinidad and they thought it fit to stop all pools because Government were not getting anything from it. They imposed a deposit of \$50,000 on every pool and a 25 per cent tax on all

bettings—win or lose. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure and privilege of being the only man in Trinidad to open three pools. Right now I am operating two pools, one in San Fernando, but because of time I am not able to attend to it and one at San Juan. What you said Rambachan?

Mr. Rambachan: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Member refer to me as the Member for Siparia?

Mr. B. Maraj: I shall not refer to him as the Member for Siparia. I thought he was trying to grumble. Well I will forgive him. He has so many horns on his head that he does not know where to go. I shall not bother with him. Everybody in Trinidad knows the amount of horns he has on his head.

I still own those two pools. I have \$100,000 deposited with Government and I get around 7½ per cent interest every year on those pools. I used to collect around \$22,000 a year on the three pools, but now it is around \$15,000 on those two pools. I have \$100,000 deposited on those two.

If Government ever made a good decision, a wise decision, a prudent decision and a decision in the interest of the inarticulate as well as the articulate masses of this country, they have done it now.

Statistics were quoted as to how many murders they had in the United Kingdom.

Hon. Member: Suicides.

Mr. Maraj: Suicides &c. But, Mr. Speaker, suicides and murders, there is very little difference, but lawyers like to put a thin edge into the wedge so I shall accept this interpretation.

5.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, what is wrong? I am sure that from the research these Gentlemen made they should know at least that the British Museum was financed by lottery, and I challenge them to deny that statement—the British Museum was financed by lottery. England and all the other countries of the world are doing it but in Trinidad it seems to be a crime to do it. You are not robbing anybody. You are not stealing from anybody. You are doing what is fair, proper and legitimate.

You have heard the Minister of State say that over \$30 million passed through the hands of the bookmakers or pool operators. What crime is it if Government should get \$10 million out of it? Are they opposing Government getting \$10 million or any part thereof? Right now Government are getting \$2 million. If they get \$2 million why can they not collect \$10 million? And this is what the Opposition is trying to say. They are talking about gambling. Is not bingo gambling too? Anything with games of chance is gambling.

Our Queen Elizabeth II is the biggest race horse owner in England. She has the largest stable. She goes and looks at the horses, or does she fix the little thing up too? The great Sir Winston Churchill was one of the biggest horse owners. The great Maharajh and others; and we have here the great John O'Halloran in Trinidad. There is nothing wrong, Mr. Speaker, in doing this but what I find is this: there was a commission of inquiry into the horse racing industry in Trinidad. While we have not got many great people, we have people from all walks of life who take part in horse racing. Did these gentlemen try to find out how much money was owed to the Government, and is owed

by the Arima Turf Club? I gave evidence and it was over \$1 million, but do you want that money to remain there and the Government not to do something about it?

Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position clear on this matter. I had no intention of generating any heat, I wanted to be as simple as possible. They had an opportunity to go before the Commissioner of Inquiry and speak if they had the presence of mind to do so. And that was the place where they ought to have gone and air their views. They did not even send a memorandum and say whether they were against it, or the law was against it or whether they had any reservations. Mr. Speaker, they could have moved an amendment but they did not even do that.

I am very sorry that I had to take up so much time. I do have much more to say but I will not burden this House beyond 6 o'clock because I know the Minister of State will have to reply. I would just like to say these few words. Certain people may be against gambling in public, but they do it in private. Some people practise morality in public, but they are immoral in the dark. May I say this, Mr. Speaker, I would rather stand up before the guillotine in the presence of the public and stand the consequences of it than to shirk the responsibility that I have before me.

I say finally, Mr. Baksh made his maiden speech this afternoon with both elegance and eloquence, and it is a crime in my opinion to have a man like him, a young man like him, for sixteen to seventeen months sitting in Parliament without giving him an opportunity to express his true feelings, and above all to show the benefit of his experience. He has been denied that, but I do hope some wisdom will prevail and they will give this young gentleman the necessary permission

he deserves and let him go ahead cracking the whip as fast as he can.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Development (Hon. F. C. Prevatt): Mr. Speaker, when I presented the Bill to the House I did not suspect that so much heat would have been generated, especially as I had taken pains to explain what I thought were the main features of the Bill.

