

Leave of Absence

Tuesday, 23rd July, 1968

*Papers Laid***SENATE**

Tuesday, 23rd July, 1968

The Senate met at 1.50 p.m.

PRAYERS[MR. PRESIDENT *in the Chair*]**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Mr. President: Members of the Senate, I wish to announce that I have granted extended leave to Senator R. Neehall, until 31st July, 1968.

**COCOA AND COFFEE INDUSTRY
(AMENDMENT) BILL**

Bill to amend the Cocoa and Coffee Industry Ordinance, 1961, brought from the House of Representatives—[*The Minister of Education and Culture*]; read the First time.

Motion made and Question proposed, That the next stage be taken at a later stage of the proceedings.—[*Senator D. Pierre*].

Question put and agreed to.

PAPERS LAID

1. The Defence (Rates of Pay and Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 1966.—[*Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister*].

2. Report of the Auditor General on the Accounts and the Financial Statements of the National Housing Authority for the Year ended 31st December, 1966.—[*The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister*].

3. Report of the Commission of Enquiry into the circumstances surrounding the Sales,

Leases or other Transfers of Gasoline Stations or Sites for Gasoline Stations since 1961 and the procedure followed in the granting of Licences for the operations of such Stations.—[*The Minister of Education and Culture*].

Paper No. 3 to be printed as a Senate Paper.

REGULATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Senator R. J. Williams: Mr. President, I have the honour to present the Second Report of the Regulations Committee (1967-1968 Session).

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS**Cocoa Subsidy Scheme**

27. **Senator J. B. Stollmeyer** asked :

In view of the Government's failure to enact legislation to dissolve the Cocoa Subsidy Board and terminate the authority to impose the cess on cocoa exported from Trinidad and Tobago which the hon. the Attorney General promised would have come into effect on 30th June, 1968,

Will the hon. the Attorney General please state:

1. When it is now planned to terminate the cess?
2. What cocoa subsidy, if any, will be paid to farmers in 1968?
3. What plans are there for the phasing out of the Cocoa Subsidy Scheme and when is it proposed to have them implemented?

The Attorney General and Minister for Legal Affairs (Senator the Hon. G. A. Richards):

1. The legislation to dissolve the Cocoa Subsidy Board and to terminate the authority

to impose the cess on cocoa has been delayed somewhat longer than was anticipated owing to the necessity of—

- (a) Identifying the assets of the Board; and
- (b) Making appropriate provision for the employees of the Board. A study to determine the extent to which these employees can be absorbed in the Civil Service is now being made.

In any case collection of the cess will be deemed to have ceased on the 30th June, 1968, and it is proposed to make the new Act retrospective to the 1st of July, 1968.

2. The full subsidy formerly payable to planters under the Cocoa Subsidy Scheme was as follows:

A. In respect of Complete rehabilitation.

- (1) Free planting material (based on average of 300 plants per acre);
- (2) Cash Subsidy—
 - (a) Land preparation and planting... \$150.00 per acre;
 - (b) Maintenance grant
1st and 2nd years \$75.00 per acre.

B. In respect of Partial rehabilitation.

- (1) Free planting material;
- (2) Planting subsidy of 20c. per plant;
- (3) Maintenance subsidy in 1st year after planting—10c. per plant.

For the crop year 1967-1968 planters are being paid a subsidy of two-thirds of the full rates, and for the crop year 1968-1969 a subsidy of one-third of the full rate will be paid.

3. It will thus be seen that the phasing out of the Scheme has already commenced and is being implemented.

Agricultural Development Bank

28. **Senator J. B. Stollmeyer** asked:

Will the hon. the Attorney General state:

1. When the new Agricultural Development Bank is going to commence operations?
2. Whether it is possible for farmers to obtain loans and/or crop advances from the Agricultural Credit Bank at the present time?
3. If the answer to the second part of the question is in the affirmative, will he state how many loans and/or crop advances have been made to farmers since 1st January, 1968?
4. How many applications for loans there are on file awaiting a decision of the Board of the Agricultural Credit Bank?

The Attorney General: 1. The Agricultural Development Bank will become fully operative as soon as the following operations are completed:—

- (a) The valuation of the assets and liabilities of the former Agricultural Credit Bank which have been vested in the Agricultural Development Bank. This is being done by the Valuation Division of the Ministry of Finance.
- (b) The determination of the rates of interest to be charged on loans. The Financial Institution Committee of the Ministry of Finance is now considering the matter.
- (c) The assessment of the staff requirements of the new Bank. This assessment is now being made by the Personnel Division of the Ministry of Home Affairs. Every effort

will be made to ensure that the Bank commences operation as early as possible and in any event not later than the 30th of September, 1968.

2. It is not now possible for farmers to obtain loans or crop advances from the Agricultural Credit Bank, as that bank has legally gone out of existence.

3. In view of the answer to part two, this part of the question does not arise.

Senator J. B. Stollmeyer : Would it be right then for me to ask the Attorney General whether Government made a mistake in having the Act proclaimed when it did, and now we are in a vacuum and cannot get any loans at all until the bank is formed?

The Attorney General : That is not a supplementary question.

LAND ACQUISITION

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Senator V. M. Crichtlow): Mr. President, I beg to move,

That this House approve the decision of the Governor-General to acquire the lands described in the Appendix for the public purposes specified.

These lands are being acquired for the purposes of roads, construction of a Telephone Exchange, and a recreation ground. The description is as follows: The first one is a parcel of land containing 1,694 acres, more or less, situate at Cassava Level Crown Trace in the Parish of St. Paul in the Ward of Tobago described in the Schedule hereto and coloured raw sienna on a plan of survey signed by the acting Director of Surveys and dated 13th October, 1966, executed under Survey Order No. 74/66 and filed in his office,

The Schedule is as follows:

A strip of land approximately 20 feet wide in the Parish of St. Paul in the Ward of Tobago containing 1,694 acres, more or less, starting at a point on the Merchiston Road about 600 feet South of the $1\frac{3}{4}$ mile mark, containing in a more or less easterly direction for a distance of approximately 3,700 feet and traversing the property known now or formerly as Merchison Estate.

The land referred to above is more particularly shown delineated and coloured raw sienna on a survey plan as C.N. 50 in the vault of the Lands and Surveys Department, Red House, Port-of-Spain.

The second is a parcel of land containing 2,359 acres, more or less, situate at Highland Trace in the Parish of St. David in the Ward of Tobago described in the Schedule hereto and coloured raw sienna on a plan of survey signed by the Director of Surveys and dated 31st January, 1967, executed under Survey Order No. 127/64 and filed in his office.

The following is the Schedule:

A strip of land approximately 26 feet wide in the Parish of St. David in the Ward of Tobago, starting at a point on the Western side of the Highland Crown Trace about 400 feet South-west of its intersection with the Northside Road and continuing in a roughly south-westerly direction for a distance of approximately 2,100 feet containing in the aggregate 2,359 acres more or less and comprising parts of larger parcels of land being:—

- (1) Now or formerly the property of McKenzie Joseph.
- (2) Now or formerly the property of Samuel Keith.

Land Acquisition

Tuesday, 23rd July, 1968

Land Acquisition

[SENATOR V. M. CRICHLAW]

- (3) Now or formerly the property of Winchester.
- (4) Now or formerly the property of Ridley Cato.
- (5) Now or formerly the property of Patterson.
- (6) Now or formerly the property of Samson.
- (7) Now or formerly the property of Winchester.
- (8) Now or formerly the property of Highlands Estate.

These lands are more particularly shown delineated, coloured raw sienna and numbered 1 to 8 as above on a survey plan filed as C.N. 69 in the vault of the Lands and Surveys Department, Red House, Port-of-Spain.

Thirdly, a parcel of land containing 4,618 square feet, more or less, situate at Roxborough in the Parish of St. Paul in the Ward of Tobago described in the Schedule hereto and coloured raw sienna on a plan of survey signed by the acting Director of Surveys and dated 8th September, 1967, executed under Survey Order No. 115/67 and filed in his office.

The Schedule is as follows:

A parcel of land at Roxborough, Tobago, comprising 4,618 square feet, situate on the eastern side of Union Street about 100 feet north of the Windward Road, forming part of the property belonging now or formerly to the Incorporated Trustees of the Church of England in Trinidad and Tobago.

This parcel of land is more particularly shown and delineated and coloured raw sienna on a plan filed at folio 122 of

book 969 in the vault of the Lands and Surveys Division, Red House, Port-of-Spain.

The fourth parcel of land contains 5a. 0r. 38p., more or less, situate at New Grant, Princes Town in the Ward of Savana Grande in the County of Victoria, described in the Schedule hereto and coloured raw sienna on a plan of survey signed by the acting Director of Surveys and dated 16th January, 1967, executed under Survey Orders, Nos. 82/61, 111/65 and 206/66 and filed in his office.

The Schedule for this reads as follows:

A parcel of land containing 5a. 0r. 38p., more or less, situate West of Naparima-Mayaro Road, approximately 200 feet South of the T-Junction of the Torrib-Tabaquite Road, Naparima-Mayaro Road and New Grant, Princes Town in the Ward of Savana Grande in the County of Victoria, forming part of the property belonging now or formerly to Guinness and Others.

The parcel of land mentioned above is more particularly shown delineated and coloured raw sienna on a survey plan filed as F.I. 42 in the vault of the Lands and Surveys Department, Red House, Port-of-Spain.

Question proposed.

Question put and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House approve the decision of the Governor-General to acquire the lands described in the Appendix for the public purposes specified.

