

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, January 22, 1985.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock noon on January 22, 1985.

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Speaker)
His Honour R. E. Brathwaite, (Deputy Speaker)
Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House)
Hon. H. B. St. John, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry)
Mr. L. E. Sandiford, M.A., (Econ.)
Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, (Minister of Education)
Hon. L. B. Brathwaite, (Minister of Housing and Lands)
Mr. J. G. Odle, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees)
Hon. V. L. Johnson, M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)
Mr. B. M. Taitt, B. A., (Hons.), M. A., LL.B. (Hons.)
Hon. L. R. Tull, Q.C., M.A., (Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs and Minister of Foreign Affairs)
Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw, (Minister of Labour, Social Security, Sport and Community Services)
Mr. L. L. Sisnett, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Tourism)
Hon. Dr. R. L. Cheltenham, M.A., M.Sc., (Econ.), (Minister of Agriculture, Food & Consumer Affairs)
Mr. M. A. King, Q.C., LL.B.
Mr. W. O. Franklin, A.I.A.S., J.P.
Mr. H. A. Blackman
Hon. A. A. Truss, (Minister of State, Prime Minister's Office)
Mr. O. S. Arthur, M.Sc., (Econ.) (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office)

Prayers were read by Father D. Stapleton.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of Tuesday, January 15, 1985.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that the Minutes of January 15, 1985, be taken as read.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections or observations, let the Minutes stand confirmed.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES entered the Chamber at this point.

PAPERS

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Report on the Audit of the Accounts of the Child Care Board for the financial year 1982–83.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:—

Resolution to grant the sum of \$15 806 528 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1984–85, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1984–85, No. 26, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$226 506 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1984–85, Part II – Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1984–85, No. 27, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the borrowing of the sum of 5 billion Japanese Yen to be raised by the issue and sale of bonds and to be applied to the financing of projects approved in the Barbados Development Plan 1983/88 and other capital expenditure approved by resolution of Parliament.

I would like to inform the Honourable House that I propose to do this in all of its stages, Sir.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: We have questions from the Right Honourable Member for St. John, who is not now in his place.

We shall proceed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members Business be the instant Order of the day.

Asides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg your pardon, Sir. I am too anxious to get on with the business.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting, Sir.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Private Members Business be the instant Order of the Day.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of Your Honour to re-open the Order of Business dealing with Notices of Questions. When we reached that point the Right Honourable Member for St. John was not in his place. He is now in his place, and I seek leave from the House to allow him to ask his questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave is being sought to re-open Item (i), Notices of Questions.

I hear no response, so I deem leave is granted since there are no objections.

Mr. SPEAKER: Questions standing in the name of the Right Honourable Member for St. John re the number of people employed in flood relief work in St. Peter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: To enquire of the Minister of State responsible for emergency relief —

1. Will the Minister state how many persons were employed on relief work and road repairs during the period 6th November, 1984 to 30th November, 1984 in the parish of Saint Peter?
2. Will the Minister state how many persons are still so employed?
3. Will the Minister state how many:—
 - (a) refrigerators (b) washing machines, stoves, or other appliances were:—
 - (a) purchased (b) distributed by his organisation during the month of November 1984 in the parish of Saint Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question by the same honourable Member re damage to houses in St. Peter during flooding on October 31 and November 1.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: To ask the Minister of State responsible for emergency relief

1. How many houses were damaged in the parish of Saint Peter as a result of the heavy rainfall and flooding which occurred on the 31st October and 1st day of November, 1984?
2. How many houses were destroyed at that time?
3. How many houses in Saint Peter have been repaired since the flooding took place?
4. How many houses have been replaced by new ones?

Mr. SPEAKER: Question by the same honourable Member re money spent on rehabilitation of roads in St. Peter and people involved in such work.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: To ask the Minister of State responsible for emergency relief

1. How much has been spent on rehabilitation of roads in the parish of Saint Peter since 1st November, 1984?
2. How many persons have been engaged on road work and rehabilitation since the flooding?
3. Is the Minister aware that the highway at the bottom of Coach Hill in the parish of Saint John was broken during the heavy rains in October and November, 1984?

4. Is the Minister aware that this road has been closed to all vehicular traffic ever since?
5. Will the Minister state when the highway will be reinstated?

Mr. SPEAKER: Can I have somebody second the motion in respect of Private Members Business.

Hon. H. B. StJOHN: I beg to second the motion.

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

12.30 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION RE CRIME IN BARBADOS

Order No. 1 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution noting that there has been an increase in the number of serious crimes throughout Barbados and urging the Government to take the appropriate action to ensure that the Police Force is adequately equipped to perform its function.

Mr. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the following Resolution:

"WHEREAS there has been an increase in the number of serious crimes throughout Barbados.

AND WHEREAS it is essential that public confidence in the ability of the Police Force to function professionally and efficiently be restored and maintained.

BE IT RESOLVED that this House expresses its support for the efforts of the Commissioner of Police to control increasing lawlessness and criminal activity in Barbados and urges the Government to take the appropriate action to ensure that the Police Force is adequately equipped to perform its functions."

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, I would just like to.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I rise on a point of order. My interpretation of the Resolution which was just read by the Member for Christ Church West Central is that it is critical of the Government, and therefore I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that if a Resolution is critical of the Government, the Government therefore has the right of final reply.

I would just like to draw this to Your Honour's attention to have this matter clarified before there is any procedural wrangling later in the day.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: The question as to whether a Resolution is critical of the Government is a matter for the Chair. I can only say parenthetically that we do not see anything in this Resolution which is necessarily critical of the Government in any way. It is a matter which concerns the public. They tend to deem that any debate in this Chamber coming from this side is critical of the Government. As I said, that is a matter for you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have looked at this Resolution on two occasions, and on each occasion I have been satisfied that this Resolution is critical of the Government, and I so now deem it to be so.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, we in the Opposition feel that at this time it is vitally important and necessary of this House, containing as it does the representatives of the people of this country, should affirm faith in the Police Force as an institution for preserving law and order in this community. I suggest that we should not mislead ourselves into thinking that there is no increase in crime in Barbados, because everything points to the fact that there has been, over the past year, and particularly in the last few months, a very shocking and disturbing increase in crime in Barbados.

There has been an increase in violent crime: in house-breakings, in larcenies, in burglaries, and in the attendant danger to the person which goes with such crimes. I believe that the statistics in relation to crime will show that between 1983 and 1984, and certainly for 1984, there has been an increase of some 600 in the number of crimes related to things like burglaries, house breakings, larcenies, robberies and related crimes over that for 1983. So the first point we have to be wary of is that we can delude ourselves into believing that there has been no increase in the level of violent crimes.

In relation to the possession of unlawful drugs — particularly drugs like marijuana, cocaine and heroin — I believe the statistics will show that there has been a marginal decrease in the incidence of drugs and drug related crimes. But although there has been a marginal decrease in the number of crimes, we do find that in these times there are abroad in the community a lot of rumours, a lot of statements, about the alleged interference with police activities in their attempt to deal with the problems of drugs in the community. I am talking about interference at the political level and about allegations of crime in relation to high political officials, and there is concern in the public about problems in this area. So although we have a marginal decrease in the number of crimes, yet we have the public mind and consciousness being

disturbed by what the public conceives to be the incidence of drug related crimes and drug crimes among high political officials.

There is also an increase of crime in what has come to be called the white collar area, in business crime.

These are all matters we have to be concerned about. These are all crimes of a serious nature, and they are all areas where there has been a dramatic increase, if not numerically certainly qualitatively, from the point of view of the population of our country. And all of this is happening against the backdrop of harsh economic conditions in the country, with closures of businesses, with the resultant layoffs in industry, a lot of people being thrown out of work and a lot of families being thrust into a state of anxiety as a result of the bread winner of the family being thrown out of employment.

So at the outset, let us not think that crime in Barbados is not increasing. Let us not delude ourselves into believing that crime is directed only against a specific section of the community, what in some areas has been called "a small, but well-to-do, minority." If we believe that the violent crime in this country is directed only against what has been described as "a small, but well-to-do minority," we are misleading ourselves. From my own experience in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, I am aware almost daily of violent crime being committed against residents of that area. And these are not wealthy people I am talking about — I am talking about violent crimes of housebreaking and burglaries being committed against low income earners in places like Silver Hill, Gall Hill and Montrose. And when you look at the crime reports throughout the newspapers daily, you find reports of violent crimes being committed against a lot of small people in this community. So let us not fool ourselves that we are concerned with crime against a small but well-to-do minority.

12.40 p.m.

We also have to disabuse our minds of the belief that the comments of the public, the acerbic comments, on matters of crime are a result of what has been termed "politicisation by the Democratic Labour Party", and that we are seeking to make political capital out of an issue of crime. We are doing no more than articulating the feelings, comments and responses to the situation which are uttered and echoed by people at large throughout the country. People are calling on us and demanding us politicians, on this side, and, I daresay, on the other side, to deal with the issue of crime, to debate the issue and to respond to it. To say that we are politicising the issue for narrow or short term political gain is to be like an ostrich, sticking our heads in the sand and hoping that the danger would pass away, and not really recognizing what are the problems in the community, what are the concerns of the people, and what is the general articulation of a problem by a wide cross-section of Barbadians

at all levels, of all classes, colours and creeds. The people of this country, let us face it, are demanding that the issue be dealt with.

Another issue which, I suggest, we need to deal with at the outset, is that we should not get into any debate about which Government has done this or that for the Police Force, whether this present Government has done more or less for the Police Force than the previous Government or *vice versa*. To deal with that, I suggest, is really to politicise the issue. If you are talking about politicising the issue, that is how you would deal with it. You will say, we did more for the Police Force than you did.

The fact is, in 1984 we are dealing with a situation that is different from that in 1975 or 1976. In 1976, the wages and salaries and conditions of employment of the Police Force were a certain level. In 1984, the salaries of police officers have risen considerably, but so have the salaries of Ministers and Parliamentarians and civil servants at all levels, and so has the cost of living risen dramatically. So for us to say that we gave the Police Force greater increases than you did is not really coming to grips with the issue, but is to politicize the issue in a narrow way, which, in my view, has no relevance whatsoever to the issue with which we are dealing. So in analysing the problems which we have to deal with today, and which we have to come face to face with, we have to look squarely at the problems of crime in 1984 and in 1985, the year in which we are now embarking upon.

Today, crime is far more sophisticated than it was in 1976. We have moved into the computer age, the criminal has moved into the computer age, and, therefore, it is important and necessary that the Police Force and those involved in the detection and prosecution of crime should move into the computer age as well. If the police languish, and the criminal advance in his techniques, we are going to find ourselves, as a community, sadly lacking. So we have to concern ourselves with the problems of crime in 1985, and to ensure that the Police Force in this day and age is modernized and equipped to deal with the problems of crime as they confront us today.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the recent upsurge in crime with which we have been faced has reached epidemic proportions. Sadly, the police, in my view, are not in total control of the situation, because a number of serious crimes still remain unsolved. In response to some of the problems which have arisen, the Commissioner of Police has responded, perhaps as best he could. But, clearly, his proposals for arming those officers who are engaged on robbery detailed duty, his proposals to cancel leave, for temporary abandonment of the Resident Beat Scheme, for increasing patrols — all of these are short-term measures which do not come to grips with the fundamental and basic problems of the community and of the Force.

Successive Commissioners of Police, in addressing the problems which the Force has faced, have commented on the lack of men, materials and equipment necessary to deal with the problems. To quote a report from one of the daily papers of the Commissioner of Police — I refer to a report.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the honourable Member begins, he knows better than that. You cannot quote newspapers in this Honourable Chamber. That would be a new rule that has not yet been written into our Standing Orders.

12.50 p.m.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I do not even need to quote the Commissioner of Police in specific language. The fact is that the present Commissioner of Police, and previous Commissioners of Police, have said in no uncertain terms that there has been a shortage of police officers available to man the Force. And what is significant is that those sentiments have been agreed with by no less a person than the Right Honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) and by the honourable Member for St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull) who, at various times in 1984, in this Honourable House, have talked about the need for increasing the number of police officers in the Force. So it surprises me when I hear from them on that side that the Police Force does not need more men. One has only got to look at some of the debates, but because of the Rules of the House, I suppose you cannot quote from debates in the existing Session.

(Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: You can. You cannot reflect. You have got it all wrong.)

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Five years in here and you have got it all wrong!)

Mr. M. A. KING: The fact is that in the debate on the passing of the Bill in relation to private investigators and security guards, the Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1984, as reported in the House of Assembly Debates for October 23, 1984, at page 1446, the honourable Member for St. George South made the point:

"The Police Department is already overburdened."

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable Member is aware of the Rules of the House. Let me just read to you a section from May's Parliamentary Procedure:

"Reference to debates of the current Session is discouraged, even if such reference is not irrelevant, as it tends to open matters already decided."

The honourable Member can find ways and means of making his point other than committing a breach of the Standing Orders.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, as I understand the Rule, it said the reference was "discouraged". I am not reopening a matter. We are dealing with an issue in relation to the police.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me read further from May's for you then:

"The same result is often obtained by indirect methods. Direct reference is permitted, however, when a Member wishes to complain of something said, or to clear up alleged misrepresentation, or to make a personal explanation. But only so much of a previous speech should be brought up as is necessary for such purposes."

Are you saying that what you are attempting to do now is to clear up a misrepresentation? That is not so. You are quoting from another honourable Member's speech to support an argument and that does not fall within the Rules.

Mr. M. A. KING: If Your Honour rules me out of order, and that I cannot refer to the Debates, then I will not.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am only trying to keep the Rules of the House in the order that they have always been.

Mr. M. A. KING: The fact is that the honourable Member for St. George South and the Right Honourable Member for St. Thomas have said, on several occasions, that what the Police Force needs is more men. Now we get the impression that a different position is being taken — we are being told that the Commissioner is asking for all these men, but the Police Force does not really need the additional men that they are asking for. A lot of comparisons are being made about Forces in other areas, about the ratio of policemen to citizens in the community, and the impression which is certainly being created is that we do not need any more policemen. That is the position which is taken by the other side today. It is an inconsistent position with the position which has been taken by them before.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the honourable Member. I have read a section of May's to the honourable Member to point out to him that he, in his own way, is opening that very aspect which I drew to his attention.

Mr. M. A. KING: I am not quoting anything!

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not say you were quoting. I said you were 'opening'.

Mr. M. A. KING: Am I not permitted to debate the Police Force and to debate the inconsistent statements made by Members?

Mr. SPEAKER: You are permitted within the Rules.

Please do not shout at me.

Mr. M. A. KING: That is precisely what I am doing. I am making a comment on the inconsistent positions taken by the Government on this matter. If I cannot address the inconsistent positions taken by the Government, I do not know what I can address.

We are dealing with an issue in relation to the Police Force and as to whether the police needs more men, equipment and material. The Resolution talks about urging the Government to ensure that they need more men and equipment to perform the duties which they are required to perform. My impression is that the Government is saying that the Police Force does not really need more men to deal with the problems, and I am only pointing out that, on other occasions, honourable Members on the other side have taken the definite position that the Police Force is short of men, that they are overburdened, and that the Force needs to be modernized. This is the position which we are articulating, and we are saying that these are areas which need to be addressed.

When honourable Members on the other side, in other places maybe, talk about dealing in frivolities and that we are raising small matters when we talk about the fact that the walkie-talkies and the radios perhaps do not have batteries available in them, that is not a small issue. We have to deal with small things sometimes, because if the communications system is not in order, you are going to have problems with your institutional arrangements. When we hear of a large number of police vehicles which have to remain idle in the station at night because there are not sufficient men to man them, these are not small matters. These are issues to be dealt with, and which we have to be concerned about. When we hear senior police officials talk about the need of having forensic laboratory facilities available, if not for Barbados alone on a regional level, like at the Regional Police Training School where you can have facilities shared by the Police Forces of the region in order to expedite some of the forensic work which needs to be done from time to time to aid in the modern techniques of criminal investigation — when you hear police officers talking about those kinds of problems and you turn a blind eye to them, we are saying that these matters have to be looked at fairly and squarely and to be addressed promptly.

A wise Government needs to listen to the advice of its experts in the various fields. I am not saying for a single moment that you are bound to take every single bit of advice which has been offered. You are not bound to take any advice whatsoever which has been offered by experts. But if you are sensible, you will listen to that advice, you would weigh all the vital and important considerations and take them into account, and you will try to minimize

the areas of conflict. You would not do like some Ministers of Government on the other side and try and highlight and open up the wounds and the differences between yourself, as Minister, and those responsible for the administration of the Force. You would not seek to widen and exploit those, but you would seek, wherever possible, to minimize all the difficulties, and to create an area of compromise and understanding and co-operation. Only in that way will we not undermine the very institution on which we depend so heavily, and on which the whole fabric of the society will depend.

1.00 p.m.

The fact that there has been serious increase in crime against property has a message for us, as politicians, sociologists, and scholars, and for those who are there to administer the affairs of the people of this country. Making allowance for the fact that some people are inclined to a life of crime anyway, and that you are inclined to find the fringe element in the society who is bent on a life of crime, the fact is that this type of crime against property is the type of crime which tend to thrive in situations where there are extremes of wealth and poverty, where you have the "haves" on one side and the "have-nots" the other, where the "have-nots" feel constrained, quite wrongly, to want to take from the "haves" what they do have, and when the social and economic conditions are such in the country that those who have not cannot even have access to job opportunities to provide the very necessities of life for them. These are sociological problems for the basis of crime, which have to be addressed when we look at the problem of crime generally, and all of these situations are compounded by the massive layoffs which you find all over the place, and the hitherto unprecedented closures of businesses in the community.