I had taken pains to point out that the Government side understood that there were certain objections not only to the lottery as a whole but to gambling in general, and the basis of these objections. And I think that we should tell hon. Members opposite that we recognize that in any society, there will hardly ever be total agreement on any matter whatever.

What we said was that the majority of the people in our society gamble. We did not suggest that all the people in the society gamble. What we said was that the majority of the people in the country have no objection to a lottery. We did not mean to suggest that everybody wanted the lottery.

It is not the intention of the Government to force anybody to buy any lottery ticket. The position will be just as it has always been in respect to our sweepstake which has been well known in the country for several years. They are put up for sale and you may buy one. If you have any objections, religious or otherwise, you just do not buy.

We do not think that in any society such as ours it would be the thing to prevent the entire society from doing what any one section does not want to do.

If we were to proceed on that basis, it would be quite possible that we would be forced to prevent the whole society from eating meat or even pork, or from going to

church on Saturdays or from doing some other thing which certain sections feel that they want to do or not to do.

5.40 p.m.

So that we cannot in these days proceed on the basis that we should force any minority group to do what the majority wants to do or to force the majority to do or not to do something just because of the minority. What we do is, we pass our laws on the basis of what the majority thinks should be done. So far as possible we always make sure that nobody is forced to do that which he does not wish to do, provided at all times that nobody is permitted to do something which is against the interest of the state or the majority of the people comprising that state. We have heard much rhetorics, which as rhetorics are to be admired. The problem we face, however, is that much of this evening's rhetoric had no real relevance to the Bill before the House. Those points which were really worthy of answer were handled comprehensively by the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and I would wish merely to refer to the point which was made by more than one hon. Member as regards section 29 and 30 of the Bill.

In section 29 provision is made merely for the conducting of legal proceeding on behalf of the board. This has nothing to do with legal proceedings against the board. The position there will remain as it now is against any other board. This merely says who will act if the board institutes legal proceedings. As regards section 30, perhaps there has been some misunderstanding. Section 30 refers only to unclaimed moneys which has nothing at all to do with disputes for prize money.

Section 30 (1) says:

"All moneys in respect of the winnings in any national lottery that remains unpaid to the winner thereof at the end of one year after the declaration of the results of such lottery shall be paid over to the Treasury by the Board."

Subsection (2) says what the Minister may do with that money. That is not money in dispute; that is money, unclaimed winnings, placed in the Treasury one year after the declaration of results. If someone comes in and makes a claim after that money goes into the Treasury, it is only in those circumstances that the Minister shall, on presentation of proof to his satisfaction by the winner of any such moneys that such winner is entitled to the moneys—he shall then authorize the payment and distribution to the man out of the moneys held in the Treasury. So that I myself was a little disappointed that my legal Friends on the other side did not get the point. It seems to me that if one reads section 30 (1) one will see that (2), (3) and (4) follow as a result, and this misunderstanding should not have arisen.

Besides these points I do not think it is necessary for me to keep the House any longer on this Bill. The other arguments which were made were irrelevant to the issue. I do not wish to keep the House any longer.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a Second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 19 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 20

Mr. Prevatt: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the following amendments to clause 20:

- (i) Insert the words "from time to time" between the words "Fund" and "such" appearing in line two thereof;
- (ii) Delete the word "amount" appearing in line two thereof, and substitute therefore the word "amounts";
- (iii) Insert the words "in the aggregate" between the words "exceeding" and "five" appearing in line two thereof;
- (iv) Delete the words "the first" appearing in line five thereof; and
- (v) Delete the word "lottery" appearing in line five thereof, and substitute therefore the word "lotteries".

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 20, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 21 to 33 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Question put and agreed to, That the Bill be reported to the House.

House resumed.

Bill reported, with amendments; read the Third time and passed.