NATIONAL LOTTERIES BILL

Order for Second reading read.

The Attorney General and Minister for Legal Affairs (Senator the Hon. G. A. Richards): Mr. President, 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.

After prolonged consideration of its desirability, after long notice to the community and after a close assessment of its feasibility the Government of this country have decided to take steps to establish a system of national lotteries. And the Bill which now comes before the Senate is designed to give effect to that decision.

The direct purpose of the Bill, as its long title suggests, is to provide for the establishment of a National Lotteries Control Board for the promotion and conduct of national lotteries. That Board would be authorized to conduct national lotteries. Members of the Senate would be aware that under the existing law, the Gambling and Betting Act of 1963, lotteries are unlawful unless they are conducted under precise conditions designed to ensure their fairness and also unless they are promoted for specific purposes mainly charitable and cultural, at any rate for purposes not of private gain. It was accordingly necessary to seek specific statutory authority for the purpose of establishing these national lotteries.

Now, it will be clear that the Bill does not seek to promote any new form of gambling. Lotteries under the guise of sweepstakes, bingos, raffles and so on are a part of our social scene. The decision to establish these national lotteries arose out of the desire to

channellize some of the proceeds of that form of gambling activity so that they may be devoted to national purposes, things like development, social welfare and so on—purposes which are beneficial to the whole community—rather than permitting all of them to be dissipated in the hands of a limited number of persons.

Accordingly in taking steps to establish these lotteries Government accept as a reality that basic trait of human nature, the urge to risk something in the hope of greater gain. And who are we to say that that is wrong? Life on this earth has not yet become so systematized that the compensation one receives for any particular effort be it good or bad is precisely proportioned to one's deserts. There are still elements of risk, danger and opportunity in our daily lives and I may ask, is not the willingness to take risks one of the mainsprings of human endeavour, one of the foundations of human achievements? We are quite frequently apt to attach pejorative connotations or to impart emotional attributes to some very straightforward and simple words. "Gambling" is one of these words; and gambling, as I have suggested, Mr. President, is merely risking money with the hope of greater gain.

2.10 p.m.

The Government have accepted also, the reality that in this community people do gamble extensively and in various forms. There are, of course, some forms which involve the playing with, the attributes, or the infusion of some form of skill, dexterity or experience; and there are also other forms which rely on pure chance. The lottery naturally falls in the latter class, and in the case of this form of gambling the thing that is most desirable is that it should not be

[THE ATTORNEY GENERAL]

allowed to fail in its purpose because of human intervention by way of trickery or dishonesty or deceit. Accordingly, a lottery that is properly conducted is perhaps one of the fairest forms of that sort of gambling which depends on pure chance.

The conduct by governments of lotteries is a widely accepted principle, Mr. President. We have seen it in one form for many years in the Republic of Ireland where the Irish Sweepstakes serve to practically maintain the hospital system of that country. We know that it exists in many of the Latin American countries, and notably in Mexico where it plays a large part in the welfare activities of that government. It also exists in Venezuela and Puerto Rico. The United States is giving attention to it. Not long ago the State of New York introduced a state lottery and certain states are now considering it. There is one in operation in Guyana, and Jamaica, almost simultaneously with us, is contemplating the establishment of a national lottery. Even in the United Kingdom, which for many years shied from this concept, is in fact using it in the form of premium bonds, which are used to encourage public savings.

Possibly there are some people who object to the promotion of a national lottery on what they might choose to term moral grounds, but I would respectfully suggest that when we enter that field we are on very shifting and uncertain foundations. After all, a decision as to what is morally permissible or not is always subject to wide and objective decisions. It is hardly for us to seek to impose on other people a standard which we might quite honestly believe to be good but which would not be acceptable to them. And I would also suggest, Mr. President, that it really is not the task of Government to legislate in these fields unless the moral sense of

the entire community condemns an action. And I think that would be quite clear to all of us that the moral sense of this community does not condemn lotteries.

The classic example of an attempt by a government to exercise this sort of control is, of course, the attempt by the United States Government a generation or so ago to impose prohibition on the use and sale of alcoholic liquors in the United States. What happened is now history.

It does seem that the wise way to proceed in these matters is to exercise some degree of control or regulation, so that any possible harmful effects can be avoided and some benefit might be obtained from these activities.

Accepting this principle then, Mr. President, that in matters such as these it is wiser to direct certain activities along safe lines rather than to forbid them, the Bill before the Senate, I would suggest, makes all the provisions that are necessary for such direction. In the first place it places the conduct of the lotteries in the hands of a Board which is charged with specific responsibilities. Clause 9 makes provision for the Minister of Finance to give any direction which might be desirable or necessary in the public interest. Clause 10 permits the Board to acquire information and to inform itself generally on any matter which might be outside its knowledge by means of a use of the system of committees. Clause 7 makes provision for assigning precise responsibilities to officers of the Board and to ensure that they will discharge their responsibilities properly. Clause 18 it would be seen that in addition to what is stated in subclause (1) the Board may under subclause (2) require its officers to give security to its satisfaction for the due execution of their duties.

It prescribes in some detail, Mr. President, the banking and financial procedures which are to be followed by the Board in clauses 26 and 27. It assigns to the Minister of Finance the power and the responsibility for making regulations designed to secure public understanding of the operation of the lotteries. I refer now to clause 31 where it would be seen that the conditions to be observed by agents, the form and contents of the ticket, the information to be published and so on, are matters on which regulations designed to avoid dispute are to be made.

Paragraph (f) of clause 31 gives regulations to prevent frauds or irregularities, and to ensure that proper accounting systems are employed.

And finally, Mr. President, but by no means least, the Bill contains provision which would make the accounts of the Board public accounts for the purpose of the Constitution. That is to say, they would be subject to audit by the Auditor General, and they are to be forwarded to the Minister after such auditing, and the Minister should cause a copy of these statements of account and a report on them to be laid before Parliament in each year.

I think an examination of the Bill will really satisfy hon. Senators that all that can be done to ensure the efficient conduct of these lotteries has been done. It is Government's intention that the lottery should be conducted fairly along precise, honest and businesslike lines, and I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that the Bill provides the necessary framework to carry out these intentions.

I have the honour to move, Mr. President, that the Bill be now read a Second time.

Question proposed.

2.20 p.m.

Senator J. B. Stollmeyer : Mr. President I am not opposed to the idea of a national lottery. I am not opposed to it on religious grounds. I am not opposed to it on moral grounds. I am not opposed to the principle of a national lottery. As a matter of fact, when this idea was mooted some time ago—and as you know, Sir, it has been raised on many occasions in this Senate, on the occasion of the Throne Speech, on the occasion of the Budget Debate, and what have you—I said to myself that when this Bill comes up I will vote in favour of it. But I have had to consider the matter further and I find that I have certain misgivings and fears and, if they are not allayed by the hon. Attorney General, these fears and misgivings will cause me to change my views.

First of all, Mr. President, I deplore, as much as I deplore the absence of Senator Neehall here today, the absence of regulations in connexion with this Bill. This is an enabling Bill, but the meat of it will be in the regulations when they are prepared. This Bill is completely emasculated without those regulations. We cannot help wondering how it is going to be run, how it is going to be drawn, what the prizes are going to be, or what the distribution of the revenue is going to be as a result of the drawing. The guts of this Bill must be in the regulations.

Clause 31 gives the Minister the power to make these regulations, as far as I can see without recourse to either of the Houses of Parliament, and this in my view is shameful. I am not going to read this particular section of the Bill but this is my interpretation of it, and inasmuch as I feel that the regulations are of so much importance and should form such an integral part of the Bill, I feel that we are at a complete disadvantage in not

having them at the same time as we have the Bill.

Mr. President, I for one will need certain assurances before I vote in favour of this Bill. I will need some positive statement by the hon. Attorney General regarding some of the implications of this Bill, for example, the question of charities. As you know, as a result of the introduction of the national lottery the sweepstakes have to be closed down, and from these sweepstakes certain charities benefited over the years to a greater or lesser extent, and very large sums of money were paid to these various charities over the years. As I see it, Sir, there are no guarantees whatsoever that these charities, whose expenses continue to rise from year to year, will be getting anything out of this new lottery. I have heard no assurance on this score. I can name some of them for you—the two orphan homes; the Institutes for the Blind, the Deaf and the Dumb; the Salvation Army, the T.S.P.C.A. and the Red Cross. What guarantee have we that any of these charitable organizations are going to benefit from the national lottery? What guarantee have we that moneys they have received in the past—and these sums are considerable—will be given to them from the lottery?

I should just like to give you an idea of some of the funds that were received by charitable institutions. I have chosen figures approximately five years apart. I shall give you an idea of the amount of money involved:

In 1956 charitable institutions received from the sweepstakes	\$133,540
1960	\$ 96,800
1966	\$ 48,623
1967	\$ 39,780

We all know of the great work being done by some of these organizations. In fact all of them have derived benefit from the sweepstake, and we should like to be assured that they are going to get something out of the lottery, at least the equivalent of what they received before.

While on this subject, among the persons who benefited from the sweepstakes and who, by implication, are not going to receive any benefit from the national lottery, are the horse-owners. I am sorry Senator Lucky-Samaroo is not here because she would be affected by this. But the sweepstake contributed large sums of money to the stakes paid to horse-owners at race meetings. Now, this revenue will have to come from some other source, unless the horse-owners are once more going to agree to accept reduced stakes, in which case they would receive less than they do now; and there are enough complaints already about this.