We on this side of the House have always believed that it has to be part of our policy to seek to narrow the gap between the "haves" and "have-nots", between the higher income earners and the lower income earners. We do not believe, as honourable Members on the other side perhaps do, that there is any room for elitism in a community which is as small as ours. We believe that, wherever possible, we have to try to create an egalitarian society, in which we will seek social justice for all of us on as wide a basis as possible.

The Government has seriously to be concerned about trying to respond to these needs of the Force in 1985. They have to avoid poo-pooing the ideas which come to them about the problems which exist in the force and stop taking up adversarial positions just for the sake of being adversarial. If the Police Force officers say that they need more men, equipment and materials to meet the problems of the technological and computer age, sit down and talk with them and deal with the problem, and do not create an area of hostility by your public

statements, which will have no other effect than to undermine the very Force whom we need to support. Above all, we need to do something about the sorry state of businesses in the community, about all the layoffs which have taken place, and the lack of activities in business and the resultant decline in the social and economic standards of the people in this community. It is in that kind of environment that we will find that crime is likely to thrive more and more, and makes it much more difficult for the Police Force, as it exists, to respond to the problems which are presented and to deal with and come to grips with the problems of containing crime in our society, and what the Government has to do is to sit down and listen, in a rational way, to the problems which confront the society and the Force.

I have great pleasure in moving that this Resolution do now pass, and that the House expresses its support for the efforts of the Commissioner of Police to control the increasing lawlessness and criminal activity in Barbados. I urge the Government to take the appropriate action to ensure that the Force is adequately equipped to perform the functions for which it is designed.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I second the motion, without prejudice to my right to speak again.

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George South): Mr. Speaker, I am frankly, very disappointed at the nature of the presentation of the honourable Member who has proposed this Resolution. I would have thought that, the way in which he approached it a week or two ago, it was something of greater urgency and crisis that would have moved him to take the Resolution in the form which he did.

During the past week, I have been off the island, and only this morning was I reading the statement of the Right Honourable Prime Minister, which he made in another arena on Sunday. He reflected the views of the Minister responsible for Police, and in his own way stated many of the points that I have made in relation to the status of crime and police activities in Barbados. It will be necessary for me, however, to repeat a number of things which he has said, and indeed to refer honourable Members to my statements on previous occasions to bear out my argument.

The honourable Member who just sat down talked about divisiveness, and about Ministers who take decisions that conflict with those of the administrative heads. There is nothing more divisive than the text of this Resolution, because the honourable Member seeks in this Resolution to create a division between the Government and the police. As we understand the system, there is only one Government in this country.

Asides

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please. I am not going to have that sort of behaviour in here today. The honourable Member who moved the Resolution was allowed to be heard in silence, and I do not expect that any side will interrupt the other.

(Aside: That is rubbish)

Mr. SPEAKER: "Rubbish" is a rude word in Parliament. It is offensive, in Parliamentary language.

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I will deal with him myself at another stage.

The text of the Resolution seeks to divide the Government and the Police Force. As far as I am concerned, our constitutional system makes the Government responsible for all departments. I heard in the statement made on Sunday, a reiteration of my position that I gave on a radio interview three weeks ago, that as long as I am Minister responsible for the Police, I will take the policy decisions. The Commissioner of Police can make decisions in terms of the operation of the Force. I will not be relinquishing my constitutional position to any person or any sector in this community. If the Prime Minister feels that he does not like how I run my Ministry, he can take the Ministry and give it to somebody else. But as long as I am Minister responsible for Police, I will take the policy decisions in relation to the police, whatever the result. Let us get that quite straight. So there is no division between the police and Government. The Government must determine policy in relation to the Police Force, and I want everybody in the community to understand that.

Mr. Speaker, a half hour is a remarkably short time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first person speaking on the side of the Opposition has unlimited time, and the first person replying on the side of the Government has unlimited time.

1.10 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: I wish to draw to Your Honour's attention that, according to the Standing Orders, Order 30, Rule 7, the speech is limited to 30 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: According to Standing Order 30(7), it seems as if we are all in breach of that Order. It says:

"In a debate on any matter of Private Members' Business, the speech of a Member shall not exceed 30 minutes, provided that this time limit shall not apply to a Member in moving a

motion of 'No-Confidence' in the Government and a Minister who speaks in final reply to such a motion, and provided also that the mover of a motion shall, subject to Standing Order No. 29(2), have a right of reply, such reply not exceeding 30 minutes."

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, let us start with first things first. Crime in a community is evidence of failure in that community in one area or another, and it has to do with the total community. That is fundamental, and we ought to understand it. Therefore, when there is an increase in crime in a community, it has to do with all areas of responsibility in the community, whether it is the Government, the Church, the school, the home, the youth group. These are all responsible for any criminal activity as a cancer in society. It therefore is important that when we begin to deal with instant issues, we do not blind ourselves to causes and long term effects, and it is very easy in a moment of panic and crisis to rush off like wild swine into all and sundry areas and make all kinds of wild and reckless statements that are not useful in the event.

We in Barbados have seen over a period of time a gradual increase in crime. Except for the year 1975, when the Democratic Labour Party was the Government, when there was the biggest increase in crime this country has ever heard about, including the house breakings and burglaries that the honourable Member is talking about, there has been a gradual increase in crime.

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I have the figures here. I will call them out if necessary, but the biggest increase in any one year in this country was in 1975. Honourable Members on that side either know that or do not know what is going on.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Quote the figures.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: I will conduct this debate the way I want to conduct it.

Mr. Speaker, to deal with this gradual increase in crime as any responsible Government should, we have decided over a period of time to take a number of measures, and these included the setting up of a Crime Prevention Panel, which was turned down by the Democratic Labour Party. Representatives of sections of the community, the Manufacturers Association, the Hotel Association, the Tourist Board, the Small Business Association, the Chamber of Commerce, were brought in to serve with the Government on the Crime Prevention Panel, that would meet on a regular basis and take a look at what was happening in relation to crime, and make recommendations to the Minister responsible for police

affairs. This was instituted by us some years ago, not 1984 or 1983, but some time in the late 1970s. That is the first thing we did, and that proposal was rejected by Members on the other side.

We also took the decision to pass a series of legislation to deal with a problem with which we were confronted. You will remember that we agreed to have an amnesty on guns. Whatever success there was, it was an effort. We passed legislation against the holding of offensive weapons, and indeed toughened the penalties to show the disapprobation of this Government of people who go around with switch blades, guns, ratchet knives and that sort of thing. That came before Parliament last year.

We have introduced the Private Investigators and Security Guards Act to tighten and control the security of these people who are doing para-police duties in this country, and very important duties too.

We have passed legislation in respect of parks and beaches to tighten up security. We established, for the first time, beach wardens and park wardens who would be able to cut down on criminal activity on the beaches and in the parks of this country. That was our proposal, and we are the ones to implement it.

We have done a number of things for the Police Force. The police set up, with the approval of the Minister of Legal Affairs, a Juvenile Liaison Scheme so that young people who got into small problems could have the benefit of mature advice and counselling before being made criminals.

We have a Probation Service in Barbados which, in my view, is not quite suitable for the role for which it was set up, because the Probation Office can only come into play if a young person has been arrested for a crime. I believe that there should be better correlation between the work of the Welfare Office, the Child Care Board and the Probation Service so that young people who show a certain tendency to move off the line can be taken in hand early and counselled and guided before they get into serious trouble. I am looking at this now, with a view to the necessary amendment to the Act, to put that into place.

I have heard statements in the last week or two, and I am amazed at the lack of information that certain people in this community have. We have constructed a new prison for first offenders. I have said this in the House before, and I have said it in the public forum, but obviously, certain people in the community do not know what is going on. We have gone into the prison, have cut off part of the female section of the prison and built high walls and used this section only for persons who are committed for the first time.

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The honourable Member for St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons) says this is not true. He is welcome to come and go with me to the prison on Friday morning.

Aside

Hon. L. R. TULL: He says he goes there every week. You do not go into that junior prison. We have constructed a division costing more than \$400 000 to separate the prisoners who are in for the first time from the old lags, the old criminals.

In addition to all this, we have built up the Police Force to deal with crime at the preventive and at the detection level. You hear that we have not done anything. The Police have had a 20 per cent increase in personnel over the last three years. My recollection is that they went from 883 to 1,050.

1.20 p.m.

We also put a high score on training. How many people in this country know that? Approximately half of all the policemen in Barbados went through some form of training course last year.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That is worth repeating. Repeat it again).

Hon. L. R. TULL: How many people in this country know that approximately half of all the policemen in Barbados were given some kind of training course last year?

(*Aside:* That is no point.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: It is not a point, but you will have to listen to it, because a lot of honourable Members from that side and some members of the community believe that the answer to the problems of the police is to throw in more men and throw more money. They are not interested in training. They are not interested in the deployment of resources. They are not interested in the development of managerial skills. They just think the answer is to put more people in uniforms and put more people on the street — and all the problems would evaporate. This is also the easy answer coming from Members on the other side, as is set out in this Resolution.

The honourable Member who introduced this Resolution started off talking about small people in Silver Hill who were victims of crime, and he wanted it to be known that it was not only a small group in Barbados who was subject to crime. I want to know from the honourable Member why when they were

breaking into the houses in Gall Hill, Silver Hill and all over his constituency all the time, into the homes of the low income people that he referred to, he never brought a Resolution in here. What has happened in the last two or three weeks that moved the honourable Member to bring a Resolution in here of this nature? Could it be that the honourable Member did not care much about the hungry, poor people who live in Silver Hill and the other areas, and all the time they were being victims of crime, their houses were being broken into, their daughters were being raped, that did not matter to him? I would like the honourable Member to explain that to Barbadians. Why is the Resolution being brought now and not last year?

I hear a lot of pious words being stated. The Opposition, obviously in a very feckless way, has rushed in on public anxiety. All I am hearing from them is that people are frightened. That is what they are shouting at me as asides. They are seeking to cash in on public anxiety at some increase in housebreaking in the past few weeks, for purely political reasons. I say that that conduct in this community is boorish and dangerous. Crime and policing do not admit a lot of reckless and partisan statements.

Every single one of us who live in this country, including me, has to be concerned about crime in the community, about safety in his home and the safety of his family. I have not had to stay in my house at night as much as I had to recently, but I share the same concerns of everybody else in this community. This affects me, too, and it is not the kind of issue that should be made the subject of partisan debate. I cry shame on the honourable Member who introduced this Resolution, because I thought that he was one of the more reasonable and sensible Members on the other side. I could see one or two on that side who would have got up and made the kind of reckless and ill-advised statements that he made, and this brings me to the question of drugs.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt), who excels at shouting out of turn, said some time last year that people were bringing in drugs into Barbados — cocaine, he said — in glass windows. When he was asked to produce the information — I asked him; I am interested in people who bring drugs in here; I want to bring an end to it; it is destroying this community, particularly the young people — when I asked the honourable Member to give me the information about these people who are bringing in cocaine in glass windows in this country, he never said a word. But it is very easy to make those kinds of statements.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) got in here and said that there were a number of people who were involved in drug pushing in Barbados — he did the same kind of irrespon-

sible thing done by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central — and I wrote him a letter. That is a hard, hard thing for me to do. For me to sit down and write him a letter requires an extraordinary amount of resolve. But I had an interest in this community, so I wrote him a letter and asked him to pass on the information to me, as Minister responsible for Police, or to the Commissioner of Police, if he preferred to talk to him. I received from the honourable Member an asinine statement, the most stupid, arrogant and self-opinionated statement ever coming off the pen of anybody I know who pretends to be sensible. So they make their criticisms, they throw their allegations, and then when we ask them to back them up, about letting us get the information so we can end what they allege, it never comes.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central made an alarming statement, and I am going to write the Commissioner of Police tomorrow, and I am going to ask him to get in touch with the honourable Member and ask him for the information that he has so that he can help us get to the bottom of this matter.

He said "political interference by high political figures". I have asked the Commissioner of Police, on several occasions, repeatedly, every time I hear a rumour — and this country is a place that is alive with rumours. I do not know if they get tax allowances for the manufacturing of rumours, but this perhaps is the centre of rumourmongering anywhere in the world — every time I hear about 'people in high places', a phrase used by the Commissioner of Police himself, I get in touch with him, summon him to my office, and say, "You have made a statement saying that people in high places are interfering with the police in their investigations of crime in relation to drugs. I want you to tell me, as Minister responsible for these things, if you have any credible reports of any one in political life in this country who is involved in drugs, and, secondly, whether anybody in the Government has ever interfered with police investigations in relation to drugs or any other crimes". The Commissioner of Police has said "No". I have said to him, "I want you to publicly say it. I do not want you only to sit down in my office and tell me so. Tell the people of the country." The Commissioner of Police, at the Annual General Meeting of the Police Association in December, 1983, in a statement that was carried on television and radio, and in the newspapers in this country, said that he has never had any interference by people in Government, this Government, since we were the government.

1.30 p.m.

I asked him, Sir, if he ever had an interference by people on the other side.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: A month ago.)

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: What did he say?)

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: He said Branford Taitt.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: Do you want the answer? He told me who he has pictures of on the Opposition side, and which ones.....Do you want to hear everything?

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes. The works!)

Hon. L. R. TULL: I will hold that for now.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: If you have interference from over here, tell the public. We are going to tell them about you all.)

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We are going to talk about everything today. We are going down the wicket. About how you rescued Barrow's daughter in New York. We will have a lot of fun. I would advise you to keep out of it.)

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: As you are ready, start!)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. That is enough. Would the honourable Member please continue his speech.

Hon. L. R. TULL: In relation to training, I am going to get back to the computer question. During the past year we have trained almost five hundred police officers. We trained them in dog handling. We trained them in police administration and related subjects, general police duties, and in criminal investigation, both at the senior level and the operational level. We have put them into the FBI Academy to study all kinds of varied subjects. They were trained in crime prevention, fingerprint photography, examining the scenes of crime, in equestration, identification methods and techniques, commander's courses, executive development, drug investigator's techniques, intelligence analysis, middle management police duties, traffic control, injury prevention, ballistics and handwriting, drug enforcement training — the whole works. We have trained them in the United Kingdom, in the US Virgin Islands, in Washington, in New York, in Canada, in Puerto Rico, in Barbados, all over the place. We have provided wide and diversified training for nearly one out of every two officers in the Police Force in one year.

It is easy to make a lot of statements about the Government not listening to its advisers. The Government listens to advisers, but, ultimately, the Government makes decisions. The advisers do not run this country. The people's representatives on this side are the ones who make the decisions.

I have constant meetings with the Commissioner of Police. The honourable Member talked about computers. The Commissioner of Police put up a proposal that we buy a computer for two and a half million dollars

for the Police Force, and he is the adviser. Am I to go and take two and a half million dollars of the people's money and buy a computer for the Police Force, when all the experts say that a computer for \$100 000 or \$200 000 can do all the work the Police Force require and still have 90 per cent capacity left on the computer? I told the Commissioner to get a study done by the computer experts and put in the report of their findings and their recommendations as to exactly what kind of computer we should buy and at what cost. I said that when that is done, I will make provision for a computer to be given to the police. The honourable Member mentioned these things, but he is a Johnny-come-lately; he has now slipped in when things are already settled.

Mr. SPEAKER: According to the clock, the honourable Member has one minute more.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I had a five minute interruption when the honourable Member for St. Michael West got up.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will give you another two minutes.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I have not started yet.

(Aside.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, in the two minutes I will deal with drugs. The honourable Member spoke about allegations. The first time I heard about that is from the honourable Member himself. He asked me privately if I had heard something and I said I had not heard it, that that was the first time I was hearing it. Certainly the honourable Member is more responsible than to walk about and give voice to a lot of the malice expressed by people in the community, including some of his members, because despite the way in which he has disappointed me today, I do not think the honourable Member is a malicious person. There are other people around him who are malicious, and I am shocked to think that he would let them mislead him on matters of this sort.

I am going to ask the Commissioner of Police to write the honourable Member and ask him for that information. I hope that, by the end of the next week, I would hear of arrest of people in high places for trafficking in drugs in Barbados. He should not follow the other two honourable Members in front, who are notorious for making the kinds of statements that make people's ears prick up and do nothing more. Both of them, the honourable Member for St. Michael West and the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, have made similar statements in the past, and when they were invited to come up with the evidence — not to present it to me; I do not want to know their business; I

invited them to give the evidence to the Commissioner of Police — they refused to do so. I hope the honourable Member who introduced this Resolution will not find himself in the same category.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Speaker, every time the Attorney General addresses this Chamber on matters of this kind, he leaves us feeling cheated. We expect that he, of all persons, by virtue of the office he holds, will, whenever he speaks in these matters, leave the community better off than it was before he spoke. Unfortunately, once again, he has deceived us and left us no better off than we were when he spoke. Indeed, he may have left us worse off.

He said that I said some time ago that people were bringing in cocaine in glass windows. I wish to tell him that I gave the information I had, which had been passed to me, to one of the highest police officials in the country. If he thinks that when someone gets up on the floor of this House and makes those kinds of statements, the person is trying to get political mileage, there are a number of statements that can be made, on reasonable grounds, from the floor of this House that would be more important, out of which one could get political mileage from. The honourable Member, for example, must be aware, since he said that he is responsible for policy, since he gets the reports from the Police Commissioner every day, of the West Coast luxury hotel where a man came into this country, stayed for upwards of eight weeks, had what can only be described as a cocaine factory, and took in excess of \$1 million out of Barbados — and when he was at the airport, he was not touched!