INVESTMENT DISPUTES AWARDS (ENFORCEMENT) BILL

Order for Second reading read.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. F. C. Prevatt): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move,

That a Bill to make provisions in relation to the enforcement of awards in

certain investment disputes, be now read a Second time.

5.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the background to this Bill is briefly as follows. For a long time the international community has been trying to devise ways and means for encouraging the free flow of private investment funds, particularly from developed countries to the developing countries. Various measures have been adopted and a number of bilateral agreements have been concluded which have as their purpose the validation of investment flows between countries and particularly between the developed and developing countries.

One of the thorny points which have often caused conflict between states is the fact that in certain instances disputes arise between a foreign investor and the country in which the investment is located. Many of these disputes have taken a long time to be resolved and, in certain instances, the resolution of the disputes has not been particularly happy. This state of affairs has naturally had the adverse effect of discouraging the flow of investment funds, and the countries which have suffered have not only been those in which the disputes took place but also those which did not encounter such disputes. It was clear that a multi-international institution was necessary.

After extensive discussions an International Centre was set up for the Settlement of Investment Disputes was established as part of the international machinery, with headquarters at the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The purpose of this Centre, as recorded in the Articles of Establishment, is—and I quote: ". . . to provide facilities for conciliation

[MR. F. C. PREVATT]

and arbitration of investment disputes between Contracting States and nationals of other Contracting States in accordance with the provisions of this Convention."

Trinidad and Tobago signed the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes in 1966 and deposited an instrument of ratification with the International Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes early in 1967. This country is, therefore, now represented on the governing body of the Centre and it is necessary to ensure that the instruments and institutions in this country are such as to facilitate Trinidad and Tobago's effective participation in this international mechanism.

The Centre has a number of organs designed to facilitate the settlement of investment disputes including provision for arbitration. The question therefore arises as to the instruments available in this country to give effect to any award made by a tribunal involving this country. This provision is the rationale of the present Bill.

The procedure for initiating arbitration through the Centre is set down in Article 36 of the Articles of Agreement establishing the Centre, and this provides as follows:

(1) Any Contracting State or a national of a Contracting State wishing to institute arbitration proceedings shall address a request to that effect in writing to the Secretary-General who shall send a copy of the request to the other party.

(2) The request shall contain information concerning the issues in dispute, the identity of the parties and their consent to arbitration in accordance with the rules of procedure for the institution of conciliation and arbitration proceedings.

(3) The Secretary-General shall register the request unless he finds, on the basis

of the information contained in the request, that the dispute is manifestly outside the jurisdiction of the Centre. He shall forthwith notify the parties of registration or refusal to register.

Under the provision of Article 54 (2) of the Convention a party seeking recognition or enforcement of an arbitral award in the territories of a Contracting State shall furnish to a competent court or other authority which such state shall have designated for this purpose a copy of the award certified by the Secretary-General. Each Contracting State shall inform the Secretary-General of the designation of the competent court or other authority for this purpose or of any subsequent change in the designation.

Being a signatory of the Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes, it becomes necessary for this country, by legislation, to designate a court for the purpose of enforcing an arbitral award made by a tribunal set up under the Articles of Agreement, and in this Bill provision is made for the designation of the High Court of Trinidad and Tobago to be the court for the purpose of enforcing such an award.

Mr. Speaker, it is most unlikely that Trinidad and Tobago will ever have to resort to this international instrument. Our relationship with foreign investment is based on frank and fruitful co-operation in attaining national objectives and aspirations. Nevertheless, the present Bill seeks to fulfil an obligation which Trinidad and Tobago assumed when, in the interest of encouraging and facilitating the development of this country, it became a signatory to the Convention on the Settlement of International Disputes. It is the only reason for the presentation of this Bill to this honourable House.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move.

Question proposed.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a Second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Question put and agreed to, That the Bill be reported to the House.

House resumed.

Bill reported, without amendment; read the Third time and passed.

Motion made and Question proposed, That the House do now adjourn to Friday, 19th July, 1968, at 1.30 p.m.—[Hon. A. G. Montano].

Question put and agreed to.

Adjourned at 5.59 p.m.