Horse-owners received:

In 1956	\$230,860
1960	\$167,219
1966	\$ 79,560
1967	\$ 65,092

Are they going to be compensated? If so, how? What assurance is there that this lottery will provide the equivalent of what they got from the sweepstakes in the past?

Then, Sir, there is the question of the race clubs, which also used to derive commissions from the sweepstakes. The race clubs, I think everybody is aware, are fighting for their lives these days in the face of the existing tax structure and the operation of licensed betting shops. Now, with the loss of the sweepstake, there will be a further depletion

in the revenue. To give you an idea of the commissions received by the clubs from the sweepstake which will no longer be in operation, I quote:—

1956	\$230,660
1960	\$167,200
1966	\$ 83,983
1967	\$ 68,712

I wonder, Sir, if Government fully realize all the implications when they set about setting up this national lottery without making provision for these various institutions that I have mentioned.

Mr. President, I had been led to believe that when the national lottery was going to be launched Government would close the licensed betting shops. But Government have been deeply silent on this particular issue. I wonder whether there has been any change of face. When the period of licence for the licensed betting shops was reduced from one year to six months, we understood the reason for this was the fact that the national lottery was pending and when it came on the scene the betting shops would be closed down within six months. Why else then was this provision brought in? I can see no other reason why it should be—that the period of licence should be six months only? This is a very unusual thing.

2.30 p.m.

I know of licences for one year or five years but you do not give a man a licence for six months unless you have some motive; and the motive in this case was that you wanted to close down these pools. But we hear nothing of this now. I wonder what the position is and what Government's views are about this now. There is no gain saying the fact that the licensed betting shops have had a terrific effect on the money which in

the past came through the race clubs; and who in their right mind would dare to say that these same betting shops would not have a similar effect on the moneys which should go through the national lottery?

Look at the way the sweepstakes have gone down in the last five or six years. Since 1962 when the pools came in, the sweepstakes have declined considerably. I say without fear of contradiction that this same thing will happen with the national lottery. As long as these pools are there, you are not going to get the return you expect. Eight million dollars from this lottery? Never. You are not going to get anything like that. Do not fool yourself about it, you will not get it.

Mr. President, I have concern over the persons—there are not many of them, but in these days of unemployment you do not wish to throw even 18 or 20 people out on the labour market, those persons who worked for years on the sweepstakes and who have some sort of idea of what goes with sweepstakes. These persons have not been given any sort of guarantee that they will get a job with the National Lottery Board. I do not suppose Government can tell them, "Yes, we are going to give you a job"; but I do hope these persons will get priority when the time comes for taking on people who have to work in a similar business.

Mr. President, in my view, the race clubs in this country have been too quiet in the last year or two; they have played the game too straight. But the sweepstake—and before I go into this I should like to say that I feel anything relevant to the sweepstake is relevant to this Bill. As a result of this national lottery the sweepstakes have been closed, and therefore I am going into some detail on the question of the tax on the

[SENATOR J. B. STOLLMEYER]

sweepstake. Up to 1962, before this Gambling and Betting Act of 1963, there was a tax on the sweepstake not in excess of 11 cents on a 50c. ticket. And in the Gambling and Betting Act, section 22 (2) I will read for you what the duty is in connexion with sweepstake tickets. I will read what the duty is now and what the duty was then in respect of every ticket issued and sold for such a sweepstake:

“(a) in respect of every ticket issued and sold for such a sweepstake—

- (i) when the sweepstake is conducted in connection with, but such tickets are not issued and sold exclusively at, any race meeting held as aforesaid, the sum of three cents, when the price does not exceed ten cents, and a further two cents on every additional ten cents or part thereof in respect of such price;”

This means that on a 50c. ticket you should pay 3c. duty on the first 10c. and 2c. on each of the other four. So you pay a maximum of 11c. But the Turf Clubs were told that they would have to pay 15c. on a ticket in 1963; and they were told that this was because of a typographical error and it would be corrected. No such correction has been made. None.

Are the Government above the law that they just come and tell you to pay a tax which is not legal? But everybody has kept silent. I do not believe in keeping silent if something is wrong. I feel it an abuse of power, an abuse of Parliament, and I think it my duty to bring it up here today. I always assumed, and I have plenty of evidence of it, that the Government are fair-minded, but this has caused me to wonder. I do not know why these race clubs

deserve this shabby treatment. They do not know where they stand. They know they are in financial difficulty, but nothing is done to alleviate their difficulty.

Mr. President, I conclude: no regulations, plus no assurance, no aye.

Senator T. T. Bleasdel : Mr. President, the Bill before the Senate this afternoon certainly seems to be a controversial one; controversial because a large section of the community is against it, and more important, because most of the religious bodies of the country are against it. Even supporters of this Bill are not quite sure that they are doing what is right, and are blinded by the projected idea that the financial gains will help greatly in solving the financial difficulties of this country. We are all willing to see our economic problems solved, but some of us do not believe they will be solved in this direction.

There are some things that money cannot buy. Moral character is the most important of them all. Collecting money, borrowing and winning money seem to be the most important functions of the Government. Individual morals may be tainted; we are all human beings; but in Government, morals and high ideals should be preserved. It is like the church; some of the priests may err, but the church stands absolute in its infallibility. And that is where Government should stand—absolute in their ideals.

It would appear that within the last few years, gambling has developed considerably in our society; a few people have become millionaires overnight. There has been a big boast in high quarters of Government that whether you like it or not the public of Trinidad and Tobago is a gambling public. This, in my view, is not a complimentary

boast; it is an awful one. It would seem that Government and some of their advisers who obviously believe in gambling, seeing a few people being swept from rags to riches overnight in running these pools, have fallen for the idea that if Government can take full control they would be able to make all the money that all these individuals are making and this would greatly help to make this country financially stable, which we are not sure of being right now. Government are losing sight of one fact; that these thoughts and ideas were projected before; similar decisions were taken before and the failures of the Government as a result of having taken those decisions are clear before us.

2.40 p.m.

For example, we have said so often with respect to some of these projects that Government have gone into after seeing them carried on by private individuals over the years who apparently made a fabulous profit, that Government have taken them over only to find eventually that they have to give them up. I need not worry to mention these utilities because Members of the Senate are well aware of them. Where is the guarantee that the national lottery will succeed when these other ventures have failed? We have no guarantee of this.

It has been mentioned in certain Government circles that about \$10 million will be realized annually from this national lottery, but as Senator Stollmeyer said we do not know what the regulations for the running of the national lottery are going to be. We may very well find that at the end of the year \$10 million may be realized and may well pass through the coffers of Government, but we may also find that \$2 million may have gone in prizes, \$6 million in expenditure and

\$3 million for miscellaneous purposes, with the lottery running at a deficit of \$1 million which amount may eventually be taken from the Consolidated Fund, which the Minister has the power to authorize.

I quote clause 22 subclause (3) which gives the Minister authority to withdraw money from the Consolidated Fund if this fails:

"If at any time the sum standing in 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. President, this is the authority vested in the Minister and when I say 'the Minister' I mean Cabinet. It has been made clear here so often that the Minister is directly responsible to the Cabinet.

But the Attorney General may ask me to continue reading. He may ask me to read clause 23 which states:

"At the end of each financial year there shall be paid into the Consolidated Fund after allowing for all expenses and the amount reserved for prizes, the balance standing to the credit of the National Lotteries Account."

But if there is no balance at the end of the financial year there is nothing to credit. How are we to guarantee that there will be any balance. There are sins or wrongs that Government have no control over; gambling is one of them. And not because this wrong

[SENATOR T. T. BLEASDELL]

may shine with lucrative yields or unworthy gain despite their highly immoral characteristics, should Government devise laws to perpetuate this wrong. We must be fair to ourselves and to our country and we must know from experience that our nation is not void of deep-seated immoral characteristics and corruption and realizing that high powered gambling in our society is certainly no asset to our young nation, Government have clearly indicated that either they have not realized the value of moral character or they can only see the way they know through one-track minds.

Mr. President, when individuals go wrong, they pay for their wrongs individually; when Governments go wrong the entire nation pays for this wrong. We are opposing this Bill mainly on moral grounds and partially on economic grounds. Since Government gave their reasons for introducing this Bill as being purely financial and we are opposing it, it is only fair that we should point out other ways of assisting in solving our economic problems. It is so often said that we in the Opposition just criticize and we do not point out any solutions. But there are many ways that the Government have erred and there are very many things that the Government could do or could have done which would have avoided our embarking on gambling and a gambling Government.

Government have erred tremendously in getting maximum value for dollars spent. This was clearly indicated in the first ten years of Government's administration. Possibly when the Government came into being they never knew of the difficulties of Government. Every one felt to be in charge of a Government may be an easy matter. But getting into the saddle is one thing; riding the horse is something else. And

Government, having got in the saddle and ridden the horse, have found out the difficulty in running this country. And to this day ten years after Government's administration they have found themselves in debt to the tune of over \$300 million.

Any good business man will tell you that wealth is not accrued from making money; wealth is accrued from money saved. If you make plenty money and squander it or you spend it badly you will not have it, but if you make a reasonable amount and you save it then you will have it when you need it most. If the Government had used this theory they would not have been in the financial predicament in which they find themselves today. Running a country is certainly like running a business. I am of the opinion that the Government do not really possess very good business acumen for if they did the money collected by them over the years would have been spent in a much better way and this country would not have been in the position that we have now found ourselves today and we would not have had to resort to gambling for making money.