(Aside: Who was the man?)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: A man. I do not know the man. He is not a friend of mine.

(Hon. H. B. St. John: Where? What time?)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: A West Coast Hotel. Last year.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: When? What date? Tell me!)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Was I there? Do you expect me to know the date? I get the information like the honourable Deputy Prime Minister gets his information. He gets information, too.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Name the hotel!)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If I call the name of the hotel, it would be unreasonable, but since he insists and tries to make me seem wrong, I mean Sandy Lane Hotel. I want you to go in Sandy Lane and get the records and examine them, and see if there were not a gentleman that came in here and had what they called "courtesy advertising". Ask

the Director of Sandy Lane, who is a crony of the Government, to tell you about it. I am not saying the Director was involved, I am telling you to ask him because he must know.

Do not come in here and suggest to honourable Members who bring information on the floor of this House, or who whisper information to you, that they are trying to be mischievous. If you think that I am going to get up in here and spell out all of the instances I have heard of, of crimes in this country, you would have to be joking. But if I get up and do it, do not accuse me of being frivolous.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: Who brought in the cocaine in glass windows?)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I do not know who brought them in. I know who told me. A reputable person. 1.40 p.m.

When we start to talk about crime, one of the things we have to ask in this debate is, who are the real criminals in this society? That is the question that has to be answered. Not every criminal in this society has faced the Chief Justice yet. I heard the Prime Minister himself on television talking about people involved in white-collar crime. I cannot agree with him more -- but he has left out some. The Prime Minister talked of some instances and he left out others.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Talk about the others.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I do not want to talk about any politicians in this debate. We have some 150 politicians in this country. As soon as you talk about political criminals, the Members on the other side will say to Mr. Speaker that I am abusing them. But, Mr. Speaker, you and I know, Sir, and everybody in Barbados knows that crime is a very important subject.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not in the debate, and I know nothing.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But you know that it is an important subject.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know only what this House tells me.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, let me be the first to tell you that crime in this country has reached very high proportions, and it is quite unacceptable for the Attorney General, of all persons, to attempt to compare 1975 with 1984. The level of terrorism and fear which existed in 1984 did not exist in 1983, 1981 or 1975. But even if it did, the Resolution is not seeking to say, let us play all of us around the mulberry bush. The Resolu-

tion is dealing with a situation which exists now. The Commissioner of Police is the person who said that he needed the resources, not the members of the Opposition. The members of the Opposition have a responsibility, if a public servant at the level of Commissioner of Police says that he does not have the resources to fight crime, to come to this House and say to you that you should give him the resources.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Sir: In relation to what the honourable Member just said, the Commissioner of Police has never yet said that he does not have the resources to fight crime in this country.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Now the honourable Member lives in an entirely different society and different country, and I leave the community to determine which is right and who is right, whether what the honourable Member said is what they heard, or whether what I have said is what they heard. The fact is that the Commissioner of Police, even as he was saying that he is going to cancel leave, was saying that he had to cancel leave and stop policemen from getting their time off because he does not have the resources to allow them to have the same kind of time they used to have.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Commissioner of Police in this country is not in debate with the Attorney General. The Attorney General is the Commissioner's Minister, and the Commissioner is not a stupid man. Therefore, the Commissioner of Police is unlikely to take on the Minister publicly, or appear to be taking him on, unless he is going to be taking leave of his senses. And, knowing the Government and the way they operate, it takes a tremendous amount of courage, as a public officer, to take them on.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like honourable Members' attention to Standing Order 28:10(b):-

"Any Member who desires to refer in debate to the character or conduct of any person in his official capacity must deliver to the Speaker written prior notice of the proposed reference; the notice must set out the facts on which such reference will be based and must be signed by the Member giving it."

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am certain that if Your Honour will reflect, you will see that to discuss the Commissioner of Police making a public statement is not to discuss his character.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is the conduct of a person in his official capacity.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: And I am sure Your Honour will agree that it would be impossible to discuss resources for the police without reference to the Commissioner's statement on resources for the police.

Mr. SPEAKER: It must be that somebody did not do their homework.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I will not respond to that, because if I do, Your Honour would ask me to sit down. But I agree with you that somebody is not doing their homework. I agree with you one hundred per cent.

Mr. SPEAKER: It seems to me that this debate is going to center around the Commissioner of Police and statements made by the Commissioner of Police.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir, not while I am in it. I am responding to what the Attorney General said.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going to allow the Rule to lay dormant today, because I believe that to prevent Members from using the title of the Commissioner of Police would sort of restrict today's debate. But I would hope that Members will in the future pay close attention to the Standing Orders.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am grateful to Your Honour.

I was making the point that the question of crime in Barbados today is a matter which has touched the heart and soul of every single person, and I really am disappointed that the Government have to feel that our decision to raise this matter, and to air it in debate, is an attack on them personally. It seems to me that the Government feels that they are like Caesar's wife was supposed to be, above suspicion, and that they are not to be touched or tackled about any of the problems in this country.

The Honourable Attorney General in the course of his speech said, to the best of my ability, to quote him, "Crime and policing do not admit of a number of reckless and irresponsible statements." I can think of no more irresponsible statement in a community of 250 000 persons than the statement by the Prime Minister in his New Year's Message, as it related to the crimes in St. George. A large number of people in this community were left with the impression that the Prime Minister was saying that the crimes are racially motivated. We were left with that impression. That is irresponsibility and recklessness from a senior official, least of all the highest official in the land. I have no doubt the Prime Minister will give us an interpretation of what he said, but a substantial amount of people in the community believe that he is saying that those crimes are racially motivated.

Rumourmongering in Barbados is nothing new. Some of the best rumours I have ever heard, I have had

from some of the honourable Members from the other side. There are nice things to talk about, but when somebody is tied up in his house and has to watch his family being assaulted; when a man goes to sleep at night and has no certain knowledge that he will wake up, or that he will not wake up and find one of his family killed; and when the rest of the community start to consider arming themselves; when a senior, serious hotel manager of a large property suggests publicly that he will hire thugs to patrol the beaches, you cannot now say that crime is no different than it was in 1975.

We have moved into forward gear in crime. We have people in this country, not necessarily Barbadians, who are making Barbados a way-station for cocaine from Colombia. Let us not pretend that that is not true. Everybody who has any interests in these matters is aware that we have a tremendous problem at Grantley Adams International Airport, where larger and larger quantities of cocaine are finding their way into our society, either for transshipment or, unfortunately, for use. Anyone who has lived in North America, especially anyone who has observed Harlem at its lowest, anyone who has seen the degradation which comes with the introduction of hard drugs, like cocaine, heroine and LSD, and who lives in this community and loves it, must have fear and must have trepidation whenever there is evidence, or even rumour, that drugs have reached a certain level of distribution in this country.

1.50 p.m.

The Police Force in Barbados has grown tremendously from the days when, to be a policeman, you had to be big, strong and genuinely ignorant.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: You are talking about yourself!)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You see, the honourable Member wants to sit there and insult me and say that I am big, strong, and genuinely ignorant. And good looking, too!

The Police Force has reached the stage now where you only have to see the recruits to note the change. Once upon a time representatives could send a letter to the recruiting officer and say a boy has a good character, we would like him to get a job as a policeman. Now they seem to choose policemen meticulously. They seem to pay attention not only to the size of the policeman, but to his acumen, his ability, his aptitude. That is why, for example, the Honourable Attorney General, while he has attained the height of Attorney General, I doubt he could become a policeman today.

The point I am making is that we have moved into an entirely different area of life in this country. The training of which he speaks is only part of the total societal arrangements in Barbados. It is necessary, if you are working in almost anything today, to have continuous

training, and if you talk about half the Force being trained in one year, and you are going to brag about it, then you are open to the question: When are you going to train the other half?

(Hon. L. R. TULL: This year).

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Then, everybody will have training, and yet you did not want to appoint the Commissioner.

The point is that we now have sophisticated crime and sophisticated criminals, and we need sophisticated police and sophisticated equipment. It is a continuing effort made in all the developed countries that their Police Forces are constantly being upgraded. To upgrade a Police Force does not necessarily mean that you have to give the Commissioner more men. It means however, that you have to give him more and better resources. If the Police Commissioner identifies the resources as men, it is not for any politician to determine that he does not need them.

If I were a Minister of Government and the Commissioner told me he wanted more men, I would ask him to make the case. That has been happening in administration from time immemorial. It is when the Attorney General and the Prime Minister are arrogant as they speak to the public, that is what we question. When they seem to suggest that, somehow, the Commissioner is bull-headed, and is pressing on at the expense of the country's resources; when, as the Prime Minister seeks to do, to suggest that the Opposition is trying to put a wedge between the Defence Force and the police; trying to suggest that no one in this country can ever deem or dare to question anything about the Defence Force — it is then that we must speak. I would rather die than be a Member of Parliament that cannot question the Defence Force, and the Prime Minister always makes it seem as if you say anything about the Defence Force, you are a traitor. And the Prime Minister, in giving information, does not include the large number of resources that come from the United States as part of the money spent on the Defence Force.

Mr. SPEAKER: But we are dealing with the Police.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, and this is part of the crime.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Defence Force involved in crime?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I really do not know, Sir. I do not think so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then you are misleading us.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then let us get back to the police.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Prime Minister has been.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get back to the police.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has been speaking about the police and the crime debate, and he has been trying to suggest that this Resolution is frivolous, and by trying to say that we are trying to put a wedge between the police and the Defence Force.

The position of the police in a democratic system has now been at last outlined by the Prime Minister himself in his speech, and the Attorney General himself, and the Dean of St. Michael's Cathedral.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you going to bring the Dean into it now?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Because he spoke on it too, and this is a national debate. The Dean has a voice like Henry Christopher. The Dean's voice is heard by everybody, just like Henry Christopher is read by everybody. I am only saying that he spoke on it, and the Prime Minister heard the Dean's words.

We are all agreed now that the police should do their work and the Defence Force should do theirs. But if the Prime Minister and the Minister responsible for the Police will be doing comparisons, then you have to throw in the whole amount which the Defence Force gets. If he is going to talk about what is spent on the Defence Force *vis-a-vis* what is spent on the Police Force, that is an unfair and unreasonable comparison.

He said they gave the police new barracks at Oistins. What is the point giving them new barracks and then telling them they have to stay in them 24 hours a day, all day, seven days a week? It is better not to give them the barracks and give them the time off. I am putting it to the Government that the measures taken by the Commissioner of Police has not improved the efficiency of the individual men, because the men are frustrated. Any time you put a man to work continuously in conditions where one of his colleagues gets shot and you tell him he cannot get time off, that man's efficiency, as the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central (Hon. V. L. Johnson) will be able to tell his colleagues, will decrease, because the psychological modes within which he performs his duties would have changed considerably. You are unable to produce if you are uncomfortable, so it is better to give him another 20 men than to build more barracks where the men are sleeping in beautiful barracks, according to what you say.

You behave as if when the Government came into power in 1976 that it was not supposed to increase and improve on what had been done by the previous Government. This Government talks about things it has done as

if the dawn rose in this country on September 2, 1976. You are expected to improve on the things the Democratic Labour Party did.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: We have!)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But you do not seem to be able to deal with the crime.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: You had yours in 1975).

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am glad you mentioned 1975. I refer the honourable Member to a speech which the Prime Minister made in here — it is on page 1447 — in which the Prime Minister dealt with the 1975 statistics. I am not referring to the speech, but the Prime Minister said, as I believe, that there might have been the odd difference in burglaries. I have the 1975 statistics here, and I invite the country to read them and see the difference in crime. Look at it and you will be able to analyse why the people in the country felt differently in 1984 than they did in 1975, and why it is self-serving to be mentioning 1975 along with 1974.

You cannot go on telling the people of this country that you did more than the Democratic Labour Party. There are persons who were 11 years old when the Democratic Labour Party went out of power. Those persons are now 19 years old. It is no point telling them what the Democratic Labour Party did. They have an interest in what you are doing for them. To declare International Year of the Youth open with a big, fan-dangle in Independence Square and not tackle the fundamental problems of the young people, when young people are involved more and more in crime, when your unemployment situation is such that there is total and complete hopelessness for the people, especially the young people of the country, it seems only natural that crime will increase.

When we ask you to give the Police Force more resources, what we are saying to you is that we, as responsible members of this community, are seeking to assist the Government in providing the Police Force, and all the other disciplined forces when necessary, including the Fire Service, with the equipment so that all of us, as citizens, can go to sleep at night feeling that Barbados is our country, which we love.

2.00 p.m.

I will never become involved in statistics, in comparisons, because Sir, you know that 20 vicious murders in a small community may turn out to be a much higher percentage than 2 000 vicious murders in a large community. But you know what the difference is, Sir? Two thousand persons have been killed, whether your statistics show that crime has gone up or gone down! The honourable Member knows that statistics are only a function of reported crime.

There is a greater incidence of crime, according to the same reporters, the police and the Minister. There is a greater incidence of dope in Barbados than there was in 1975. There are greater dope related crimes in Barbados now than they were in 1975. It follows naturally, because people have progressed, so if you had somebody stealing a sheep in 1975, that is a larceny, but if you have someone breaking and entering and tying up people, shooting them and carrying away one bangle, that is a larceny, too. Let us not fool ourselves. We cannot hide in statistics, nor can we hide in saying how much we have done for the police. What we need to do is to arrest the problem at source. We need to deal with the causes.

I have not heard the Prime Minister in his statement — I have no doubt he will do it today — I have not heard the Attorney General, I have no doubt he should have done it — address the causes of crime. I would like them to address the causes of crime. The causes of the crime have to do with the massive amount of unemployment in the country. It has to do with the lack of hope which is afflicting the entire community, except for a chosen few. Some people are living better than they have ever lived in their lives and the rest are sucking salt, and that is the basis of the upsurge in crime, the upsurge in anxiety and the upsurge in the conscious rejection of the establishment by a large sector of the community. Those are the facts, and if you have eyes you will see, and he that hath ears to hear will hear.

There is a phrase that you cannot use in this country now, because if you use it, somehow you are deemed to be subversive. But if we do not change our attitude, if we do not address ourselves to these problems, it is true that we will all be singing "One Day Coming Soon", because the people in this country will rise up, as they have done in other places, and nothing that we in the middle-class do can stop that. In 1937, it was hunger and poverty that finally broke the bonds of the frustration, and some quite ordinary people became giants. There is nothing to stop the quite ordinary people, who are even now more sophisticated, from doing what they have to do, if they feel that that is the last hope.

No one who lives in Barbados, no one who loves Barbados, would wish to see violence, not even the most rabid oppositionist on either side of the House would wish to see violence in this country. So when we say that we are asking you to assist in making this country a safer place, we are looking after our own interest too. You may believe that you are going to be the Government forever, but we know that is not true. We know that we will have to clean up any mess that you leave.

Asides

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable lady says it is going to be for a long time. That is as she says.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no lady in this House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It must be an apparition then, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see any lady in this House at this time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It must be an apparition.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member has three minutes more.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It is good that even in this serious debate we could have a little levity.

We had a Commission to examine the unsolved murders. It may not be outside of our ken and interest to establish another Commission to examine the rise in white collar crime, the rise in dope-related crime and other related matters. I invite the Minister to consider setting up a Barbadian Commission — you do not need to send for people from London and from Canada — get three persons in Barbados — to examine what is happening. I am calling on the Attorney General and the Government to set up a Commission to examine the extraordinary change in the pattern and level of crime. In this way, a number of factors and facts, which may not come out in the normal scheme of things, may, in fact, emerge, and we may get the community talking about it, and maybe we will get the total community to feel that they have an obligation to help solve the problem.

When we reach the stage where a Commissioner has to post a reward of \$20 000 to capture criminals who are terrorising the whole community, we need to examine ourselves. I am calling for a Commission to look into this. Get three of the people, not people who are yard-fowls, people who have an interest and who have the respect of the community, the respect of the police, the respect of the Government and the respect of the Opposition — and there are people like that in this community that have the respect of everybody — put them together, and let them operate under the Enquiries Act, the Act that sets up Commissions, so that people would feel able to go and talk.

We may get to help solve the beach patrol problem, because all of the answers which have been advanced for the problems we have on the beaches seem to me not to fit the bill, but all of us would like to see that problem solved. We cannot solve the problem by the kind of reactionary effort which saw a young man, who carries his hair in the style of a Rasta, and who was clearing some bush on a piece of land which I happen to own, and for which they sent to prosecute me — I got a notice saying that if I do not debush in 21 days that they will take further steps.....

(*Aside: You do not even know the difference between bush and garbage!*)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, they sent me this notice. This young man was out cutting the bush, he was walking down University Hill, and a policeman asked, "what is that you have there?" He had a cutlass, and the policeman drew a gun. He said, "I working on Mr. Taitt's land", and the police drew a gun and I cannot go into the other matters, because it is a matter being investigated, but what I am saying is that that policeman had been put into a position where he feels threatened.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: By whom?)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: By the system, by the society — I do not know.

The point is that we need to find out, and I am saying to the Minister, let us, by passing this Resolution, signify that it is our intention to support the efforts of the police. That is why I take great pleasure in seconding this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Resolution has already been seconded.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I will support it wholeheartedly.