As I said, I should like to suggest a few points where Government could introduce ideas other than gambling for making money or improving the economic situation in our country. Government should introduce a Ministry of Food whereby the accent would be on the mass production of food. For example, we claim to produce various brands of stockfeed in our country but all we do is crush the grains in producing this feed. We do not really produce stockfeed here. All the grains are imported and with a Ministry of Food the accent will be on producing food in this country and we will be producing the grains that provide the stockfeed in our country and the more food we produce the

less we will import. Our food bill today is in the region of \$92 million annually and the more we produce the more money will stay at home for the development of our country.

The Government have given or loaned \$400,000 to Glamour Girl Lingerie; \$500,000 to the Coconut Growers' Association and \$200,000 to Matouk, a total of \$1,100,000. Instead of giving or lending this \$1,100,000 to these industries Government should have bought shares to this value on behalf of the workers of these industries. By doing so these workers would have been entitled to share in the annual profits of these industries because each worker would then be a shareholder and there would be no room for unions or industrial courts. This would have been the beginning of the workers of our country developing the spirit of independence and ownership. This is one way of starting to build a new moral outlook in the employees and their generations to follow.

2.50 p.m.

Mr. President, I can go on and on to show how well Government could have spent their dollars on approval, but there is no need for me to do this because hon. Members of this Senate are well aware. But what I do say is if we continue as we are going I cannot see us getting very far. I imagine the decision is already taken to establish this national lottery and nothing we say can change this idea of Government, but I sincerely hope that something happens to change Government's mind on this Bill.

Morally, Mr. President, it is wrong. And we ask ourselves the final question: Will our families benefit from the national lottery, or will the harm done to them be greater than the money we make?

Mr. President, this lottery will only bring pressure to bear on the masses who are

already poor. The 80 per cent of the masses are the ones who will be spending their last twenty-five cent pieces with the hope of becoming rich overnight to find that they are just fooling themselves.

I read, I believe in a Watch Tower magazine, a few days ago that Christ will be coming in 1975. But when you do some research into Government's financial activities, when you really search the Government and their failures, when you really look at the hardships of this country, when you really look at the corruption in this country, and you realize that nobody seems to have the answer to the day-to-day corruption that goes on in this country—because it would seem difficult to me to find any honest bargaining in our country today—I sincerely wish and pray that Christ comes not in 1975, but right now to save this Government of ours and our nation.

I thank you.

Senator C. O'Brien : Mr. President, since receiving a copy of the Bill before us I have been questioning myself as to what is the reason for Government wanting to institute a national lottery into the society of Trinidad and Tobago. On hearing the hon. Attorney General present this Bill I got a vague suggestion that it may be to assist in certain social services. And bearing in mind that this Bill is supposed to bring to the country a certain amount of revenue one must assume that it is designed to assist in some sort of economic development. Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the comments that I am about to make will be considered by you to be relevant to the discussion of this Bill; because I can see no other reason for the proposal of this Bill than to try to stimulate further the economic development of Trinidad and Tobago.

National Lotteries Bill
[SENATOR C. O'BRIEN]

Tuesday, 23rd July, 1968

National Lotteries Bill

And this is why I am confused, because I should have thought that we would have spent more time in stimulating certain agencies in this country that could do with a lot of stimulation in order to assist our economic development. But instead of this we are again being asked to set up another board, another organization, which will involve more expenditure, more people to pay, more discussions to take place, with the hope that this will bring a few million dollars into our coffers; when at this present time we already have several boards in operation for many years that have not as yet begun to scrape the potential that exists in the sections of the economy that were placed under their charge.

Mr. President, surely if we want revenue in our coffers, if we want some dynamic economic development, then it is time a new and dynamic approach is made to tourism in this country. Time and time again we have criticized publicly and have discussed at many private meetings, the inability of the Industrial Development Corporation to really get moving. Surely these are two agencies that could bring into the coffers of this country much needed revenue. And this is why I feel that really there is no need in the present set up of our country to have a national lottery.

Let us develop our economy, let us obtain additional revenue by strong fundamental basics of economic development and not by a game of chance. This, in my view was the thinking that the Government had a few years ago. This was the sort of deep understanding that the Government had a few years ago of the economic problems that faced this country. But with full respect, Mr. President, I think that the introduction of this Bill almost exemplifies the fact that our Government seem lost for ideas, seem

lost to be able to really stimulate the basic fundamentals of economic development that are there if somebody will only begin to move them.

Mr. President, we have heard that national lotteries have been operated in other countries. May I point out, with reference to Ireland, that prior to their dynamic tourist development and the establishment of Shannon Airport as a free trade area, Ireland was considered to be one of the poorest countries in the world. It was not the national lottery that brought in great wealth to Ireland. And, Sir, as far as I am concerned, I would not compare this country with any other South American country, because our standard of living and our per capita income make those larger countries look minute.

Therefore, I do not think that we should try to substantiate the argument for the establishment of a national lottery in this country with reference to the fact that this has happened elsewhere. I do feel that Government should turn their attention to such things as our housing development. It seems to me that only when some major crisis comes to this country that certain people or certain departments in Government do their work.

3.00 p.m.

It may interest hon. Senators to know that within the last month the department for planning in this country has given approval to more projects than they gave in the entire year 1967. I presume that we must thank our labour friends for their successful Saturday morning march, and I believe we must thank the Prime Minister for the Tripartite Conference. This is where the Ministries of this country should look and instead of the Minister having once more to devote time to a national lottery, he should

devote more time to ensure that those officers, whoever they may be, who are holding up legitimate projects, get moving. This is the type of administration that this country needs for effective economic development—not the establishment of any games of chance.

Mr. President, it may interest the Senate to know—and we have heard it many times—that in certain building projects in this country nine agencies have to be consulted. My God, tell me how much patience must an investor have, because I am sure that you will agree that each of these agencies will take at least one month with an application. It even takes life—nine months. So Mr. President, I do feel that what the Government should look at, rather than the introduction of any more cumbersome machinery, to streamline what they have; because what they have is a good structure, and basically a good team can get things moving, but for some reason or other, it has got bogged down by personalities. What Government should do in these days is not to worry any more about the introduction of new Bills, but to take stock and see what is wrong in the warehouse, and what is blocking the machinery from coming out, and they will find a lot more money in their coffers and a lot more dynamic development in the building industry and in tourism, &c.

To give an example, Sir, I am sure my friend the hon. Attorney General will recall that about three months ago I asked about the hotel development of this country. I was then told that during the year 619 hotel rooms will be built plus 225 in the Scotland Bay project. This is July, and as far as I know, only 18 rooms have been built. I am not suggesting for one moment that the Attorney General was trying to mislead the Senate, for this information was given him

by those very agencies. If 844 rooms could be built in 1968 this would give us 13,376 new jobs. So, Mr. President, let these agencies stop fooling themselves with Scotland Bay. Let us get somebody else instead of Mr. Lee Davies and let us get things moving.

I had the opportunity to visit Scotland Bay with a good friend who enjoys the luxury of his motor boat, and I find that the only people who seem to be enjoying Scotland Bay are the Red Howlers. They are having a ball down there. You see hundreds of them.

Mr. President, if we want a proper, fundamental, economic development I suggest that some of the things that have been planned for several months and going on over the years should be implemented. We heard in April, 1967 of a ten-storey block of Government offices to be erected on the Old Fire Brigade Station site; but the old Fire Brigade Station has not even been pulled down as yet. We have heard also in the Budget Speech that certain fiscal incentives will be attended to immediately, because they were considered constructive. But the Budget Speech was delivered six months ago and no action has yet been taken. We also understood that construction of the highway to San Fernando would be completed in 1968. This has not taken place as yet.

The point I am trying to make is that we should strive to get a sound economic development that this country needs and can obtain. It is there for the asking, Mr. President. Then perhaps if we want to expedite the building of hospitals or social works, you can come along with something like a national lottery. I do not think even then you will need a national lottery. But you should not bring a National Lottery Bill to the country at this time when there are so

many other things that deserve priority. I cannot accept the principle of instituting this legislation at this time. And even if this were done, if there were one bit of legislation which urgently required the regulations attached to it, it is this Bill, because the fundamental part of the national lottery is to know how it is going to be regulated, and how it is going to be run. The Bill says it will be run by a board, but Government also say that the establishment of gas stations should be run at the discretion of a board but some people thought it best not to seek that advice. And I say here, today, knowing full well what I am saying, that what the scope of something like a national lottery could do for people who would want to use it for dishonest purposes, would make the gas station probe look like a joke.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is most necessary that it is clearly stated by Government how this national lottery is going to be operated. I presume how, but I should like to hear it, that these tickets are going to be properly and secretly perforated. What are the frequencies of draws? This is a very important thing, I presume. We have no doubt that today this Bill will pass into law, but I should like to see a great frequency of drawings with a wide spread of benefits. In other words, I think these lotteries should be drawn every two weeks with perhaps ten or fifteen prizes instead of every quarter or every six months with two or three prizes. These drawings must be done in full public view so that the public will feel confident that there is no bobol.

3.10 p.m.

Then the men who form the Lottery Board—an extremely important item in this Bill, I notice, and perhaps with good reason, it is stated there would be a chairman and

four members to form the Board, but no indication is given as to where these people would come from. I hope that the Ministry concerned will scrupulously ensure that the men who sit on this board have the confidence of the public of this country and that they are men of high integrity. Because, if there is room for suspicion at all that these lotteries may be misused, it will not this time be the scandal of any individual; it will be the scandal of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago.

Mr. President, on page 11 clause 25 (2) reads:

“The accounts of the Board shall be audited by the Auditor General.”

I have the highest regard for the department of the Auditor General, but let us be practical and realistic. Time and time again, we come to this Senate and audited accounts are laid on the Table from different Government Departments and different Government agencies. Today, we have received the Auditor General's Report on the National Housing Authority for the year ending 31st December, 1966. This cannot happen, hon. Senators, in a National Lottery; and therefore I am suggesting most strongly and I hope the Attorney General will accept my suggestion, that a private firm of auditors audit the accounts of the National Lottery, with distinct instructions that they submit their report so that it can be presented by Government to Parliament not later than 90 days after the end of the year. We know that the Auditor General's department is already overworked, and therefore, I feel from the point of view of instilling public confidence, you cannot ask the country to wait a year, two years, and as we all know sometimes three years, to get the Auditor General's Report on the accounts of the

National Lottery. I would ask my hon. Friends from the opposite side to reconsider this and get a private firm of auditors to audit the accounts as I have suggested.

Mr. President, I took the time to get some information from countries having national lotteries, and the nearest to us is Curacao. They have a national lottery and it operates quite successfully, and I hope ours will do so. But it is specified where the funds that come from this National Lottery must go. Those funds are held in a special account for education and social services. And this is where I feel this Bill has not been explicit enough. These funds should go into a special account for a specific purpose and I can find no better purpose than for those two objectives — the educational system of this country and social services. I should like to ask the Attorney General to consider this amendment.

Mr. President, somehow—and I hope he will forgive me—I seem to have detected in my hon. Friend, the Attorney General, when he presented this Bill that his heart was not in it, and it is the same thing with me. I have tried to see how I can support this Bill, because I am not against it for religious or moral reasons, but my heart is just not there. To me there is no need in Trinidad and Tobago today to bring a national lottery to raise money for economic development. The agencies that are now responsible for doing this are there. Let us streamline them, let us get dynamic people to work with them. Let us give them some sort of opportunity and independence to get the job done; and let Government establish the overall policy of the I.D.C., the Tourist Board, the Public Transport Service Corporation. Put the men there, let them do the job, and if they cannot do it, get somebody else; and then this

country will move in a dynamic direction and then our Treasury, perhaps, will be a bit healthier than it is today.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that for the concrete reasons I have tried to put forward I am going to find it very difficult to vote in favour of this Bill.

Senator Ramzan Ali : Mr. President, unlike my friends, no amount of guarantee or regulation attached to this Bill can make me change my mind. I know as a fact that this Bill will have safe passage in the Senate today, but I want to make my position clear. While I am a Member of the Senate, I am also a responsible member of the Muslim community. I am one of the members of the Muslim Advisory Council and I have to place on record my contribution to this debate. I am not opposing this Bill on legal grounds, but I do so on religious and moral grounds.

Mr. President, this Bill is pregnant with misgivings and suspicion. There is absolutely no protection in this Bill for our children. This Bill is silent; it does not say whether our innocent children, our infants, will be able to participate in this national lottery or not, and since this Bill is silent, we have to look at what will be the position of our children including our elementary and secondary children. This Bill will be a cancer and will destroy the moral standard of our children; this Bill will be a curse on our children and Government will be condemned by posterity for introducing this Bill in Parliament.

Mr. President, I have the highest regard for the Government, for all they have done for the advancement of this country in such a short period of time. But I want to say with due respect that they are ill-advised in promoting this Bill. A Government that is

contented with what it has done will never become famous for what it will do in the future. Remember the formula for achievement—congregate, co-ordinate and co-operate. Think carefully of the feelings of the various denominations in this country. I know as a fact that every religious denomination is opposed to this Bill on religious and moral grounds, and we must take into consideration, and I want to draw the attention of this hon. Senate to, the importance of the church in our nation. The church has played a very important part in the preservation and protection of the social, educational and moral standards of our people.

Mr. President, no education is perfect and can be described in the true sense of the word—education—without a religious background, as it is known, there can be no knowledge and no truth without accurate facts, but all the facts in the world do not add up to knowledge.

3.20 p.m.

There are three sources through which knowledge is made available to mankind. And these are the three claimants in the field of guidance and every one of them claims that it can guide humanity in the ultimate problems of life. One is science; the other is philosophy; the third is revelation. Mr. President, my main purpose for this explanation in this debate dealing with the various aspects of knowledge is to point out the error of our Government which is supposed to be based on the hypothesis of mathematical calculations of earning revenue for Government from this National Lotteries Control Board, on the basis of scientific method and economic advice.

Science is based upon observation and every observation is made up of three

factors. One, the Observer—the physical capability, the mental capability of the observer can lead him wrong and astray—two, the object which is observed; and three, the condition under which the observation is made. If we examine these factors we shall see that they are variable and not stable.

The second source, philosophy, may be broadly classified into four schools, namely, formal rationalism; empiricism; criticism, and empirical rationalism.

Let it be noted that scientific facts are at best workable hypotheses or working material on the scale of observation or the system of reference with which they are connected. Hence they have neither finality, nor perfect accuracy, nor absolute certainty. This means that if the starting point and the working material of empirical rationalism lack accuracy, certainty and finality, the conclusion arrived at will suffer from the same shortcomings. In other words, a solution of the ultimate problems on the basis of the sure knowledge is impossible even for the empirical rationalist school of philosophy.

An eminent scientist thinker of modern times admits this truth in the following words:

“Many people wrongly think that logical mechanisms are standard and that logical reasoning, and all the more so mathematical reasoning are inevitably ‘true’. This is not always the case; we must be aware of the process of human thought because, in the first place, the starting is often a sensorial observation, therefore of doubtful value or an observation based on commonsense. Now commonsense cannot be trusted.”

Mr. President, let us be practical and realistic. This Bill leaves no doubt in the

mind of any one that it is in direct conflict and opposition with the teachings of all the recognized religions of the world and we have now reached a very unhappy situation of the state versus the church.

Mr. President, I hope Government will appreciate the error committed by introducing this Bill, and behave like the student who once said, "I have made mistakes, but I have not made the mistake of claiming that I never made one."

I remember a story, and I believe it is appropriate to quote it in this debate. Once a man was hired to chop wood at \$3.00 per hour with the back side of the axe and not the bit. To the wood cutter, the pay sounded good, but the idea sounded crazy. After going through the motions of wood chopping for a few hours, the hired man went back to his employer and said, "I am through". The employer said, "If the wages are not enough I will pay you more". Replied the wood cutter, "No, sir, the pay is enough but when I cut wood I have to see chips fly." This is the position in which the Government find themselves. The Government are in the place of the employer hoping to earn revenue from a national lottery.

Examine the other public utilities of our nation and see what the position is. Every one is losing money. You hope to earn \$4 million or \$6 million from the national lottery. You will never see that \$4 million or \$6 million, just as the man chopping the wood with the back of the axe will never see the chips fly.

Mr. President, we are asked to follow the pattern of some of the Central and Latin American countries with regard to the national lotteries. Are we to regard these countries as an example for us in every

respect? I say emphatically "no". On the contrary, Trinidad and Tobago can serve as an example to them in many respects—true democracy, religious and racial peace and harmony, among our multi-racial society. These things do not exist in many of the Latin American and Central American countries.

Another argument advanced in support of this Bill is that as a large section of our community indulge in gambling therefore it is better to give it the sanction of the law. Are we prepared to create a precedent? Because a large section of our community violate the law by distilling bush rum, are we prepared to legalize it? A large section of our community is cultivating and smoking marijuana. Some of them are doing it because of unemployment, distilling rum to try to earn a few pennies to maintain their families. But it is illegal. Are we prepared, because we have some people in our country doing this, to give it the sanction of the law? Prædial larceny is now the order of the day. Are we to legalize it because a large section of our community steal goats, cattle, sheep, fowls and what not? There are unlicensed firearms in hands of criminals and thieves. Do not criminals and thieves have firearms and weapons and decent citizens of the country cannot obtain a firearm? Are we to make it free for all because you have a large section of the community having these things in their possession?

Mr. President, what is the position with abortion? Probably it is hoped to assist birth control. Are we prepared to legalize it? What is the position with cock fighting? Are we prepared to legalize it? Prostitution is legalized and regarded as a virtue in some countries, are we prepared to follow suit?

National Lotteries Bill
[SENATOR RAMZAN ALI]

Tuesday, 23rd July, 1968

National Lotteries Bill

Limitation of man's knowledge. This limitation of man is at the basis of his inability to solve his problems with any degree of satisfaction, and to it the conflicts between the various emotions and between emotion and reason are attributed, and you can get a fair idea of the muddle with which man is confronted.

Mr. President, what is the pronouncement of God Almighty, through his reformers and prophets, with regard to gambling? Religious instructions are meant mainly for the purpose of disciplining mankind, for the purpose of disciplining its followers. As we know, man is in a state of constant struggle for attainment of peace and comfort while ignoring religious institutions and seeking through material things; he fails, he starts in one material direction and obtains a certain amount of success, but when he evaluates in the light of his ultimate ideal he finds that he is far away from it. Neither wealth nor health, nor even a decent home life can separately guarantee that peace of the mind and comfort of the soul which every one of us cherishes so intensely. They can work only as contributory factors, if the fundamental requirements of the ideal exist.

3.30 p.m.

The question is—what is that fundamental requirement? What is that which the whole of humanity seeks but fails to find in its material pursuit? What is that which can cause a man to say: "I feel actually satisfied," or "I have peace of mind," or "I have achieved true happiness"?