Thank you very much for your patience.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 3 o'clock today for lunch.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
2.10 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

When the suspension was taken, the House was on Private Members' Business. To that it now reverts.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable Member speaking in his own right, or does the honourable Member intend to wind up the debate?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am speaking in my own right, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hear an aside. The mover of the motion has a right of reply, but a Government Minister will have the last word, if he so wishes. That Government Minister, according to Standing Order 30, will have an unlimited time to reply:

"In a debate on any matter of Private Members' Business, the speech of a Member shall not exceed 30 minutes, provided that this time limit shall not apply to a Member in moving a motion of "No-Confidence" in the Government and a Minister who speaks in final reply to such a motion."

It looks as if everybody has just thirty minutes. But the Government Minister will have the right of reply.

Does the honourable Member still intend to speak at this point in time?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Maybe I will wind up, Sir.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: No. I will wind up, Sir.)

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: You see what I told you. The Chief decides the winding up.)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, on a motion of this sort, I would normally have been happy to leave the conduct of a Private Member's debate entirely in the hands of the Attorney General, who I believe, in answer to such an empty debate, would need to do no more than speak after the mover of the motion and then speak his final reply. To my mind, the wording of this debate is vapid. Evidently, it is prepared, not because the Opposition really thinks that there is a case against the Government or the Police Force in respect of a perceived situation, but because the Opposition thinks that it is incumbent of them to make a fuss, and having made the fuss, are now trapped in a snare of their own construction.

Certainly, the honourable Member speaking first on behalf of this motion made no serious points to which any Minister other than the Attorney General need advert. But it is always wise when certain allegations are made to deal with them on the floor of the House. There was a time when I tended to believe that certain things were not likely to be given credence by the general public and therefore, could be ignored. My late father, one of the wisest politicians ever to walk these parts, advised me that everything should be denied, because nothing is too incredible for belief, or at least repetition. I honestly do not think that the introduction of arguments and allegations about drugs into this debate has any purpose other than prejudice, than exciting the media

and the general public, and lending spice to a debate in which, otherwise, there might be little interest.

The public is very interested in law and order. Those members of the public who are suffering burglaries, and who are suffering the appearance of a lot of violent crime may very well wish to have their grievances and their affairs articulated by their elected representatives, as well as by the Commissioner of Police and other senior officers of the Police Force. But on any sober analysis, it is clear, as Dean Crichtlow said last Sunday, that the perception of crime has gone far beyond the reality. I really do welcome the Dean Crichtlow's sermon warning people not to put as much emphasis on what they observe as the present crime rate as they have been putting.

There have been burglaries in Barbados before, there have been murders in the course of burglaries before, there have been waves of crime before, and on most of these occasions, there is a nine days, sometimes a nine weeks wonder, and then the wonder subsides, as the particularly atrocious crimes decline. This being so, without some spicy addition, such as has been raised in the speeches both of the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) and the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt), the debates might be dull. I am ashamed of the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, a member of my own profession, one of Her Majesty's Counsel, at coming into the House of Assembly and speaking of high political figures involved in drug matters. He should be ashamed of himself. He knows it is not true. I repeat, for the third time, he should be ashamed of himself. He has let himself down.

In respect of the remark by the honourable Member for St. Michael West to the effect that somebody, on an advertising resource facility, or whatever phrase he used, stayed eight weeks at Sandy Lane, had virtually a cocaine factory and left the island with \$1 million, for that remark, I have nothing but contempt. But it does not surprise me, because the honourable Member is not known for any restraint imposed by the ordinary rules of truthfulness when he wants to make allegations to catch the public's eye or to enhance his position in the Democratic Labour Party.

I have enquired, in the last hour, of both the local Directors of Sandy Lane and of the Commissioner of Police, whether there is any element of truth in this allegation. All three persons, as well as the Attorney General, have said that this is the first time they have ever heard it, and I can also say that this is the first time that I have ever heard it.

A search was carried out at virtually every major hotel in Barbados, and most of the minor ones, during last year for drug-related offences. No cocaine was found

at Sandy Lane, and no evidence to connect anyone at Sandy Lane, where, I am told by the Commissioner of Police, a very intensive search was carried out, with cocaine.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Forte was charged.)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It goes without saying that no person who can be called a person in high political office, certainly not anybody on this side, has ever, so far as I know, and so far as the records reveal, been questioned by the Police in respect of the use of drugs, whether it be marijuana, cocaine or anything else. But these things attract public attention. When the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, a man not known to be given to untruths until today, says in the House of Assembly that a high political figure has been involved, some credence is given to it.

Every dog is allowed his first bite, every politician is allowed his first lie. That is the theory under which the honourable Member acted when he so disgraced himself as to make allegations of this sort. I suppose the theory under which the honourable Member for St. Michael West acted is that if you throw enough mud, some of it will stick. The honourable Member must understand that if he makes this sort of accusation, if he tries to link members of the Government either to knowledge or to participation in drugs, that people will regard him as a proper subject for rumour also.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of elucidation: At no point in my speech did I seek to assign or attach any member of the Government to anything that I said regarding Sandy Lane. If the honourable Member misunderstood, the honourable Member should not say that I have said something that I have not said. I stand by whatever I have said on the floor of this House.
3.15 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I thank the honourable Member for the assurance that the lies he was telling were on the people of Sandy Lane and not on any honourable Member.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member now gets up, in his classic manner, and talks about lies, and said that I have said the lies that I have told. I submit that for the honourable Member to state or imply that what I said on the floor of the House was lies is unparliamentary.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I withdraw it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will you please continue then.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The debate on the police will not be assisted by these unpleasant and

untruthful red-herrings. I am not aware that there is any general view in Barbados that the increase in crime is related to the increase in drug-related crime, and I believe that the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, in fact, specifically admitted that it appears that offences related to drugs are not expanding, as far as the police record goes.

The public perception at the moment is that violent crime is increasing. But the public's attention may very well be drawn to the fact that there are many areas of crime where, clearly, the efforts of the Royal Barbados Police Force have been containing the manifestations and their occurrences of those crimes. The first, quite clearly, is crimes against visitors to the island. Crimes against visitors have declined sharply over the last two years, so as to have reached the stage where only one visitor in a thousand can expect that a crime will be committed against him or her in the course of a visit to Barbados.

Certain other violent crimes have also been on the decline from their peaks. Sexual offenses have declined quite sharply in Barbados, and sexual offences against visitors have also declined. There is much less casual violence than there used to be in Barbados. There are hardly any more standpipe rows, because, under the policy of the Barbados Labour Party, virtually all the standpipes have passed out of use, and the occasion where two people would go together to a standpipe, I do not suppose anybody has seen that now for two or three years, because people have water in their homes, but other casual violence — fights at the bus stand, fights outside rum-shops — has gone into a decline, which we must all welcome. The casual violence of children against each other, of stone throwing, compared to the childhood of most of us in the House, I suppose is infinitely less in Barbados. Just as there is a generation of children growing up that know houses only with inside sanitation and electricity, so there is a generation of children growing up who may never have thrown a stone at another child. What has, in fact, happened, is that, as Barbados gets better off and more sophisticated, the crime profile of the country points to the direction of the profile of crime in well-off countries. People have a little more money and they have more possessions, they live in houses which attract criminal attention, and, therefore, there is an increase in the amount of burglaries.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central said that there are regular burglaries of poor people's houses in Silver Hill. That, I believe, is just exaggeration. Maybe in the last twelve months one house in Silver Hill has been burgled. If the honourable Member really wants us to believe that the crime in Barbados is directed against poor people's houses, he would also have to assume that the criminals in Barbados properly should not go into the Glendairy Prison, but they should all go

into the mental hospital. I know of no country where the poor are the customary and overwhelming victims of robberies. I do hope that the Attorney General will have the opportunity to look at the daily crime sheets and see when last anybody in Silver Hill got robbed.

I see the crime sheets everyday. They occupy three foolscap pages normally, sometimes four on a Monday, maybe five, because it is the weekend and there are no reports on Saturday and Sunday. I do not have one to hand, but I would really very much doubt that they reveal that New Orleans, Silver Hill, the Pine Housing Area, Redmans Village in St. Thomas, those sort of areas are places where breakings and enterings frequently occur. Breakings and enterings occur at Sandy Lane, and in middle class settlements all over Barbados. At one time one district will be fashionable, and at another time, it will not be fashionable. I have noticed, for example, that there seem to be very few break-ins in the better off districts of St. Philip, certainly the St. Philip coast. On the other hand, undoubtedly, there have been a great number of breakings directed in the small area on the St. George/St. Thomas/St. Michael border, affecting mostly the houses of persons that can be regarded as ethnically or socially white. I do not know why honourable Members are afraid to say that white people's houses are broken. We all seem to have avoided the use of the ethnic description. But the Fisher Pond houses in Airy Hill, St. George, and others have been the subject of assaults by the same number of criminals, with roughly the same *modus operandi*, tying people up and looking for guns and money, leading to a conclusion that they are probably the same people.

The small number of criminals in Barbados often excites the attention and comment of people when they hear how few names are actually on the police books. When I first entered practice, the then Commissioner of Police used to estimate that there were no more than 100 to 120 thieves in Barbados. The number now, I would guess, is very little more than 200. I am not talking about white collar crimes, I am talking about people who are likely to break. Out of those 200, perhaps 60 or 70 are in prison at any one time. So the number of people available to carry out crime is really very low in Barbados, and many of them can be traced by police efforts. The police do follow persons who are observed in childhood, sometimes, as being likely to commit violent crimes, or crimes of stealing, and they do follow these persons through adult life, until, eventually, they cease to be criminals. Because unlike most developed countries, I am told that there are very few really professional criminals in Barbados over the age of 30 to 35 years. By the time they reach 35 years and spend 10 or 12 years in jail and a couple at Dodds, they tend to retire from

crime. So when we go overboard about the incidence of crime in Barbados, perhaps we are saying more about ourselves and our own perceptions than about any objective level of crime, compared to crime as it is in developed countries.

The crime profile in Barbados is not one of continuing escalating levels of violence. In 1975 crime was high. It fell in 1976, 1977, 1978 and 1979. It began to rise in 1980. It fell in 1981, rose again in 1982, fell in 1983, rose again in 1984. It is because we are such a small sample that we get figures that do not show an underlying trend.

I know all of this is cold comfort to those who have been attacked, those perhaps who may be in panic, and I repeat that my heart goes out to them. I am told the honourable Member for St. Michael West has had a murder in his family — and the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central — maybe some of the others have had murders in their families — but I am one who has had a very atrocious murder committed on a direct ancestor, my grandmother, and therefore I have some little sense of how people feel when violent murder, especially accompanied by stealing and other offences, is committed on one near and dear. But I would really counsel everybody concerned not to fly off the handle at what is essentially a temporary phenomenon within our society that will subside and will rise again.

3.25 p.m.

I have spent some time in the last few days looking at crime statistics in the world. I notice that in 1980, the principality of Monaco had a murder rate of four per hundred thousand inhabitants, and in the following year it could not be rated. Why? Because in 1980 one murder was committed among the 25 000 permanent residents, and in 1981 no murder was committed. If now in some year a man kills his wife and a child, and perhaps somebody else, the murder rate will rise up to the top, because it is such a small sample. St. Kitts suddenly finds itself with four murders and the appearance of a very high murder rate. Perhaps in another year in St. Kitts there will be no murders, therefore it will appear that serious crime has declined. These are the inevitable results of dealing with very small numbers.

In Barbados, we have, I think, a very reasonably efficient Police Force. Certainly we have a Police Force which, I think, would make it impossible for somebody

to open a cocaine factory at Sandy Lane for eight weeks and try to take a million dollars out of the island and the police know nothing about it. I just do not believe that that is possible. You would have to hear about it, even if you could not, in the end, find the evidence to convict someone.

Aside

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I hear an honourable Member asking why they did not know about it. Because it is a lie.

Aside

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member for St. Michael West is implying that the police knew about it. Between the Commissioner of Police and the honourable Member, I would prefer to believe the Commissioner.

Aside

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I hear the honourable Member saying that I am correct in preferring the word of the Commissioner of Police to his word, but I do not wish to be diverted.

We have a reasonably efficient Police Force. They have done a great deal to control the level of crime in this country. I have seen the Police Force carry out what have appeared to me to be miracles of detection. On one occasion, I had some work going on at a beach house, and I used to go there every afternoon. I forgot one afternoon that I had left a fifty dollar American note in my lawyer's jacket pocket — I was practising at the Bar then — and I left it in my car while I went into the sea to have a swim with my workmen at work. When I came out, I was just too late to catch somebody stealing that fifty dollar bill. The car door was open, and my jacket was halfway out of the car.

I reported the matter to the police, and two days later I was driving through Strathclyde and a policeman stopped my car — of course I thought it was not licensed, or something — and he said: "Mr. Adams you will be pleased to know that we have the fellow who took your fifty dollar note." It was a first offender, it was not a well known crook. The police system was sufficiently

analytical to have known who were the likely people on Brighton beach to be stealing. The offender has since graduated to become one of our major thieves, but the first time he was convicted, it was for stealing my fifty dollar note. He is now a well known house breaker and an inhabitant of Glendairy. I call that very good police work.

I remember on another occasion defending some youths after a breaking of a warehouse, and evidence was given that the police arrived and they said — I will not give the details because I would be betraying their knowledge of a *modus operandi* — "if it is so-and-so taking liquor in this way, it has to be so-and-so and he is going to carry it at so-and-so." They went at a certain person who had an establishment that fringes on the City of Bridgetown, still has in a slightly different position, and they found the liquor, and they went at the person whose name was called and arrested him for doing the breaking.

They cannot solve every case that way, but I mention those two examples known to me personally as examples of the fact that there are a lot of very good people in the Criminal Investigation Department doing their best to deal with crime in this country. I think that whatever friction breaks out from time to time between the Police Force and the Government, or between the Police Force and the public, we owe the Police Force a great debt of gratitude for the relatively efficient way that they have carried out especially detective work in the country. I would prefer to see the general public recognising the contribution that the Police Force has made to keeping this country one of the most law abiding in the world, certainly one of the most law abiding in the Caribbean, in any Resolution which we pass in here today.

Perhaps we who live in the Caribbean do not recognise that we live in one of the most socially disturbed areas of the world in many ways.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have one minute.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am winding up, Sir.

An analysis of comparative statistics will reveal that the Caribbean has, by and large, the greatest incidence of admissions to mental hospitals virtually in the whole world. I believe Antigua is one of the leaders, but Barbados is quite high. As is well known, there are in

fact only 16 countries in the world where more than half the births are out of wedlock, and 14 of them are in the Caribbean. Caribbean countries tend to have very high levels of crime, Bahamas, Guyana, Jamaica, Trinidad all figuring in the top dozen countries for crime. In these circumstances, Barbados should congratulate itself and its Police Force on maintaining relatively low levels of criminal activity in the island.

3.35 p.m.

For this reason, I wish to move an amendment to the Resolution currently before the House. I do not think that we would be fair to the police if we passed it in the present form.

I beg to move that, in the first recital, all the words after "there" be deleted and the following words substituted:

"is great current consciousness of crime in Barbados."

In the second recital, I beg to move that a comma (,) be put instead of a full stop at the end, and the words added

"and not destroyed by partisan political consideration".

In the third recital, after "efforts", I beg to move that all the words be deleted and the following words substituted:

"of the police in controlling lawlessness and criminal activity in Barbados and in the Government for its efforts in ensuring that the Police Force is adequately equipped to perform its functions."

The Resolution will now read, if the House agrees:

"WHEREAS there is great current consciousness of crime in Barbados,

AND WHEREAS it is essential that public confidence in the ability of the Police Force to function professionally and efficiently should be maintained and not destroyed by partisan political considerations,

BE IT RESOLVED that this House expresses its support for the efforts of the Police in controlling lawlessness and criminal activity in Barbados and of the Government for its efforts in ensuring that the Police Force is adequately equipped to perform its functions."

I beg to move, Sir, that the Resolution now before the House be amended in that sense.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second the amendment to the Resolution and reserve my right to speak.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: If you will bear with us for a minute while we make sure that he has the amendment in order. As I understand it, at the end of the debate, the amendment will be put first and then the other motion.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it now, what is before the Honourable House is the amendment to the substantive Resolution moved by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two motions now before the House, the original motion, moved by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, and the amendment to that motion, which has just been moved by the honourable Member for St. Thomas and seconded by the honourable Member for Christ Church West.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I thank you for that ruling so as to obviate my right to claim a second time to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable Member has a second time to speak.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Because of your ruling, Sir. Thank you very much.

There is a suggestion by the Right Honourable Prime Minister that there is a great awareness of crime in Barbados. That awareness is in conflict with reality. Perhaps, the most outrageous and insensitive public statement that I have heard by any political official in this country was that made by the Right Honourable Prime Minister on the matter of crime on the first day of this week. He seemed to be unaware that what is happening in Barbados today is that normal, law-abiding citizens are prisoners in their homes, whilst thugs roam the streets and terrorize them. This is the central issue of this

debate. The fact is that the law-abiding citizens in this country can no longer enjoy the peace and comfort of their homes because of the constant fear that their homes might be broken into, and that they might be the subject of violent crimes within their homes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute, please.

(Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER assumed the Chair).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am surprised by the general tenor of the debate emanating from the Government side today, because at no stage have I heard any attempt to restore public confidence in the necessary prerequisite for the maintenance of law and order, that is, that the political directorate of this country is interested in maintaining and enforcing law and order in this country and supporting those people who are responsible for carrying out those functions. What we are seeing here in Barbados is a culmination of eight solid years of neglect of the Barbados Police Force, and despite the long recitation of what has been done for the Police Force, I will demonstrate to this Honourable House, in no uncertain terms, the extent to which the Police Force has been neglected during those eight years.
3.45 p.m.

The Government has rightly said that they have the authority to allocate the resources within the country. But I say that when good and sound political advice was given by the Commissioner of Police in the closing months of last year on the rising tide of crime in Barbados, particularly of a violent nature, if that advice were taken and acted on, then it is quite probable that there would not have been the wave of crime that took place in December and January so far this year.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: January?)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: In December and January this year. There are still housebreakings going on in Barbados. Housebreakings have taken place in my constituency, including the property of a member of my profession, during the month of January this year. It is total stupidity trying to compare the levels of crime in Barbados in 1975 and the resources of the police at that time with the level of crime in Barbados today and the resources of the police. The fact is that at no time during the Democratic Labour Party Administration has the sort of crime that is manifesting itself in Barbados today ever emerged in this country. The political directorate ought to be today indicating to the public that they, like the Opposition and like all the other people in Barbados, have confidence in the Royal Barbados Police Force. That has not come forcibly, except for one

speaker so far today from the other side. It ought to be pointed out that it was a wicked political statement for the Prime Minister of this country to go on the television — wicked and malicious I would say — to say that the Democratic Labour Party was trying to foster differences between the police and.....

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker: The words used by the honourable Member "wicked and malicious" are unparliamentary, and offend against the Standing Orders.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Democratic Labour Party made sure that it did not participate in this debate on crime for a while, hoping that there would be a positive response from the Government to the legitimate demands of the Commissioner of Police.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker: I did rise a moment ago on a point of order that the honourable Member had offended against the Standing Orders in referring to the conduct of an honourable Member as being "wicked and malicious". I did not get a ruling, Sir.

Asides.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: Do not defend him.)

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Stop that foolishness. You are the Attorney General.)

(Hon. L. R. TULL: You know that I am better disposed to him than that to you.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would ask the honourable Member for St. George South to identify the words he referred to.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The words were "wicked and malicious", Sir.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not going to pursue this. But what the honourable Member did say was that statements made by the Prime Minister on television were "wicked and malicious". My submission was that that was unparliamentary language.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The point I wish to make is that it was not the Democratic Labour Party that highlighted any differences between the Police as to their manpower requirements and the Government as to its assessment of the manpower requirements of the police. The police made one statement saying that they needed more men, a total of 1200 men, and a spokesman for the Government said that they did not need that amount of people.

We, after about two weeks had passed, having got the benefit of the best advice outside of the Police Force, came to the conclusion that the 1 200 men represented a legitimate request to arrest the present wave of crime, and that, in the longer term, about 1 500 men would be needed to deal with crime in Barbados. We even went further, through our leader, in a public statement, and a suggestion was made that immediate steps could be taken by asking resource personnel, particularly now that the retirement age is being moved to sixty-five — those who have retired and had special resources — to come back to the Force, if they wish to do so, in order to deal with the problem of the gap between recruitment and training, so that there could be an instant improvement in the number of the Police Force. That was the contribution which the Democratic Labour Party made to the debate. For that, we were castigated on the public platforms of this country. And for coming to this House and bringing a Resolution, it is now being said that we are making this matter a partisan affair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are several problems that need to be addressed in this whole matter of security in Barbados. A very distinguished reverend has referred to the lack of even-handedness in terms of the allocation of resources to the Police and other security agencies in Barbados. It is a positive fact that the Police have not been adequately provided for since 1977. It is a fact that between 1977 and 1984, \$8.789 million in Capital Expenditure was allocated to the Royal Barbados Police Force, and that expenditure had to accommodate, at the same time, renovations of buildings and various other things. During that same period, \$41.317 million in Capital Expenditure alone was allocated to the Barbados Defence Force, not including the \$10 million for the Skyvan for Aero Services and the subvention to that. That brings it to \$51 million. You are talking now of a differential of \$8 million in seven years between the Police Force and the Defence Force, and that does not include the debts incurred in relation to the Capital Expenditure on the Defence Force. Are you surprised to discover when these blatant facts have been exposed on the Floor of this House? It is for the people to judge whether there has been a just and equitable allocation of the resources of this country to the Police.

The police work; you can see them working day after day doing duties. They wake up in the morning, they go to work and they do a full week's work. They work overtime. I do not even know how many people are in the Defence Force. We know how many there are in the Police Force. We know how many people there are in the United States Army, we know how many nuclear warheads there are, but we do not know any of these things about the Defence Force in Barbados. All that we have been told in that outrageous speech was that that \$51 million in expenditure was justified because of a

threat from Sydney Burnett-Alleyne some seven years ago.
3.55 p.m.

Let the public judge whether what they have been hearing about the state of the equipment of the police is true, and if they feel that \$8 million in Capital Expenditure can possibly serve the Police Force in this modern age. They will then understand why it is that the police do not have patrol cars when they are needed, and why their communication system happens to be in the state in which it is in. But we hear the kind of nonsense in this Parliament that we train this and we allocate this, and they do not look at the blatant facts of expenditure.

I will give you a classic example. I think the people of Barbados should know this. I believe that I am correct in saying that the police are still using the SMLE pattern 303 rifles, for which ammunition is no longer available, and which were first issued in 1916. The small countries in the OECS already have FN rifles, and the Barbados Defence Force has on order the latest issue of IWs, known as individual weapons, manufactured by N.P. Small Arms factory of Britain, in addition to a light support weapon, an automatic, the most modern weapon, which is being used by NATO at this time. But the police are using the weapons of 1916, for which ammunition is not available.

Asides

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am talking about the rifles they have to practice with; I am not talking about their pistols. They are using the same rifles that I used to use as a cadet when I was practising to shoot on the range at the back of Harrison College, often missing the target and shooting over into Queens Park — the same 303 rifles with the bayonets attached to them.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not sure. I was a cadet for a short period.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The worst shooters in the cadets were Trevor Thorpe, probably Ken Hewitt and I. We used to shoot over the wall at Harrison College.

The point I am making is that we should let the people judge and see what kind of allocation of resources have taken place. The police in Barbados need more patrols. The people pay taxes and they are demanding it, and there must be more patrols on the roads.

I am going to shock the people of Barbados now. I was called one night and told that the police are checking

three break-ins at the moment. I asked them how they knew. They said that they have a monitor that cost US\$200. People can sit down in their homes and monitor the conversations going on between policemen in Barbados. One was in Lowlands and two elsewhere. For \$200, you can listen to every single conversation going on on the police communication system in Barbados.

Now you are trying to catch the criminals. Do you think that the criminals cannot get the \$200 in order to monitor the movements of the police day and night in Barbados? Even the whole question of security in Barbados is at risk here, and something must be done immediately to upgrade the communication system in the Police Force, with specific reference to security of messages through the system and better equipment.

People were quite right when they said that the walkie-talkies could not work because of lack of batteries. I have checked it out. There are nickel calcium rechargeable batteries that they use now, which each cost a little more than the \$5.00 or \$8.00 someone suggested in one of the newspapers. It costs a little more than that. But the point is that you had reached the stage in Barbados where you had walkie-talkies and you did not have batteries, so now you can begin to understand what is happening.

I want to say a word on the reporting of crime. A considerable amount of crime is taking place in Barbados which is not reported. The people who have those monitors can tell you daily how many calls and how many crimes the police had to respond to the night before. That is a fact.

They say that they have improved the physical conditions of the police over the years. I am saying that in most of the police stations the physical conditions are most appalling. There is also clear evidence that, with movements of the population in Barbados, there will have to be some kind of re-allocation of the police stations in this country if they are going to have easy access to the population at risk at all times.

I want to make some specific charges here. Much of the crime in Barbados is very much non-Barbadian. I have always maintained that immigration should have remained the responsibility of the Royal Barbados Police Force. If that had been so, we would not have had the corruption at the political level, which even the Government itself had to pay attention to and establish systems to try to avoid it, as many criminals have come into this country and the police have the greatest difficulty in keeping a tag on them. In the past, the police had a back-to-back card system, and they knew where to go and pick up any person who came into this country.

In relation to some of the reports of the violent crimes that have taken place in Barbados, from the accents

reportedly used, there is a clear suggestion that some of the participants might be non-Barbadian. If the Royal Barbados Police Force had remained in charge of immigration, even if they were helped by clerical officers, we would not have had this kind of crime today. I am calling for a return of the responsibility for immigration to the Police Force.

Another major point is that if you were to look at the inner harbour of Bridgetown, there was a time when you could see police launches very actively operating in this area. But now, once you get past the Coast Guard, although they have powers of arrest, and you get into the inner harbour of Bridgetown, there is very little police supervision. I am calling for a restoration of the authority of the police, the manpower of the police, and the equipment for the police to monitor the inner harbour in Bridgetown. I am saying that because I believe that the time has long gone when there should be better policing of the airport and the harbours in this country. I have spoken again and again about gambling, and I have no doubt that it was the immoral decision of the Government to legalize the one-armed bandits in this country that has been the springboard for the growth in that underground of illicit drugs and pornography in Barbados, and these are very much crime related. It was that which provided the financial resources for the wholesalers in this country to be involved in the importation either for domestic consumption or for transshipment, of the cocaine and other drugs from Colombia and elsewhere in South America.

I hope the people will learn their lesson now and begin to understand the implications of gambling. The people must ensure that the Government is bogged down in its efforts to introduce casino gambling into this country because it is going to lead to further crime. Now they begin to understand the long term implications of amoral and immoral Government in terms of this kind of decision making.

4.05 p.m.

On the question of illicit drugs, I substantiate and endorse the statement made by the honourable Member for St. Michael West and the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, that senior members of the Barbados Labour Party are involved in the drug racket in this country.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Name them).

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have had a letter asking me to name them. The police know who they are. I have already said on the floor of this House that if a certain person had been arrested, he would not be in here cursing me.

It is very important that the police be given the technological resources to deal with the growing and

wicked crime of arson in this country. That is a very dangerous situation developing in Barbados. Unless we deal with this question of arson, which is a crime that has serious implications not only in terms of insurance costs for other people, but for the lives of other people, then we will be in serious trouble. There are people who have had three, four, five and six fires and have got away with it in this country, because the police and the Fire Service do not have the capability of really investigating fires in the way they would be investigated in more developed countries. The whole question of electrophoretic examinations of ashes and various other techniques are just simply not available in Barbados.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You can do what you like, that is your business. That is none of my business. That is why I am speaking now, so you have the whole afternoon to deal with me. I am not afraid to speak the truth, because I am a free man. I am an independent man and you cannot bully me. The lives of our children are at stake and I am not going to allow the Barbados Labour Party to ruin this country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am telling you there will be a voice from the floor of this House.

Asides

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please take your seat. No honourable Member can cast suspicion on any other honourable Member of this House. You may continue your speech.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: They can scream and shout, but the truth will be told on the floor of this House, and I am not afraid of any one of you out there.

Loud asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order! The honourable Member must continue to speak on the motion.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: This generation and the next generation of Barbadians must be protected.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two honourable Members are on their feet. Will the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central please take his seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If you ask me to sit down, I will sit.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no Parliamentary Assembly in the world of which I am aware where a Member can say that senior members of the party opposed to him are involved in drugs, and that one of them would not be in the House if the police had been allowed to do their duties without some intervention from the Chair. The former Prime Minister of New Zealand, Sir Robert Muldoon, has just been put out of the New Zealand House for using a remark far less serious in character.

It is a characteristic of all Parliamentary Assemblies that honourable Members are made to abate their language, and in circumstances such as these, made to withdraw statements. It is a disgrace to the whole House, because it is a breach of privilege of the House.

Houses of Parliament cannot be conducted if honourable Members are free to make accusations of the most atrocious sort in a general way, linking them with other Members of Parliament, and not be punished. It is normal, I respectfully submit to you, Sir, to indicate to honourable Members that they cannot continue to make those remarks unless they are prepared to substantiate them.

The whole of Parliament, you, Sir, all of the members of the Barbados Labour Party, are disgraced if parliamentary privilege is abused in this way by an honourable Member who makes general statements about drug abuse by members of the other side, specifying them by saying there is one person in particular. In the House of Commons, in any House of which I know, the honourable Member would be told that he would have to substantiate what he says.

It is to my knowledge that the honourable Member has made these statements before, and when called on by the police has refused to give the police any assistance that could lead them to an opportunity of proving or disproving them. That shows his general contemptibility.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir: The police have never asked me about anything. That is a lie.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two honourable Members are on their feet. Please take your seat. Continue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This form of speech cannot continue.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I am submitting, as a point of order, that an honourable Member cannot say that senior members of the Barbados Labour Party

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two honourable Members on their feet.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There was a long drawn out speech made by the Prime Minister

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Leader of the Opposition please take his seat?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will do that. If you want to have a noise, you will have one from me. You will see how hopeless this party is.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Let us go outside and back coats, then.

Mr. SPEAKER: Both Members please take your seats. I was listening to a point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order: Only one person will be taking his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the honourable Member please take his seat?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I really am going to be very brief. The Leader of the Opposition need not fear another long speech.

I submit that it is out of order for an honourable Member in his speech to say that many senior members of the Barbados Labour Party are involved in a drug racket, and if the police were allowed to do their duty, one of them would not be in here today. I submit that that is out of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: May I now make my point of order, Sir? That was a purely academic point, because no submissions have been made to Your Honour that something is alleged to have happened when Your Honour was not in the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member must wait until I make a ruling.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Once you make the correct one. As far as I know, you will.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: An honourable Member is not allowed to stand

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Johnson, could you tell me anything about Parliament? A thief like you?

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Or a perfect clown like you?

Mr. SPEAKER: Will both honourable Members please take their seats?

The honourable Member for St. Thomas has drawn to my attention a statement made in the House. Firstly, I want to make it absolutely clear that if a statement is made in Committee, the Speaker has no jurisdiction over that.
4.15 p.m.

The Speaker has jurisdiction in the House. No honourable Member is allowed to impute criminal action to another Member in this House. Therefore, any such statement is unparliamentary.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, to continue, I believe that there is an urgent need, apart from manpower and apart from dealing with the conventional things like vehicles and communications, ...

Asides

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael West, please. The honourable Member for St. Michael West has no authority to address any person in the House other than the Chair. It is very discourteous.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order: Your Honour has ruled that to use those words are unparliamentary, but the honourable Member has not withdrawn those words.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I did not use those words. He is paraphrasing what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member is saying that he did not use those words?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: What I am saying is that what he paraphrased were not the actual words I used, I am willing to continue my speech. As I was saying, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute. The honourable Member for St. Thomas made a complaint to the Speaker. Is the honourable Member saying he did not use those words?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am saying that I did not use the words used by the honourable Member for St. Thomas. I want to continue my speech. I have lost ten or fifteen minutes already.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable Member saying that the honourable Member for St. Thomas has reported incorrectly to the Speaker?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am saying that his summary was not my exact words.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: May I rise on a point of order, Sir, to point out something. I was present during the whole of the proceedings. I am not going into what was said and what was not said, because I do not remember the precise words myself. But there was an officer in the Chair, who is the Deputy to Your Honour, and what happened was that there was a lot of noise taking place, and His Honour, the Deputy Speaker, was trying to maintain order, and most of the noise was emanating from the floor Members, starting on the right, down to the Honourable Attorney General.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member is not allowed to accuse Members of bad behaviour in this House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said there was a lot of noise, not bad behaviour.

Mr. SPEAKER: You said it was emanating.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It was emanating, that is, as Members frequently have to be enjoined by Your Honour to let other Members to be heard in silence.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was not being heard in silence, because, in their places, the honourable Members on the other side were remonstrating for a very long time. At that stage, the Right Honourable Member for St. Thomas rose to his feet and began to say what Members are allowed to do and what members are not allowed to do, much of which, purely on a theoretical basis, I would be inclined to agree with him.

What I wish to draw to Your Honour's attention is that there was a presiding officer, and at no point, not even now since Your Honour has been back in the Chair, did the honourable Member get up and object to the remarks, because no remarks, as far as I know, were made about him, and when Your Honour refreshes your memory about the Rules, the words objected to must be objected to at the time when they were made.

I am suggesting that a long period of time ensued since whatsoever the words were supposed to be, because

up to now it is merely an exercise on what can be said and what should not be said in here, the juncture at which Your Honour is making the enquiry. I suggest that the honourable Member be admonished that he should be careful and be allowed to go on with his speech, and that the Member be heard in silence. Nobody has objected to the words, neither were those words taken down, which would have assisted Your Honour.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you saying that the words were not taken down or objected to? Are you saying that the Hansard Reporters have not been carrying out their duties?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: When I said "taken down", I meant taken down in accordance with the Rules of the House. If words are objected to, the words that he is objecting to are then taken down and then the Hansard Reporter is consulted. I do not have to go through all that, Your Honour knows what I am saying is correct. That is what I mean by "taken down." I am not saying that the report was not made by the reporter. It is a different thing altogether.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under the circumstances, while I regret the situation, I would warn that Members are not allowed to accuse other honourable Members of criminal activities. It therefore leaves it open to any honourable Member on the Government side to answer allegations made from this side.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not agree with that ruling either.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have made a ruling and that is the end of it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I thought you were just responding to my reminding Your Honour of the Rules of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have just made a ruling.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Can you say that if you abuse somebody in self-defence, that that would be heard in the Magistrate's Court?