An imperfect instrument of knowledge like the human brain—and in this case it is Government advisers—can never be regarded as a true measure of advice on a matter upon which rests our ultimate salvation. Sure and

comprehensive and trustworthy guidance cannot be that which comes from the finite and the imperfect but from one who is infinite and perfect, one whose knowledge comprehends the whole past, present and future, one whose vision is beyond the limitations of time and space, one whose knowledge of the reality of things leaves nothing to be desired. Is there any such thing? Is there any such means or medium from which knowledge can be obtained? Can that knowledge and guidance which follow faithfully ensure success in life and true happiness? Is there any practical and positive proof that those who follow that guidance achieve the ideal? These are the questions which we have to answer. These are the questions to which we should, as wise politicians and rational persons, attend. Because on them seems to rest the solution to our difficulties and our problems.

A nation does not sacrifice self-respect to win popularity, for if it respects itself then it does not feel any need for popularity. Once a great man said:

"I watched a gang tearing a building down;

A gang of men in a busy town.

With a ho-heave ho and a lusty yell,
They swung a beam and a side wall fell.

I asked the foreman, 'Are these men skilled?'

He gave a laugh and said 'No indeed,
Just unskilled labour I need.

I can just wreck in a day or two,
What builders have taken years to do'
And as I thought of myself as I went
my way,
Which of these roles I have tried to play?

Am I a builder who works with care,
Measuring life by a rule and square?
Or am I a wrecker who walks the town,
Content with the labour of tearing
down?"

This Bill for the operation of a national lottery, Mr. President, is, in my opinion, illegal in the sight of both God and man; and God Almighty says that the loss in this is greater than the gain. This is an inducement of Satan; this is a step in the wrong direction. We can only succeed by putting every step in the right direction. We must inculcate in the minds of our young nation—perseverance and persistence; taking always the right steps. Do Government believe that this Bill is the panacea for all our financial problems and that they will earn from it \$4 million to \$6 million? This is a wrong step made in the wrong direction. For it is said:

"One step would not take you very far,
you have to keep on walking;
One word won't tell folks who you are,
you have to keep on talking;
One inch won't make you very tall,
you have to keep on growing;
One deed won't do it all, you have to
keep on going."

A government which rules a nation and its leaders must be careful and cautious. They must not accept their positions merely for the pleasant privileges those positions afford, but it must be of necessity their moral duty to find legitimate ways and means for the advancement and progress of their people.

Our watchwords must be—Production, Tolerance, Patience, Perservance and Persistence. We must not be despondent or unfaithful. Even the men of God had their problems;

for instance the Prophet Noah:

"When Noah sailed the water blue,
He had his troubles same as you;
For forty days he drove his Ark,
Before he found a place to park."

This Bill, Mr. President, is the negative of all that is good and righteous. To support this Bill is tantamount to believing that the coming of Christ and the propagation of his mission was in vain; the division of the waters of the Red Sea for Moses to cross with the children of Israel, and the destruction of Pharoah and his army by God, was in vain; the appearance of all God's reformers and prophets and his revelations, were all in vain.

I appeal for piety; I appeal for righteousness; I appeal for the ideology of godliness, sacrifice, justice and loyalty. If there be righteousness in the heart, there will be beauty in the character. If there be beauty in the character, there will be harmony in the home. If there be harmony in the home, there will be order in the nation. If there be order in the nation, there will be peace in the world.

Men of understanding and knowledge have a serious duty and obligation to discharge. The way the mathematicians, the scientists, the politicians and the economists, are going, is not the way of the Kingdom of God, as it is to be established on earth. And to achieve this the church must be respected; the revealed words of God must be obeyed; absolute loyalty to the teaching of religion by leaders and states must be established. It is the greatest misfortune of humanity that religion, which alone can furnish the moral foundations on which true peace and happiness can be established, has been put under taboo, and this very panacea is deemed to

National Lotteries Bill
[SENATOR RAMZAN ALI]

Tuesday, 23rd July, 1968

National Lotteries Bill

be a poison. Hatred of religion has become the fashion among the so-called materially advanced people, without their giving a thought to the incontrovertible fact that religion has been the supreme force in the development of mankind to its present condition. As a matter of fact, human civilization, as we have it today, is based on religion. Religion has made possible a state of civilization which has again and again saved human society from disruption.

Mankind believed by its unprecedented material advancement and unthought of conquest of Nature that it had reached the acme of perfection. That impression has received a rude shock by the happenings among the nations on the international scene today. Material advancement, which was believed to be the source of increased happiness for the human race, has brought untold misery and vast destruction. The world is almost in a chaotic condition; every weak nation being the victim of the tyranny of its more powerful and more advanced neighbour. The sense of right and wrong in international relations has entirely disappeared before the passion of national aggrandizement; and this mentality rules the world from end to end. Evil is taken for a virtue if it wears the cloak of nationalism. It is evident, therefore, that materialism which fans the fire of human greed will bring in its trail only ruin and misery.

Mr. President, I want to make my position clear, as I said before. I am not subjected to party directives. If I, as an independent Senator, had absented myself from this sitting today, then my absence would have been misinterpreted. I have a duty and a responsibility to discharge. And I discharge my duty without any fear; I discharge my duty with due respect to one and all.

I have said that I oppose this Bill on religious and moral grounds. I share the view that Government was ill advised. I know of Government's eagerness to accumulate all the known potentialities of our resources, but in this particular instance, I wish to say very respectfully that Government have been ill advised and I cannot see my way to support this Bill.

3.40 p.m.

Senator L. Balgobin : Mr. President, we on this side of the House are unable to support this Bill today for two major reasons. The first is that a minority group in this country opposes the national lottery in the hands of Government; and the second is that various religious bodies do likewise. We must realize in this country that a clear example has been set in the past with respect to state ownership in Trinidad and Tobago. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago have clearly shown their incompetence to run anything. If you have anything that is working well and you want it to go bad, place it in the hands of the Government and you get it to go bad. A national lottery as is run in other countries is for specific purposes. We noticed that in another place the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Mr. Prevatt), said that some sections of the population have opposed the Bill.

Mr. President : I am sorry I cannot take that—"Mr. Prevatt said". We have ruled on that over and over.

Mr. L. Balgobin : In another place it was said that the national lottery would bring in a lot of funds to help the development of this country. It is perfectly clear that in 1956 the revenue of this country was \$88 million, and the expenditure was \$86 million, which shows clearly that we had a

surplus of \$2 million in that year. But when we take from the year 1959, we shall see revenue to the tune of \$157 million and expenditure was \$168 million. This is where our plight begins. Despite what you want to say in this country about creating new jobs, it was stated in another place that when you stop selling the sweepstake tickets in this country the national lottery will create thousands of jobs. But, Mr. President, we must realize that when you stop the selling of sweepstakes you put thousands of people out of jobs. So if these people are re-employed in the national lottery, you are not helping the labour field at all. This is just a farce. You are not helping them; you are re-employing them.

The Prime Minister of the country went on to say in 1956, "the problem of jobs is therefore number one priority in Trinidad and Tobago . . ."

Mr. President : Senator, I am sorry. Is that from *Hansard*?

Senator L. Balgobin : No, Sir, not *Hansard*.

Not jobs to sell sweepstake tickets but productive jobs. Today what we are offering our people is to sell lottery tickets. It is very clear that the Government found themselves in a difficult position after squandering their money on projects which are unproductive. As a result they have nothing to do but to find themselves adopting the pattern of South American countries. But I hope and trust that we will not allow ourselves to adopt the habits of the South American countries. We are an English speaking people. Our culture is English. Our heritage is English. For a generation we have practised true democracy and, Mr. President, we hope that we would not find ourselves following the pattern of other countries in whatsoever they do.

When we in this country move on any specific project, we must move on something which is beneficial to Trinidad and Tobago, and the people as a whole. But we must realize that the greatest bugbear in Trinidad is corruption in every field, and the gas station racket is one which has clearly shown us what is happening. So some big boy must be dealt with when you come and tell us that you want another Board for the National Lottery, we know that we shall have to get Wells Fargo! It is more trouble again.

The people in this country have no confidence in anything that the Government run, because it is clear to them that corruption starts from the beginning to the end and the people involved get away scot-free. You might hold a little fellow by the throat but the big man is allowed to run scot-free. The time is ripe for creating more jobs, but the national lottery will never bring \$10 million into this country, if we do not have people of good character and integrity to run it.

If the national lottery comes into being as we expect it, I hope that Government would consider very seriously bringing into force a national insurance scheme and subsidizing it with money from the national lottery, so that the working class people would have something to look forward to. You must have a specific purpose for running this lottery, and if you do not have that, then we say you are running it for somebody to live in luxury and others to live in poverty. The young people in this country need employment and we trust that other major projects which will include these people and will give them relief, will now be embarked upon.

I cannot see the success of the national lottery and, Mr. President, I trust that if it succeeds, Government will do everything in

their power to spend the money wisely for the working class and for the education of the people in this country.

The Attorney General : Mr. President, I do not propose to reply to all the rubbish that I have heard here this afternoon. Senator O'Brien suggested that my heart was not in the presentation of the Bill. I had hoped that I was a rather less simple character and that people would not see my heart on my sleeve. Let me assure him, however, that he has not read the signs aright.