Mr. SPEAKER: You said that the words were not said.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not say that. If Your Honour would just retain your composure. I said that the words were never objected to, and if they were objected to, then the Chair would have directed that the words, as understood by the person objecting, be taken down and be checked with Hansard. Your Honour is not in a position to make a ruling on something that was not objected to.

What the Honourable Prime Minister did was to get up and say what should be done and what should not be done, in most of which I agree with him. Your Honour is now saying that if one honourable Member is unparliamentary, the way to redress that unparliamentary balance is to let somebody on the other side abuse him. That would be a ruling for all time which would create a very dangerous precedent.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling, again, is if Members do not understand how to conduct themselves and they leave themselves open, then I am going to give either side the opportunity to answer allegations.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: As far as I am concerned, that ruling is perfectly all right by me.

To get back to about twenty minutes, I was on the point of dealing with arsonists in the society. Several fires have taken place in this country, many of them in the industrial and commercial areas of Barbados, where I am reliably informed that there has been considerable suspicion, both on behalf of the fire officers and of the Police Force, that they were cases of arson. However, what happened in these instances is that neither the Police Force nor the other organisation really has the effective resources to deal with and analyse the causative factors of these fires. I believe that this is a reflection of the adverse economic climate which exists in Barbados. Whatever, it certainly is something that has to be stamped out.

This brings me to another area of investment which is needed in the Police Force for crime prevention and for fighting crime.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been advised by the Clerk that you started your speech at 3:45 p.m. You have had interruptions which, he explains, would be about 10 minutes. Therefore, I am prepared to give you a further three minutes to complete your speech.
4.25 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Fair enough. I am quite happy as always. I can make my point in three minutes.

I think that there is a need and will to support the suggestion for a regional forensic laboratory. We have a Forensic Pathologist in Barbados, but he has not got the tools to work with. You are really here dealing in the area of Biochemistry. You are dealing in the area of Chemistry, you are dealing in the area of Physics, you are dealing in the area of many allied disciplines, and no one individual can function purely on a physical basis, using routine laboratory facilities used for clinical, medical purposes and be effective as a Forensic Pathologist.

The time has long past, with the modern methods and modern approaches of criminals, where the standard techniques can be used for the detection of crime. I believe that a case can be made for a regional laboratory, and probably there could be a case made out for a Regional Police Force, which could probably in situations, as occur in Barbados now, and occur from time to time in other islands, be used to help deal with a problem, rather than have to maybe increase the establishment to deal with the particular problem. I believe that a probable site for the siting of such a place might well be across the other side of the Garrison, the opposite side from where the Defence Force is located, where I believe there are one or two empty buildings inside there which can house a regional forensic laboratory and probably a regional detachment of the Police Force or something like that.

Thank you very much for your assistance, indulgence and tolerance, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Speaker, it is important for all of us who are Members of the House of Assembly, and who are in politics, to know, understand and appreciate how the abuse of the Rules of this House can lead the whole community to lose confidence in the House of Assembly, in politicians and in democracy. I listened to the speeches of the mover of this Resolution and the last speaker, who both went out of their way to insinuate and directly accuse members of the Barbados Labour Party, and, inferentially, this Government, of being involved with the drug traffic. I want to say here that, in the absence of names and specific evidence being led on the floor of this House by the speakers, I characterize them as low, dirty dogs, unfit to be Members of the House of Assembly.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I object. I am sure Your Honour did not intend that Members be given that kind of licence.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member is not allowed to refer to Members of the Honourable Chamber as "dogs".

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: "Low, dirty dogs."

Mr. SPEAKER: That is one of the unparliamentary words. I would ask the honourable Member to withdraw that word.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I will withdraw that, but people who make speeches under the cover of privilege are nothing but abusers, liars and dishonest mischief-makers, speaking for narrow political gain.

Let there be no doubt about it, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has said repeatedly

on the floor of this House that in politics, what is important is not the truth, but impressions. I accuse him of abusing the privilege of the House of Assembly in order to gain political mileage by falsely saying on the floor of this House that he knows that high-ranking members of the Barbados Labour Party are guilty of being part of the drug traffic. That is the calibre of the person that is in here. I trust that this debate will reflect, and that the public will know, that that is the kind of man who was holding out himself as being fit for leadership. A liar, a cheat that is what he is!

As for the other one who moved the Resolution, he has pretended all this time to have an element of decency in him. After this speech today, he exposes himself for what he is, that he is along the same lines, the same type as the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. Not one of them can bring a shred of evidence to support their base allegations, but because they believe that it will give them a few more votes at election time, they make them.

There can be no doubt that Barbados, like the rest of the world, is in an era in which more crime is taking place. Two specific areas have come to the fore only in the last five years: One is drugs and the other is housebreaking. Let us deal with the question of drugs in Barbados.

Anyone who has done any kind of sociological study would know and understand that, having regard to the nature of the economy of Barbados, and having regard to the era in which we live, it is not surprising that marijuana and other drugs have become part of the mores of a number of people in Barbados. The United States of America is one of the principal trading partners of Barbados, and it is known, as a fact, that the Americans are some of the greatest drug takers in the world. Not only Barbados has suffered from being sucked in by the United States' capacity for consuming drugs — the growing of marijuana in the United States of America, according to the *New York Times*, is probably the second biggest agricultural product — but from the Bahamas, right through the chain of islands, right through to South America, countries are under attack and security systems threatened because of the capacity of the United States people to consume drugs.

Do not let us fool ourselves about it. We are living next door to the greatest consumer of drugs. Let us call a spade a spade. But the fact that it is the United States of America which has these habits should not prevent us from dealing with them.

I have here an article which I will make a document of the House. It is from the *Wall Street Journal* of Monday December 3, 1984 and it says:

"The drug trade, and the abuse of narcotics in the US, is by no means a recent phenomenon. In the 1800's doctors'....."

the profession that the so-called honourable Member is a member of, people who, from the time there was a profession, always made money out of any of the ill habits of other people, any of the weaknesses.

".....praise about opium and morphine caused much addiction. They used to prescribe cocaine for the common cold."

That is the tradition we are dealing with. If, therefore, your largest trading partner is the United States of America, is it unusual that you are going to be part of what other people who deal with them are? That is a problem that we have to face, and we had better recognize that we need to deal with the drug industry in Barbados and around the Caribbean and in South America, and we need a co-ordinated attack on it. It is beyond the resources, to a large extent, of all of these small islands. We need a co-ordinated effort, we need to ensure that all of the forces join together in this attack, both at the airport and the Port.

4.35 p.m.

The police have a role to play, and those who look after the administration of the aviation laws have a role to play. I can say as Minister of Aviation that we have repeatedly told airlines that if they come in here and they allow their cargo capacity to be used as a vehicle for constrained drugs, that I will revoke their license. That is known. We had applications from certain South American airlines, and it was put as a term of their license that if they brought in drugs, they will lose their license automatically. We have discussed this matter and we understand what the position is. I reject totally the nasty insinuations brought in here by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central. He started the nastiness in here with his vile baseless and unproven allegations, which were carried on by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. They brought that in here and they thought that they would get away with it. They thought that the Rules of the House would allow them to demonstrate their nastiness. But thank God, in the interest of fairness, Your Honour has ruled that we can answer them.

There is no doubt also that the question of housebreaking is one causing people concern. There are two types of housebreaking that we have in Barbados. We have housebreaking by hardened criminals, by people who make a living out of housebreaking, and we also have, to a large extent, housebreaking carried out by young people, who, during the day, when other people are away and working and their houses are unattended, take the opportunity to break and enter. I would like to see a segregation of the statistics between the two

categories. Nobody in Barbados, in such a small community, would tolerate or condone any of this type of activity.

As a politician, in a newly-independent country that follows the Westminster system, I was appalled when I saw the direct challenge to the Government by the Commissioner of Police in his public statement. It breaks all of the norms of proprietary behaviour between the head of a department and his Minister. If you come into the political arena, because that was what it was — it was the utilization of the media to tell the public this is my view, you be the judges, this is their view; let us see who can ring the most public support — that is a direct challenge to the political authority. It reminded me very much of the opening sentence of a part of Sir Roy Marshall's speech in the Central Bank's lectures. He said that modern states can be challenged by the army. They can be challenged by the police, and that struck me when I read it that morning. Here is an example of a challenge. I do not care who likes it or lumps it. I regard it as improper behaviour, and I will say so.

It is perfectly proper for a head of a department to have a disagreement, a violent disagreement, with his Minister, but it has no right in the political arena. As you want to challenge your Minister, then your conduct is open to challenge publicly too. And there is a belief that as a result of the speech made, and particularly the way how it was reported by the media, that that exasperated the fear in the community. Many people feel that as a result of how that speech was delivered and how it was reported, particularly when the Government's point of view as expressed by the Permanent Secretary at the same meeting was not given equal publicity, that many people in this society feared, and more fear was generated by that.

I regret that it has happened, because I believe that the Commissioner is a young man who has done very well. He obviously has some talent, he has some ability, but he seems to lack the capacity to understand the distinction between being a politician and being a Commissioner. I am not accusing him of being a politician, but he must understand that when you challenge a decision of the Government publicly, you are opening yourself to being subject to an attack publicly. As a politician, I have to draw these things to the attention of the public of Barbados, because I am vitally interested in preserving the integrity of democracy. I am interested in preserving the relationship between the political directorate and others. That is why I get very annoyed when people try to break the Rules, like the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, who makes nasty accusations, and like the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

I am not accusing the Commissioner of Police of being a politician. I say that when things happen like how

that was put out in the media, in which the Minister and the Government are challenged, the public is entitled to the viewpoint that that is a political challenge. It has to be dealt with; we cannot whitewash that. Do not tell me about any operational thing. In the public perception, there was a row, a public argument and the public perceived that instead of trying to settle it in the normal manner, by correspondence and by argument, a challenge was made to the Government in the public domain. We have to deal with these issues. We cannot run away from them. All of us are strong supporters of every effort that everybody in the community is trying to give the Commissioner of Police and his men to help solve these problems. But if you step on the crease, you have to be given out.

It must also be recognized that some of the points that were made in this public challenge were already being addressed. That is also a source of annoyance. The Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Legal Affairs made the point that Cabinet had already agreed to an increase in the numbers of the Force. Also, I know and I am going to say it, on the question of beach wardens my Ministry circulated information to the Commissioner of Police and others, and we have valuable suggestions from them, and Government had agreed that the utilization of beach wardens, back-up by the police, was the best way of attacking that problem. The bringing of legislation to control private investigators was all part and parcel of a comprehensive programme which was arrived at after consultation, and the hurtful thing is that, of course, none of that was said in the course of his speech. So the Government has to defend itself.

We have added some 61 people to the Parks and Beaches. We have also agreed to create a high level adviser in the Ministry of Defence so as to advise the para-police, so to speak, to work as a liaison with the Commissioner of Police to help. The Government has absolutely no interest in preventing the law and order forces in Barbados from operating. We are there doing our best trying to co-operate, and it is not nice when all of this is going on to your knowledge then to come out and challenge the Government in public and say that they are not getting the resources. It is not nice at all!

4.45 p.m.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is true).

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That is what we would expect from him.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Not the gin, the basic nastiness inherent.

I am not going to deal with the question of batteries, because I believe that the Attorney General

will be able to answer that. It is most remarkable to me that a little private party in which there was a lot of alcohol flowing, judging from the participants, up in St. John, judging from the constituency.....

(Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It was not in St. John, it was in St. George).

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Do you see what I mean? The writer of the letter was so drunk he did not know whether he was in St. John or St. Lucy!

Mr. Speaker, when you read that letter, the only conclusion you could come to was that it was a political meeting. According to the letter — I was not there, I am dealing with the letter — the only impression that the public could get from that letter was that the worthless Labour Party Government would not even give the police \$500. The Attorney General will tell the truth today, the real truth and nothing but the truth.

I also want to say this. We are talking, and talking fully now. On at least three occasions there have been statements emanating from officers of the Barbados Police Force which have caused the Government great disquiet, in the sense that they are statements which, clearly, suggest that they can be used for political purposes. I refer to speeches made about people high up in society who prevent the police from arresting people for drugs. On each occasion they have been made, I have contacted the Attorney General, and I am very pleased to say that the Attorney General has been able to say "I agree with you, I am going to ask them directly to provide public evidence of it." You cannot allow these things in a small community to go scot free. You cannot make these insinuations in a small community, particularly a community that has the capacity for rumour.

All of us in Barbados know what the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw) had to undergo in this country as a result of malicious rumours. We know the power of rumour in this society. A Commission of Enquiry had to be set up to help to assuage and clear the name of an honourable Member of this House. The other side knows it, too. The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, and especially the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, know that. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central knows that he only has to drop the titbits in here, however nasty and untrue the accusations are, and that the rumourmongers will pick them up. That is why he drops them in here. Then you will hear: "I hear it, man"; "Richie said it"; "Maurice said it." That is all they have to do, drop it in here, and then a little insinuation goes out and it spreads all over Barbados.

There are two young men from St. George who had to take a whole page of a newspaper to attempt to

clear their names. That is the society we live in, and the past masters at exploiting those weaknesses are the honourable Member for St. Michael, South Central and the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central. I am sorry he has anything to do with Christ Church. They do it in here with an ulterior motive. That is what we have to combat.

I am one hundred percent behind the Commissioner of Police and his policing duties. Any help I feel is reasonably justified in the context of the economy of Barbados, I am one of those who fight hard for it. I like justice, I like law and order. That is why I criticise lawyers who do not lock up thieving lawyers. That is why I feel that white collar crime should be ruthlessly exposed in this country. All kinds of crime should be exposed in this country, and that is why I can give my support to the amendment to this Resolution, because the original Resolution is conceived in hypocrisy and is designed to get narrow political advantage out of this situation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Mr. Speaker, in 1966 I was honoured by the hands of democracy to take a seat in this august Chamber. I have climbed these stairs whenever there was a sitting and I have attended the meetings of this Chamber, and I believe that I have come a long way. Without a university background or without even a simple secondary education, I learnt by trial and error. I can say that I am grateful for what God has done for me.

Never in 18 years have I heard the Speaker of this House, or his Deputy being indicted by any Member of this Chamber the way in which both of you have been indicted today by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central when he made reference to you and your Deputy as people involved in drug trafficking in this country. His statement was clear. He said "members of the Barbados Labour Party in high office," and you hold the most prestigious office in here. You are still, to the best of my knowledge, a member of the Barbados Labour Party, and your Christian Deputy is a member of the Barbados Labour Party and holds equally as prestigious an office. Today, Sir, you have been indicted as a person dealing in the trafficking of drugs. Any by whom? Easily, as far as I am concerned, one of the worst characters that has ever walked the face of the earth!

Last Thursday on my way to Cabinet I was met by a young lady who said, "Lionel, what is wrong with you?" I said, "Like what?" She said, "I just heard that the Commissioner of Police arrested you at the airport and Tom Adams turned up and told the Commissioner 'hands off! You don't touch my boy' and the Commissioner said, 'Well, here is my resignation.'" Well, Sir, it caused me no pain then. Only last night, when my 78 year-old aunt called me, a woman suffering from a

stroke, in the evening of her years, and told me she heard that, did this thing pain me. I told her to have no fear. I have always been very careful, even to the point that when my wife, son or daughter is travelling, I have instructed them not to bring a single gift from anybody overseas when they are leaving an airport, do not care who it is, because I know the danger there is in the society in which we live in.
4.55 p.m.

Let me say this to the members of the Opposition. There is nothing that you can say about me that I cannot say about each and every one of you individually better than anyone of you. God gave me that talent to speak, and to speak effectively, and I have done it successfully. Whatever you say about me, I can say about you in here, or outside, equally as good or better. So do not fear for me, I am not worried about that.

We have seen, as my colleague not too long ago made mention of it, almost \$800 000 of the taxpayers money was taken from the Consolidated Fund to clear the fair name of one of my colleagues because of rumour-mongering. And this was pursued not only by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, a political nonentity, but by the Leader of the Opposition himself, who walked around this country and gave people the idea, and people believed him, that my colleague had murdered a man. But we came through it with flying colours.

Aside.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The Leader of the Opposition encouraged it. And on one occasion he stood up in here and told my colleague.....

Do not point your finger at me. I do not know what you have in your hand.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two honourable Members are on their feet. On what does the honourable Member rise?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am objecting to the words used by the honourable Member, that I went about saying something about a Member of the House and that I encouraged it. You heard it because you were in the Chair, and I strongly object, because at no time have I made any allegation about any Member in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you saying that you never made such a statement?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am saying that I object to his statement, because I have never made any such statement at any time.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is an allegation. You have not yet spoken. You have the right to reply to his speech.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Rules of the House say that words must be objected to at the time when they are spoken, and I am not going to fall into the trap, or be plunged into a sense of security, by being told by the Chair, or anybody else, that you have a right to reply. So I would just ask the honourable Member to leave me out of his diatribe.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Leave you out? I am going to deal with you now, you and your daughter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You are going to deal with me?

Mr. SPEAKER: What Rule of the House did the honourable Member offend? I wish you could draw my attention to it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable Member accused me of going about making accusations about another honourable Member of this House, and I said that at no time have I made any accusations about any honourable Member of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a statement for explanation. It does not....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: For explanation?