I must accuse some of the speakers of insincerity, Mr. President. I accuse Senator Stollmeyer of insincerity because in the case of some of the facts that he has stated he ought to know better. He would know, for example, that notwithstanding his example of the case where he was told there was a typographical error which he said had not been corrected—he is in a position to know that there has been a specific reduction in certain taxes to the turf clubs. He is in a position to know there has been a specific reduction in licence fees, and these things together amount to considerably more than the difference in the tax he quoted. He talks of the club being quiet; The reason he gives is not the reason why they are quiet.

3.50 p.m.

I accuse Senator Bleasdell of insincerity. All this nonsense about religious bodies being opposed to this thing! Where is the evidence that the great body of churches in this country object to the Bill? Besides, they all talk as if we are doing something new. Do they not know that lotteries are going on in the country? Who says that the Government are now legalizing lotteries? Have they forgotten, or did they not hear me, when I quoted the

examples of bingos, sweepstakes, raffles? Are these not all lotteries? What nonsense it is to talk about the Government introducing lotteries. I do not want to say that the churches run them; some of them do; some of them do not. And as for the suggestion that this thing is morally indefensible, that is nonsense.

My good Friend, Senator Ramzan Ali, began his speech by talking about rationalism, and I observed he wandered into the field of emotionalism. That is why I commenced by saying that these judgments are not objective; they are purely subjective judgments. To add some ridiculous examples to those he gave: let us by all means forbid the use of poison in medicines; let us forbid the use of alcohol totally; let us go further and forbid any invention that could possibly do any harm to people. The point is, Mr. President, in an advancing society one does not just forbid things; one seeks, where it is necessary, to channel and control. And that is what is being done here.

I heard somebody (I do not remember who it was now) give an example of how much money the various public utilities are losing. I do not know what sort of process of thinking would equate a utility that is giving a specific service to the public and which has to spend money, with a lottery.

My Friend, Senator O'Brien, thought that it would be a mistake to leave the audit of the accounts of the proposed lottery to the Auditor General. I am sure he did not mean to do an injustice to the Auditor General. But if he would only refer to a paper that was laid here today he would see that in respect of accounts submitted to the Auditor General in January of this year the examination was completed and the audit was finished towards the beginning of July of

this year. When one considers all that might be involved in an audit, one would say this was a pretty expeditious piece of work.

I have no recollection of having stated here that the lotteries would produce \$10 million or any number of millions; I never mentioned any figure. I am not a prophet. I do not know what will happen.

I am being asked to guarantee; I have no guarantee to give anybody on any point whatever. We are starting something; we hope it will work well. Those who do not care to have confidence in the administration of the Government can do what they think fit. All this primitive and puerile economics that we heard spouted out here—you sit down and you save and you will be in a far better position. I wonder how many industrialists believe in that sort of approach. Do the people not know it is necessary to borrow money for the development and expansion of any enterprise? All this nonsense about money being given to certain bodies here. I wonder who told the Senator that this money is being given to anybody. I wish people would make an honest attempt to find out the facts before coming here and making these silly statements.

I can tell you something in one case you mentioned—the Coconut Growers' Association. A loan has been given them. Do you know what it is used for? Its effect reaches to the plantation, the factory, to export trade. Can you say this is money not well used—a loan to such a body? It has a thorough-going effect on the whole agricultural sector. Is anybody going to condemn a loan like that which is designed to stimulate and keep alive an industry?

I would imagine that Senator Stollmeyer was seeking to obtain from me some state-

ment as to Government's intention as regards certain other things. I regret I am unable to make any statement in that regard. I will only say this, Mr. President: In the very near future Government's intention will be known. Government are not going to do an injustice to the racing clubs or to any other group of people in this community.

And the example of the sweepstake. I am not so sure it is perfectly correct and logical to say that lotteries will be replacing sweepstakes; but even if that were so and even if this Bill does not say that a certain amount will go to charities, does not the Senator know that the Government's total contribution in subventions to charitable bodies amounts to well over \$1 million a year? What is that compared to the \$39,000 that the diminishing yield of the sweepstake has produced?

Mr. President, I think I have said enough. I would rather not go further, otherwise I might be tempted to say certain things I should not say. But I reaffirm that this Bill does all that one could expect of such a Bill.

I have been accused of quoting examples of South American Republics. But if I remember rightly I mentioned one country in South America. Other countries that I have mentioned are north of the Equator. I notice nobody has challenged the use of the principle in the United Kingdom; the use of the principle in the State of New York and other States of the United States.

There is just one final point that I should like to mention; it is a point of substance, and I should not like it to be misunderstood. Senator Bleasdel in referring to the possible financial liability that might be expected by the lottery referred to the possibility of ending up with a million-dollar deficit. He

National Lotteries Bill
[THE ATTORNEY GENERAL]

Tuesday, 23rd July, 1968

National Lotteries Bill

perhaps is not aware that clause 20 of the Bill—or maybe he did not get a copy—has been replaced by a typescript. Had he looked at that, he would have seen that not only in the replacement clause, but even as originally phrased, the limit of loans to this authority would be \$500,000. Well I do not see how you can get a million dollars out of \$500,000.

Senator Bleasdel : \$500,000 at a time. It does not say how often.

The Attorney General : “Amounting in the aggregate”—that means the total.

Mr. President, it is true that one is entitled to criticize the actions of Government, but I would suggest that one must make such criticisms fairly and squarely and based on substantial facts.

I beg to move.

4.00 p.m.

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 12, Noes 5.

Ayes:

Pierre, Hon. D. P.

Richards, Hon. G. A.

Alexander, Hon. W. J.

Crichlow, Senator V. M.

Shears, Senator T.

Beckles, Senator L. E.

Williams, Senator R. J.

Tull, Senator C. A.

Simonette, Senator N.

Date Camps, Dr. A.

De Suza, Senator W. O.

Hobson, Sir Patrick

Noes:

Bleasdel, Senator T. T.

Balgobin, Senator L.

Stollmeyer, Senator J. B.

Ali, Senator R.

O'Brien, Senator C.

Bill accordingly read a Second time.

Bill committed to a committee of the whole Senate.

Senate in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 22 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 23.

Question proposed, That clause 23 stand part of the Bill.

Senator C. O'Brien : Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, That clause 23 be amended by deleting the words, “Consolidated Fund” occurring in line 2 and substituting therefor the words, “a Special Fund”; also by deleting the words “the credit of the National Lotteries Accounts” and substituting therefor the words, “to be used for the development of education and social services”, in the last line.

The Attorney General : I am afraid I cannot accept the amendment. I appreciate the Senator's motive in suggesting it. As a matter of fact, in the course of the preparation of the Bill some consideration was given to whether any amount received ought not to be credited to a special fund. The matter was given careful consideration and it was agreed that it should not be so restricted. In those circumstances I am afraid that I am unable to accede to the request; although I say it has some merit in it.

As to the first part of the amendment dealing with the Consolidated Fund, it is easier—moneys going into the Consolidated Fund are in fact subject to more strict control and I should have thought that my Friend would not have objected to that. I mentioned just now that consideration was given to the question of inserting the words, “a Special Fund”. All I can say at this stage is that it is not known exactly how much this thing will yield and one cannot rely on it for the purpose of budgeting the expenditure of a specific national service, like education for instance. It is therefore good reason that it should not be tied down or restricted to that. I hope my Friend would understand that. But if it should in the course of things turn out later that the money ought to be allocated to some specific purpose which can more clearly be determined, I have no doubt that consideration would be given to that. But at this stage I think myself it would be unwise.

Mr. Chairman : Senator O’Brien, do you persist?

Senator Stollmeyer : I would be in favour of the first part but not the rest of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman : Do you persist, Senator O’Brien?

Senator O’Brien : No, Mr. Chairman, I would not waste time.

Clauses 23 and 24 ordered to stand part of Bill.

Clause 25.

Question proposed, That clause 25 stand part of the Bill.

Senator O’Brien : Mr. Chairman, I do not want to waste the time of the Committee.

Is there any use making my point here about private accountants? Will that not be rejected also?

The Attorney General : I have understood the Senator’s point to mean that they might engage services of private accountants but I ask him seriously to consider whether this is not a better safeguard. This is an absolute safeguard; not only will the accounts be audited by the Auditor General, not only will they reach Parliament but the Public Accounts Committee will have some scrutiny of them when they come.

Senator R. J. Williams : I do not think Senator O’Brien’s point has any validity at all. He is suffering from a misunderstanding. He feels that the Auditor General’s Department is a very inefficient one but that is not so at all. As a matter of fact, I do not think he quite got the point the Attorney General was making in his reply: that the same accounts for the National Housing Authority for 1966 which Senator O’Brien said it took the Auditor General up until July, 1968 to audit, were in fact audited within six months of presentation. If you look at the accounts which were laid you will see that they were presented to the Auditor General some time around the 12th January, 1968. They were audited and the Auditor General’s certificate affixed by the 8th July, 1968—within six months; even in private firms this is pretty good going and I think Senator O’Brien will agree.

Senator O’Brien : Let me make my position very clear on this point. I thought I had done that in my remarks in connexion with this clause. I do not suggest any lack of confidence in the Auditor General. My point was that I thought that that department has its hands full with the number of things that

it is called upon to audit and my point is that in order to instill public confidence every aspect of this lottery must be dealt with speedily and expeditiously. This is my only reason for asking that it be put in the hands of private enterprise. No lack of confidence at all in the Auditor General.

Senator Williams : Does the Senator think that six months will be all right?

Senator O'Brien : Yes, if I can be assured it will be six months; but we have known accounts submitted by the Auditor General as much as three years old.