Mr. SPEAKER: If you can tell me the Rules of the House that he is offending, I am prepared to deal with it. Did he accuse you of a crime?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He accused me of making false accusations.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did he accuse you of a crime?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: So if you accuse a Member of making false accusations, is that not a reflection on the Member?

Mr. SPEAKER: Many false accusations are made in here daily.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The multiplicity of the accusations does not sanctify them with being in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not creating an argument. If the honourable Member....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Are you being a protagonist in this, or are you ruling?

Mr. SPEAKER: You are now attacking the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, I am asking you.

Mr. SPEAKER: But you are attacking me.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You are adopting the attitude of descending into the arena. The case of *Yule v. Yule*, 1945, in the court is relevant.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not in the court. I am not in the arena.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You should not descend into the arena because your eyes become clouded by the dust of battle.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule that that is not a breach of the Standing Orders. The honourable Member, please continue.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, it is easy for you to send him out and let the others walk.

The Leader of the Opposition, head of the Democratic Labour Party, sat on a public platform in this country and heard his colleague accusing a colleague of mine of murdering a man, and he, himself, went out of his way to say that the headteacher of Kay's Academy had asked Mr. Bradshaw for an increase in pay, he did not get it and he lost his life.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order: I have never sat on any platform and heard anyone making any accusations of murder against anyone else in this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thank you. Go ahead.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You sat on the platform with them, and birds of a feather flock together, you are an old blackbird. You cannot help picking the fruit. You are a spiteful, old blackbird. You know that you are about to die, so what you do is pick every single fruit so that nobody can get a fruit. You are a spiteful old man!

You sat down on a platform and heard the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central castigate the Speaker of this House. He called him an arsonist. You made reference to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition as a plantation rat in here, and abused his wife.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of explanation: I would like to assure Your Honour that I have never heard anyone accuse you of being an arsonist, and, if I had heard them.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not in the debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, the honourable Member said that I sat on a platform and heard the Speaker of the House being accused of being an arsonist. I would like to assure you, Sir, that I have never heard that, and I certainly would have objected to either you or any other Speaker being so accused so I do not know why the honourable Member.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear that. I heard him say something about a Deputy Speaker.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, no. He said the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable Member said "the Speaker", please withdraw.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I withdraw "the Speaker". I mean a former Speaker.

I have heard him on a public platform bringing the Deputy Prime Minister's wife into the public arena, when he got up in Independence Square and then went on to say that he invited Mr. St. John and his wife to a party, and rather than going and having a drink, she went measuring curtains in a bedroom. You went on to say that the curtains would have to be made in moth balls.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation: I have never made any such statement on a public platform.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute. The honourable Member will have.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) knows it is not true.

Mr. SPEAKER stands.

(Certain remarks made at this stage by the Hon. L. S. CRAIG and Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW were ordered to be struck from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member previously referred to another honourable Member as a rat. That is unparliamentary. It must be withdrawn.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If I said he was a rat, I withdraw that. What I said was that he made reference to the Deputy Prime Minister in here as a plantation rat. That is a fact of life. That is in Hansard.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get back to the debate. Let us leave out the curtains.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am speaking of people being brought into public life and how they are dragged down by members of the Democratic Labour Party. You can rest assured that there is not going to be any one way street with me and them.

This rumour about me — that is an old stupid thing. I would not worry about that. It is only bothering my old aunt. I only heard it since it was announced that I would be running for the St. Michael South seat, and I have warned my colleagues already that the Member for Christ Church West Central and the Member for St. Michael South are sneaky, smart, politicians, walking around with their chests up in the air. They do not care anything about anybody, and are dangerous.
5.05 p.m.

How did we get this debate in here today, Sir? The first person to accuse the members of the Government of being involved in illicit drugs is Mr. Clean, a man who looks so sweaty and nasty. He is too big to bathe. He has too much face to bathe. But he is Mr. Clean. He starts off this debate in here making reference to members of the Government.

I have heard rumours about your family, but I would never encourage that. My colleagues would tell you that in Cabinet and in my private life, I am not a gossip. I hardly drink strong.

You have heard all around Barbados that your daughter, a Miss Leslie Barrow, was arrested, at Kennedy Airport, and the Consul-General himself had told me that he heard it and that he had to come to her rescue. But I would not believe that. It is not fair to the young lady, no more than it was fair for you to drag my father into politics.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member is dragging my only daughter into the debate.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: What about my father? He dragged my father into politics and said he was prosecuted more often than Rawle Garner.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I cannot really do anything about the honourable Member. My daughter has never been arrested for anything in her whole life, not even driving a motor car without the appropriate licence. I think it is reprehensible for the honourable Member to come in here and made statements like that.

If he says that the honourable Member for St. Michael West had to go to my daughter's rescue, the honourable Member for St. Michael West is here. He said the honourable Member told him so, but I think the honourable Member for St. Michael West would be as

reprehensible a liar as the honourable Member for St. James North. I make that statement about one of my colleagues.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot have a point of order on a point of order. It shows us quite plainly now what all of these malicious allegations and rumours will do to this House.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. I did not give anybody a licence to do it. It brings home to us most clearly that it is now for honourable Members to curb their desire to get one up on the other side by using such rumours in this Honourable Chamber. It would go far.

My policy has always been to keep the debate as fair as possible. If persons on either side decide to open attacks on the other side, they must recognize that I have, in fairness, to give the other side opportunity to answer back those attacks.

I now say Members should desist from this behaviour in Parliament. They can conduct that behaviour on the political platforms. I believe this debate will show us clearly where we are sinking in our behaviour in Parliament.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: What I said, Mr. Speaker, is that "it was rumoured." It is no more than they rumoured about me. But I would not condone that sort of behaviour. Know your place, Errol Barrow! I do not care anything about you. You do not exist. You can walk about and curse me.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I wish to state for the Record that never have I assisted the Right Honourable Member for St. John's daughter in any situation at the airport either in New York or anywhere else. Never have I spoken to the honourable Member for St. James North, or any other person in the world, indicating that she had been involved in any crime either while I was in New York or anywhere else at any time. I categorically deny it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You categorically deny things and that is why Johnson is going to kill you dead with money now. You are so ignorant that you do not know that. You are at your master's feet.

Mr. Speaker, a rumour is around town that I have been charged at the airport and that the Prime Minister told the Commissioner of Police not to hold me. The

point I am making is that I have heard rumours, which I do not condone, about his daughter.

Asides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Do not tell me not to bring your daughter into the debate. You brought my father into the public domain in this country when you said that my father and Rawle Garner had more sentences than me. If you want to know who is my father, come down in District 'A' and you will hear it. Now you are saying not to bring in your daughter. Barrow, you know that I do not care anything about you. It is only that I respect your ways; otherwise, I would have given you a slap in your face already.

Sir, I can deal with every single one of them. The Member for St. Michael West, of course, should have brought the Resolution in here long ago.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Members for St. James North and St. Michael West were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER: This debate is beginning to get out of hand, I believe that honourable Members must conduct themselves much better.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. You also promised to give each side latitude, when the attack was made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, so that members of the Government can defend themselves. This is the latitude that I am having now, Sir. When we were accused on the floor of the House, including you, Mr. Speaker, of being drug traffickers in high offices, that is where it started, and, therefore, we can talk about anybody on that side.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: For five years you have been accusing me of drugs. It did not upset you then.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I regret and my sympathies go out to all of those unfortunate persons, not only now, but over the recent years, who have been savaged at the hands of wicked, vicious people — old man, Mr. Bready, Esther Clarke's mother in Upper Carlton, the Sisnett family, every one of them. Do you think I believe about Mark Stokes and you, that nonsense from a rumour? And how the police was gunned down so as to avoid Jordan giving evidence? That is the sort of rumours you get in a society known as Barbados. I would never have supported at any time that the then Prime Minister of Barbados was involved with a missing man called Mr. Mark Stokes. I would never have supported that sort of behaviour. But you opened the floodgate for these things.

Aside.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I would say anything about you on a platform. It does not appear as if you listen to my tapes. I do not care anything about you. I say anything about you. Those were big rumours around here. But I am not a gossip, I am not interested in these things.

We are satisfied, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that the biggest rumourmongers in this country are on that side. I know for sure that the Leader of the Opposition was a past master. No doubt your protegee today has some authority. The only thing is that he is crude. He needs going to the grinding stone to be polished up.
5.15 p.m.

You have said all kinds of things about people's private life publicly. You have destroyed many people. I heard you on platform speaking of the Deputy Prime Minister's wife in the public domain — I cannot understand how this can be right — in Independence Square, in front of a mammoth crowd saying, how she measured curtains at Culloden Farm. Did you not say that, and, of course, your disciples?

I know that on our side we have gossipers too — I am not denying that — and we have disciples that will drop things too. But I am always very careful in listening to rumours. You do not know me well enough. You do not know the man that I am. There are certain things that I do not get involved in. If you hear that they have me for a woman, you can say that is true, but do not believe any nonsense, not when at age 56 I have come from the cane fields in Louisiana, Florida, to the Governor-General's house. No way! And if you believe that is going to be a deterrent to me to contest St. Michael South, you have another thought. That could not turn me back. I have heard too many things about myself already in life.

I want to give the police this assurance today. They are hard-working young men, I believe, well-meaning, operating in a society that is a step ahead of them where sophisticated crime is concerned. The sophistication of crime, I believe, is the problem you have in this country. No longer do you have a man carrying away a turkey or somebody carrying away somebody's house. It is a different ball game today, as Dean Crichtlow has said. It is difficult to find the terrorists, because you do not know who they are and when they are going to strike, and the Government is doing everything within its power to curb these activities, I have no doubt in my mind that in the not too distant future that the criminals are going to be caught, and I sincerely hope that when they are brought before the law Courts and if they are convicted, that the harshness punishment be meted out to them. I am still to this very day a firm believer of the cat-o'-nine-tails. I do not care how barbaric it may appear to be, I believe that is one of the answers.

But where did all this crime and these problems start from in this entire society? During the administration of the Democratic Labour Party, they threw 14 year-old boys and girls out of school without a real hope, no skills and nothing to do, but just to sit down by the wayside. Today, most of them are now 22 and 23 year-olds. Those are the persons now going before the courts, boys and girls 22 and 23 years, because they threw them out of school at the age of 14 with nowhere to go and not a ray of hope in life. That is what they afflicted this society with.

The Attorney General, in his capacity then as Minister of Education, had to run and bring back old, retired teachers and bring back the children into the schools because the law did not permit for a 14 year-old boy or girl to be working. But that was the policy of the Democratic Labour Party, and that is the affliction of the society. We are now getting the tail-end of the problems that had started some ten years ago, because every single one of them that you see convicted is 22, 23, or 24.

The division which the Government has been trying to make clear in the eyes of the public is that between the Defence Force and the Royal Barbados Police Force. My understanding is that they are two differently trained persons; one is an institution of law and order and one is, as I understand it, there to resist any attack on the shores of Barbados in whatever way they can. There is no member, I believe, of the Barbados Defence Force who is trained for the purpose of carrying out the duties of a CID man, to be able to assist the police in carrying out their duties. I do not believe that any of the members of the Defence Force are trained for the purpose of prosecuting people before the law courts, there are two different institutions, and from the time the Defence Force was set up — and you were the first people to introduce it; you said it was a battalion, according to Hansard — you have been trying to say that the Defence Force is encroaching on the police.

The Government found it necessary to establish the Defence Force because of the problems which we were having with Sydney Burnett-Alleyne, another bad element in the society, who was a friend of the Democratic Labour Party; a man who threatened the security of this country and was given a banker's licence by the Leader of the Opposition and a licence to bring in cement by the then Minister of Trade, now the Member for St. Michael West. He is an example of the bad elements that were always around them — rumourmongers and terrorists — who were always involved with and supported by the then Minister of Finance. He gave Burnett-Alleyne a licence to operate a bank; yet he knew what the man was, what he was good for and what he had done in the past, a man who had threatened people in this country

with axes and fire if they did not support your view. Now we hear this evening of this debate on crime!

Mr. SPEAKER: We have come to the end of your speech.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I assure you, Sir, that the Resolution has my wholehearted support, and I would like to give this country the assurance that whatever I can do, and wherever I am, I will do my best to assist them in bringing the crooks to justice. They can count on me. The Government is satisfied beyond a shadow of doubt that it is doing everything in its power to assist the police in this country. I think this is very, very clear from the reward which they have offered, some \$20 000.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The honourable Member for St. Philip South.

SUSPENSION

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, it is now 5.25 p.m. I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 5.35 for ten minutes, so that Your Honour will be able to have a cup of tea.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and the House was suspended accordingly.
5.25 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

When the suspension was taken, the honourable Member for St. Philip South was about to begin his contribution. If he so wishes, he may do so now.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN (St. Philip South): Mr. Speaker, the debate has not gone as I would have expected. From a veiled attack on the Commissioner of Police, it has gone to an open attack. I believe that to mention that the Commissioner of Police has entered into the political arena, as has been stated by one speaker, is too simple an explanation. I believe that the Commissioner of Police, like any other person, would have realised that his request for an increase in manpower had gone unanswered for a while, and would have observed that there was a steady increase in crime in the country, and in December there was a great escalation in crime in this country. Therefore, the Commissioner of Police, who I believe would know about the equipment and his manpower, and all the technological gadgets that

are available to the Police Force, would have taken all these things into account and would have satisfied himself that the only way out of the present situation was for an increase in manpower.

It is okay to speak about the ratio of policemen to citizens in other parts of the world, but one also has to take into consideration the other equipment that goes with policing. If you just compare Barbados with another country and say that the ratio of policemen to citizens in Barbados is higher than in another country, and do not take into consideration the amount of technological improvements and gadgets and knowhow available to that other Police Force, you are really short changing the Police Force in Barbados.

I have no reason to doubt that the Commissioner of Police knows the capabilities of his Force, and knows what equipment they have available, and I prefer to err on the side of a person who is qualified in the area of detecting crime. Although I can see that a Minister cannot at every whim and fancy bow to the wishes of a Head of Department, I can also realise that a person who has been trained to prevent crime should know a bit more of what is needed to prevent the crime, than one who has been trained to represent people after the crime has been committed. So I would err on the side of the Commissioner of Police because I believe that he has taken into consideration all of the factors on all of the manpower and equipment available to the Police Force.

The Democratic Labour Party has been accused of alienating the Police and Government. I do not believe that the persons who have made this statement are really serious, because I recall some time in December, on the front page of one of the daily newspapers, there was one article by the Commissioner of Police, and directly opposite that article there was another item of news by the Honourable Attorney General. These two learned gentlemen were saying totally opposite things. One was saying that he wanted extra men and the other one was saying he did not believe extra men were needed. Where on the front page of one of the daily newspapers you can have conflicting views by the two top persons, let us say in the argument, that sort of thing is calculated to alienate the police from the Government, so I do not believe that the Democratic Labour Party should be accused for this.

We have to decide whether we believe that the police are really in need of extra manpower or not. I have said that I believe, taking all the facts into consideration at the present time, because it is an urgent matter, that the Commissioner has come down on the side of the extra manpower. I think it was on 23rd October last year that the Honourable Prime Minister, in a statement in this Honourable House, said that what we need to do is to give the police the numbers to carry

out their duties in a country where police work has increased. If I recall correctly, on that particular day, the 23rd October, 1984, the Honourable Prime Minister went on to say:

"We can argue endlessly as to whether there is more crime than there was in 1975. The statistics show that in 1975, perhaps there were a few more offences. When you break them down, there were more offences of people beating others, but not so many offences of people stealing. There may have been more cases of rape in 1975, there is more burglary in 1984. Undoubtedly, the level of crime has had some elevation in Barbados. There are more young people, there are more objects of crime, there is more money."

In that same speech, the Honourable Prime Minister said:

"The police need a much better traffic department, they need more people, they need better training." So we have to increase our Police Force to deal with crime, to deal with traffic and to deal with traditional policing. I would like to know what sort of equipment has been given to the Police Force between October 23, 1984 and now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the honourable Member. I did not hear from where the citation was taken.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I believe that that speech can be found on page 1448 of the debates of this Honourable House of Assembly for October 23, 1984.

Mr. SPEAKER: If that is so it would infringe against the Rules of the House.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I was not quoting directly, I was referring to the statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is all right.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir: I was actually going to take the same point that Your Honour is taking, because the point is this. He is, in a sense, in my respectful submission, reflecting on a vote of the House, because on the 23rd October, 1984, I introduced a Resolution into this House increasing the size of the Police Force, and he is quoting from what I said on that occasion in justification for that increase, and then trying to turn the arguments against me.

In introducing an increase in the size of the Force, I made that speech. The Force has been increased.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, the Cabinet agreed in September to increase the size of the Police Force, and it has since then been increased. I assure the House about that. There was an Order on the Order Paper which I withdrew and created the jobs on a temporary basis.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is that, according to our Standing Orders, you are not allowed to reflect on a vote of the House. If it is taken from Hansard, it is obviously part of something that passed through the House during this Session. If you do that you are going to reopen a debate which has already been closed in this Session, and in so doing you are infringing the Rule.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: As you say, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to make one point clear. The speech I adverted to was not made when the Police Force was being increased. It was made in a debate on the Private Investigators and Security Guards Act. I am just putting the record straight.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I am saying is that it is a debate which took place in the current Session.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: The point is taken, but I was just putting the Record straight, because the Honourable Prime Minister said it was a speech otherwise.