Senator Williams : If I may clear up the Senator's misunderstanding. When you see the Auditor General's signature on a particular date it does not mean that he has taken this long. From my experience of the Auditor General, I have seen this when I had the honour to serve on the Public Accounts Committee, the Auditor General is as efficient as, and probably more so than, many private firms. The Auditor General can get out an audit within six months. And some private auditors take a longer time than that.

Senator C. O'Brien : I can only talk from my personal experience, Mr. Chairman. I would be very disappointed in any of the private organizations with which I am associated if they took any longer than ninety days. And in my own organization this is a must; we get our audited accounts ninety days after the close of the financial year. But, as I say, I do not want to waste the time of hon. Senators, so that if the hon. Attorney General feels that he cannot entertain this I am not prepared to argue.

Senator Sir Patrick Hobson : Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that perhaps this could

be resolved by an alteration to clause 25, by merely fixing a period during which the Board must submit its accounts audited. If the Board chooses to hold up its accounts for a year there is nothing in this Bill before us that can stop them from doing so.

The Attorney General : I would rather not have the section changed, Sir, but I will say that consideration will be given to doing something of the sort when the regulations are made. Although my hon. Friends opposite do not like the idea of a Bill coming before this Senate without regulations, I should like to remind them that there is no authority to make regulations until a Bill becomes law. But, as I said, some consideration will be given to that when the regulations are being drawn up.

Senator Sir Patrick Hobson : Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney General will give the undertaking that under clause 10 the Minister will give a special directive to the Board that they must submit their accounts within a specified time. I think that would perhaps satisfy Senator O'Brien.

The Attorney General : While I shall not give an undertaking, I will certainly pass on the suggestion.

Mr. Chairman : Is that all right, Senator O'Brien?

Senator C. O'Brien : No, Sir, I am not satisfied at all. I do feel that particularly with this last suggestion of Senator Sir Patrick Hobson, the hon. Attorney General could undertake to ask the Minister to incorporate this. Because, Mr. Chairman, this is not a matter of accusing anybody of inefficiency. It is just that in a national lottery we have got to assure the public that there are no loopholes anywhere, and that

nobody can have any suspicion as to fraud or dishonesty. This is all I am asking for here. With all due respect, I am just trying to protect the image and the name of the Government in my own humble way, and I think that one of the ways to remove any suspicion whatever is the speedy auditing and speedy presentation to Parliament of the audited accounts after the close of each year. I do think that this is a most reasonable request and one which is in the interest of Government, Sir.

The Attorney General : Perhaps my words have been misunderstood. I did not reject it; I said I would pass it on.

Senator C. O'Brien : I am afraid I would not convince you nor would you convince me on this one.

Mr. Chairman : So that we will pass this on.

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 25 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

Senate resumed.

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

INVESTMENT DISPUTES AWARDS (ENFORCEMENT) BILL

Order for Second reading read.

The Attorney General and Minister for Legal Affairs (Senator the Hon. G. A. Richards): Mr. President, I have the honour 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.

I should like to emphasize the fact that the Bill is drawn up in relation to the enforcement of awards. Under the International Convention, which is set out in the Schedule to the Bill, with respect to the convention for the settlement of investment disputes, disputes are not determined in their country of origin, but in the centre, which is located in the principal office of the International Bank for the Reconstruction and Development, as would be indicated in Article 2. But a dispute having been settled there, there might be difficulty in a successful litigant getting his award made effective and thereby getting the fruits of his award. It is therefore accordingly necessary that the various signatories to this convention undertake and make provision for some court or other authority in their country, which would be able to deal with the matter, as if it were a judgment of that court, and so render the enforcement effective in that country.

Trinidad and Tobago, Mr. President, ratified the convention in 1967, and in accordance with Article 54 of the convention—which you will see deals with the obligations to make awards under the convention binding and enforceable in a territory—the Bill makes such provision in clause 3.

It is also necessary to give to the centre certain privileges and immunities, and accordingly clause 5 of the Bill indicates what are the extents of the immunities and privileges to which they are entitled. It will be observed that there is some restriction here in relation to the importation of goods which are intended for subsequent sales.

4.20 p.m.

Really that is all there is to the Bill, Mr. President. It is in keeping with our

[THE ATTORNEY GENERAL]

general obligations under the convention to make these provisions that the Bill comes to the Senate.

Hon. Members will be fully aware of the extreme value of a convention of this sort. People in investing countries naturally would want some sort of safeguard and assurance that their investments would be protected as far as possible, and that any dispute between them and the state in which they are investing will reach an impartial tribunal, and provision is made in the convention for all of that. But all that having been done, it may well be that they would be denied the value of the award if there were not effective means of enforcing it in every country which is a party to this convention. We have undertaken to do that, Mr. President, and in this Bill, we are proposing that it be done.

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 Senate.

Senate in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 and the First Schedule ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

Senate resumed.

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

COCOA AND COFFEE INDUSTRY (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Education and Culture (Senator the Hon. D. P. Pierre): Mr. President, I beg to move,

That a Bill to amend the Cocoa and Coffee Industry Ordinance, 1961, be now read a Second time.

The purpose of this Bill is quite simple. It seeks to place the responsibility for the Cocoa and Coffee Industry Board on the Minister of Industry and Commerce. The Cocoa and Coffee Industry Ordinance, 1961 places the responsibility for it on the Minister of Agriculture. "Minister" in this Ordinance is defined as the Minister of Agriculture. Thus, of course, the Ministry of Agriculture is the responsible Ministry. This Bill now seeks to re-define "Minister" to make the Minister of Industry and Commerce the one responsible for this Board, and therefore the Ministry of Industry and Commerce will replace the Ministry of Agriculture. This is all that this Bill seeks. I therefore beg to move.

Question proposed.

Senator J. B. Stollmeyer: Mr. President, while I am aware that this Bill is not worthy of debate, I am afraid that the mover of the Bill has omitted to give us any reason whatsoever for this change. He merely said what the Bill purports to do. My understanding is that the reason for this Bill—you may correct me if I am wrong—is that the National Coffee Organization and the International Coffee Council required certain figures which it was found inconvenient for the Ministry of Agriculture to provide. As I said, Sir, I may be wrong, but in the absence of the mover of the Bill giving us any reasons, I can only surmise that this is the major one. But I cannot see the dire necessity for a change of this nature for just this question of keeping figures for the International Coffee Council. I feel it is a trifling matter to warrant a

change of this nature, and I think Government might be accused of messing about with minor matters when far more important matters in the cocoa industry need solving.

The cocoa industry, in any case Sir, should be controlled by the Ministry of Agriculture, and matters pertaining to cocoa and coffee, are in my view correctly placed under the Ministry of Agriculture. I, therefore, object in principle to this change particularly without any reason being provided. I cannot see why the Ministry is unable to carry out the functions of the Cocoa and Coffee Industry Board unless, as I have said before in this Senate, it is a very inefficient ministry.

Senator D. P. Pierre : Mr. President, I can agree with Senator Stollmeyer when he says that agriculture is very dear to his heart. But if the two Ministers find that the real functions of the Board are really connected with trade rather than agriculture, and therefore in order to allow the Board to discharge its responsibilities whatever its international responsibilities may be, the Board is placed under the Ministry of Industry and Commerce instead of the Ministry of Agriculture, I see no reason why objection should be raised.

Mr. President, I can assure you that the two Ministers responsible have discussed this matter, and have agreed that the purpose of this Board is more trade-wise than agricultural, and that is why we have come to the Senate to get the legislation necessary for effecting this change.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a Second time.

4.30 p.m.

Bill committed to a Committee of the whole Senate.

Senate in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

Senate resumed.

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

REGULATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Senator R. J. Williams : Mr. President, I beg to move,

That this House adopt the Second Report of the Regulations Committee (1967-1968 Session) which was presented at an earlier stage of the proceedings.

This is not going to be a long debate, Mr. President, but I think the rather unusual step of asking the Senate to adopt the report of one of their standing sessional committees deserves some explanation, and in order to explain why the Regulations Committee felt that this motion should be brought it is necessary to refer to the paper which was so admirably laid earlier in the proceedings by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister. I refer to the Defence (Rates of Pay and Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 1966. If hon. Senators will refer to the report which I had the honour to present earlier, they will note, Sir, that Standing Order No. 68 required that the Regulations Committee draw to the special attention of the Senate certain circumstances that may arise. Some of these circumstances arose, and the Committee came to the conclusion that it should draw to the attention of the Senate

three of these circumstances. They are as follows:—

- (a) These regulations involve the expenditure of public moneys;
- (b) The publication of these regulations and the laying of these regulations before the Senate appear to have been unduly delayed;
- (c) There has been unjustifiable delay in notifying the President that these regulations had come into operation before they were laid in the Senate.

Now, Sir, so many papers are laid in the Senate that it is sometimes very difficult to hatch them and the Senate lose sight of what is contained in most of these papers. The Regulations Committee felt it should draw to the attention of the Senate the fact that these regulations were made by the Minister on 3rd November, 1966, some twenty-one months ago, and through an oversight, whatever the reason might have been, these

regulations are only now being brought to Parliament.

This briefly is the reason why I have the honour to move this motion.

Question proposed.

Question put and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House adopt the Second Report of the Regulations Committee (1967-1968 Session) which was presented at an earlier stage of the proceedings.

Motion made and Question proposed, That the Senate do now adjourn to a date to be fixed by the President. [*Hon. D. P. Pierre*].

Question put and agreed to.

Senate adjourned accordingly.

Adjourned at 4.35 p.m.