I want to know what sort of equipment and technological changes have taken place in the Police Force between October and now for us to believe that the Police Force is no longer in need of extra manpower. The only way I can concede that the Police Force is no longer in need of manpower is if the technological changes in the Police Force have given them the sort of equipment that most of the things that were done before by policemen are now taken over by, say, computers and that sort of thing.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir: We are getting bogged down with the technicalities of which speech was made or which debate. I respectfully submit that the honourable Member is now positively reflecting on a vote of the House because I introduced a measure in here to do with a guarantee by the Government of a package for police equipment with the Crown Agents. It was Fire Service equipment and police equipment, and the honourable Member is keeping on and on asking what equipment has the police got, when, in fact, it is a matter of record in the House that the House had voted money for specially equipped police cars to be supplied by the Crown Agents, along with a turntable.

5.55 p.m.

In addition, the numbers of the Police Force have been increased, not by 30, as I said then, but by 50

since October. So the honourable Member, in my respectful submission, is reflecting on things that have happened very recently, and it is the worst sort of reflection, because, in effect, he is saying that it has not happened, and he is saying that either you have to get more equipment or more men, when the House knows that the police have got more equipment and more men since October.

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree. Let us follow the Rules of the House, because, as I said, as long as you attempt to break the Rules of the House, you are going to open debates which have already been dealt with in this current Session.

Please continue.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am just trying to ascertain the state of affairs existing between the police, on one hand, and the Government on another. I am not getting at any person, and I am not trying to show that any person said one thing here and one thing there. This issue of crime is too important to get into this sort of thing.

I want the people out there to be reassured about what the Government is going to do or is doing to alleviate their fears about what is happening, and as long as I can get this information forthcoming, that is enough for me. I am not going to get into any slugging or lashing at anybody. I would like the Government to allay the fears of the citizens out there.

Today I heard people asking about where crime is happening. There are lots of crimes taking place in this country that are not reported. The whole point is that as long as you are uncomfortable in your home at night, you need the Government or whoever is in authority to come out and alleviate those fears. It is as simply as that. As long as people are afraid to sit down at nights and watch their television in comfort, without locking up their windows and doors, there is going to be this sort of tension in this country, and I want the Government to come out and say categorically if they and the police have come to some agreement on what is needed, and that they need have no fear because the matter is under control. I do not understand what is happening.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I rise on a point of order, arising out of the honourable Member's speech, to draw Your Honour's attention to the matter which has been alluded to, but for which the specific rules have not been cited, which is Order 28, Rules 11 and 12.

Rule 11 specifically states:

"No Member may allude to any debate of the same session upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion, except by indulgence of the House for personal explanation."

So perhaps I could allude to it, since it was my speech, but no other Member can allude to it, if the House allowed me.

The second Rule is:

"A Member may read from the authorised report of the debates, the report of any speech made in the House of Assembly during any previous session."

So, technically, a Member, as I take it, may explain something he told the House at an earlier occasion, if the House will hear him, but no other Member can refer to a speech. They certainly cannot read from the debate. I have nothing to fear, but I think a breach of the Rules has been committed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have said from early this morning that we are breaking the Rules of this House by referring to debates which have been passed in the House in this Session. Members have constantly referred to these reports, and it is a bit difficult, especially in this kind of a Resolution, to really suppress Members from dealing with it in that vein. That is why I said earlier that if Members persist in breaking the Rules on one side, it is but fair to allow the other side to answer their allegations. Otherwise, it means preventing a Member from making a speech.

I would therefore warn Members that we must try to keep within the Standing Orders of the House.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Speaker, I really had no intention of entering this debate at all, but as a result of a call from one of my constituents this morning, I am going to make a short speech on this matter.

This debate, having degenerated to the stage that it did, is a direct result of the fact....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you are now casting aspersions against the presiding officers of this House. You are now accusing us of allowing the standard of debate of this House to degenerate to very low levels. I find this not to be so. My contention is that Members are entitled to have their little fracas across the Chamber for a limited time, but I would not like you to say that the presiding officers have allowed the debates to get out of hand.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not intend to give that impression, but this debate, having got to a lower standard than expected in this Parliament, is a direct result of us, parliamentarians, not realizing the role that we should play and the example we need to set in a small community.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, and I took serious objection about it, one of the Members in a recent debate making the statement that he could not be compared with any School Meals worker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Here again we are going back into debates that have passed through this House no more than two weeks ago. Are we going to open these debates again? We are dealing with a Resolution on crime. You started by saying that we have allowed the debate to sink to a lower level than should be expected, and you are breaking the very Rule by referring to debates that have just passed through the House. Come on, let us keep the standard high!

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is my contention that, in societies like Barbados, which are subject to rumourmongering, as it is, this has made it very easy for people to believe quite readily the things that are said of their political leaders, because of some of the faults and some of the very things which we, the political leaders, do ourselves. If we, the political leaders and leaders in this community, try by our utterances and otherwise to give the impression that we are a cut above the average citizen, either by the way we conduct the debates, or by portraying elitism, either by way in which we approach the increase in our enumeration or otherwise, it is very easy for a small society to believe that we are above the law.

You would not certainly get this type of behaviour in a country like America, because the American believes that everyone is equal before the law, and if we do not drive home to the people in Barbados that that applies to every single person in Barbados, either by utterances or otherwise, we would make it very easy for them to hold on on rumours like these, and it is as a result of rumours made in this place that has started the debate in this tone. I sincerely hope that the parliamentarians in this country, the leaders in the Church and otherwise, realize we have a responsibility to the people out there and that we do not give them the impression that we have two standards, one applied to ourselves and one applied to them. I believe that the perceived double standard is one of the reasons that we have been able to have the type of debate that we have been hearing today.

My only reason for intervening, as I said, is that this morning I was asked by one of my constituents in Mount Pleasant to make the point that, some time ago, they reported a crime to the District 'C' Police Station, which was not able to respond, because, to use the words of my constituent, the officer-in-charge said there were no vehicles available to respond to the call. She said it happened on more than one occasion.
6.05 p.m.

St. Philip is the largest parish and it means that the District 'C' police have to go far and wide. So if the police is responding to a call, let us say, in the Crane, and there happens to be one in Mount Pleasant and there is not adequate transport for them at District 'C', it makes it very difficult for them to police and to provide the type of service that is needed in St. Philip. This is why I say that we need to examine very carefully the allocation of expenditures.

One of the subtle differences that the Prime Minister must realize is that when John Public is looking at allocation of resources, John Public is saying that the agency that touches on his daily life is the police. If you are in an accident, it is the police. If you and your neighbour have a row, you call the police. If you have a war going, it is the police. If there is a murder, it is the police. If there is a drowning, you have the police. Every single thing that touches on the daily lives of the people in respect of law and order, the police is expected to respond to. So John Public, quite naturally, would be very, very emotive if he believes that the police is not getting adequate money to fund it, when an agency that they hardly know of, and does not touch on their daily lives, is getting proper resources.

We cannot gainsay this. It is a common thing. You can drive down the road any morning and see the Defence Force with new trucks and buses. That agency does not touch on the daily life of John Public. As far as the man in the street is concerned, it is an agency that you might need some time in the future if you have external aggression, but right now, taking into consideration what is affecting lives, he cannot care less if you spent a penny or a cent on that agency. He is only interested in seeing that the Police Force is properly equipped so that when he or she gets on the telephone and calls his police station, they must not be in a position to say they cannot respond because of a shortage of transportation. We must realise that these things that touch on the lives of our constituents are the things that we must take into consideration in allocation of scarce resources. It is quite an easy thing for the man in the street to be emotive about that type of argument when these things happen every day.

The Administration must realize that the police agency is the one that the citizens know of. Certainly, there might be some old ladies and old men in this country who do not know that there is something called a Defence Force, because they do not want to know. They are in their houses watching television, they are in their houses reading their Bible, and the only thing they might see is when the police come into the place to respond to some call. Those are the things you have to take into consideration when you are looking at the type of distribution of resources. I urge the Administration of the day, having weighed dispassionately the request of the police

agency, to equip them with the equipment and manpower, if needs be, to respond readily and give people the assurance that everything is all right in Barbados, so that they can sleep in peace at night.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR (St. Peter): Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks I have deliberately refrained from joining in debates in this Chamber because I thought I would use the opportunity to get to fully understand and appreciate the Rules which govern our debate, and also to absorb the atmosphere and environment which, I was led to believe, should prevail in a Chamber of this character. I must confess, first of all, that today I have learnt a lot. And I feel compelled to break my silence and to speak as the youngest and most junior Member of the Chamber from the heart. I feel compelled to speak from the heart because even though I might be the youngest and most junior Member of this Chamber, I have had the benefit of an experience which, perhaps, other Members in the Chamber have not benefitted from. That experience is having to live in a country for ten years which has rend itself on the question of crime and violence.

When I listen to the talk about throwing men and material behind our problem, I remember that we in this country have evolved as a civilized society, and that while men and materials might be partly important to the solution of our problems in this society, the Barbadian way has always been a civilized way. I feel that if we follow the civilized way soberly, and without undue panic in dealing with this problem, as well as the other problems which confront our society, we would make far more advances than we would if we continue to pursue our various affairs in the tone and the manner in which this debate has been pursued.

I want to make a number of specific points on some of the matters which have been raised during the course of the debate. First, I believe that the argument in relation to relativities is, indeed, a pointless argument. The argument as to whether our Police Force is equipped in the same way, per capita, as other countries' police Forces is a pointless argument. Also, the question as to whether our rate of crime is similar to, lower than, or higher than that of other countries is a pointless argument. Those are pointless arguments, because we are a society in which the people, for a long period of time, have been made to feel relatively safe and secure, and a very small increment in the rate of crime, in the context of a society where the citizenry have always felt safe and secure, can have a more pronounced impact than one in which crime and violence is rampant. Indeed, those types of societies, such as Jamaica, have evolved defensive mechanisms, a fortress mentality, in absorbing rates of increases in crime.

Having said that, I turn to the matter of men and materials. I do not endorse the view which says that we have to throw money, men and material behind our

problems. In the United States of America, you have a situation in which sober, economic policy, for example, cannot be properly constructed because so long as the word "defence" is mentioned, there seems to be the view that any level of public expenditure on defence is justified, because defence has become a sacred cow. In the same manner, I do not believe that, merely because the level of crime in Barbados has risen, we, in this Chamber, should issue a blank cheque to our Police Force and say, "Spend, throw men and materials behind our problems." The programmes of the Barbados Police Force, their requirement of men, machinery and equipment, have to be subjected to the same kind of critical appraisal as should those of any other department which comes forward with requests for public funds in order to meet a matter of urgent public importance.

In recent weeks, I have had the opportunity to look at some of the estimates of the Barbados Police Force. Some of them are estimates which are designed to cope with the various problems which the Opposition has told us are very serious problems. The danger that was very much present in that exercise is that if we had allowed a blank cheque approach to prevail, a lot of padding and fat would have been included, and we might well have ended up in a situation in which we, too, would have become the victims of a sacred cow mentality.

The Government pledges its fullest support for the Barbados Police Force, but we must state a condition, and that condition is that the request for additional support must be reasonable. The Government cannot abdicate its responsibility of looking at what is put before it. It must determine as a Government whether the requests are reasonable, whether they are related to the particular problems at hand, and whether they will put a strain on the financial resources of the society.
6.15 p.m.

Clearly if the only thing that was required to solve crime in Barbados was additional men and equipment for the Barbados Police Force, then, in point of fact, the thesis that part of the problem of crime in the society has to do with deep-seated sociological and economic factors would no longer have any validity. I want to suggest to this Chamber that even when we are in the process of evaluating what is necessary to provide the Barbados Police Force with the muscle to address the problem of crime in the island, we have a responsibility as well to create an environment in which that additional muscle, whether it be men or equipment, can have the fullest effect. We have, I think, to deal with the business of strengthening our economy. We have to get fully into business of having a National Youth Service in this Society so that we can take some of our youths off the streets and put them in useful occupations. We also have to get our backs into the task of building a strong community. In areas such as Black Bess and Diamond Corner,

where we have strong community spirit, where we have youths who are interested in progress, the level of crime and violence which seem to be endemic to the rest of the society does not exist. In the final analysis, our best efforts should perhaps not be spent discussing rows between the Barbados Police Force and the Government or the Government's relationship to the Police Force and the army, but getting down to the business of making this society a more civilised place to live in, from both an economic and social point of view.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT (St. Michael North East): Mr. Speaker, I merely want to ask a few questions so that the Attorney General, who has responsibility for the Police and policing matters, could perhaps shed a little more light on some matters.

I was privileged not so long ago to have a first hand look at the drug situation in the Miami Port Authority, where very large consignments of all types of cargo are kept in a very elaborate shed at the airport. To impress upon us who were asking what was taking place, we were able to see a number of police dogs on what they call "routine duty", and these dogs were performing a normal 8-hour duty as the security police within that port authority. The demonstration which we witnessed showed us the ability of those dogs to detect all kinds of drugs, regardless of how protectively sealed they were, even if they were in a can like a can of corned beef or sardines. These dogs were so properly trained that, regardless of where the drugs were, they were able to find them. Drugs were placed on a conveyor belt, a very long round-about circuit, and these dogs were held on leashes by officers fully responsible for the care of the animals, and in every case where drugs were, the dogs were able to detect them.

I feel that this country could do with that kind of service at the Bridgetown Port and the airport. Barbados is becoming a port very easily accessible to the international drug traffic. A lot of drugs are allegedly passing through the airport, and I feel that where your manpower is unable to detect these drugs in the many forms they are arriving in Barbados, the Police Department, in conjunction with the Customs, should have an investment in a team of properly-trained security dogs for the detection of all kinds of drugs. In addition, they should have dogs for general patrol to assist policemen, who do not have that sixth sense of perception as a dog that is trained. If three policemen are in pursuit of an alleged robber, and the robber goes to St. Thomas and enters a ravine, instinctively the policemen would want to stop; a normal human reaction. If those policemen were in the company of trained dogs, the dogs would want to further pursue the criminal.

We are talking about better equipping the Police Force. I have heard today about \$800 000 in communication equipment. I feel that it would not cost that figure

for all the outposts in Barbados to be reasonably equipped with the kind of dogs for the kinds of services to cope with our criminal activity. I feel strongly that the police will be able to make more arrests if that kind of service was introduced.

Not so long ago, in the month of December, I was speaking to a manager of a poultry farm, and he expressed to me some fears that he had about the crime in Barbados. I was very surprised that, in less than a week's time, the same poultry manager was held at bay in his house. What is of importance, and to further support my argument to equip the Police Force by obtaining dogs, is the fact that police had at bay a number of criminals and one of the police was shot. If the Police Force had properly-trained dogs, that situation was ideal for the dogs to pick up the trail of those robbers. We have no lakes in Barbados, we have no rivers of any consequence, and I am sure that, with the properly-trained dog in service, the Barbados Police Force would have been able to make an arrest in the case of that particular robbery.

I also feel that, in support of this, most of the drugs which are filtering into Barbados can be halted. In Miami, they showed us how it is done. The cargo leaves the aircraft usually by a van. It is put on the conveyor belt before the passengers are allowed to pick it up, but before it is put on the conveyor belt the dogs, which have been trained specifically to sniff out drugs, are unleashed, and as every piece of luggage is put on the conveyor belt, the dogs take sniffs. When they attack that piece of cargo, you can be sure that there is some form of drug in that container, that suitcase, that box, whatever it is. The Customs make a mark on it and it goes through as ordinary luggage. Nothing is done to prevent the passenger or the owner of that piece of cargo from collecting it. Customs are trained specifically to look for these identifications. When the passenger collects his luggage, he is asked whether he has anything to declare, and he might deny that he has anything to declare. The Customs see the mark but they allow him to go. No arrest is made. That is done because they believe that in two, three or four months, they will make a bigger haul, since notations of the address and the person who makes the collection are taken into account. Quite easily, these simple principles can be applied in Barbados, and would be in a position of arresting some of the drug trafficking that is taking place in this country.

6.25 p.m.

If we are serious about putting a halt to the increase in crime, theft, and housebreaking, I would like to suggest that the police begin making some notation of the persons who wear expensive jewellery in this country. There are a number of seemingly unemployed and relatively poor people who have amassed large quantities of jewellery, very expensive motor cars and real estate in this

country in recent years. I am suggesting that these persons are known, as far as I am concerned, not to have any steady form of employment to generate that kind of wealth they have acquired. When you see an ordinary man walking around with locks and he can tell you his jewellery is valued at \$30 000, and when senior civil servants and private people in business cannot amass that kind of wealth in so short a space of time, I believe the police should be in the market looking for these persons who have so suddenly acquired this kind of wealth.

Aside.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: I do not care how you do it. We are talking about crime, and if we are to remove crime, emergency situations demand emergency measures. If crime in this country is on the increase, everything should be done to find out why it is on the increase. We must look at the reasons why crime is on the increase.

The measures which I have advocated today are simple ones. Dogs are part of the equipment which the police need. They have been used successfully in other countries, and I believe that they could very well be put to use in this country as an arm of the Police Force and of the Customs. I would like the Attorney General to tell us what kind of money, if any, is being spent to acquire the kind of dog service within the Police Force to improve that aspect of policing and detecting crime, as it really is on the increase.

Mr. J. G. ODLE (St. George North): Mr. Speaker, in supporting this amendment, I wish only to state that, as the representative of the constituency which seems to be hardest hit by this wave in crime, I am concerned about those people who have been suffering and who have been put to great inconvenience, and the relatives of those who have died or who have been damaged as a result of the criminal activity of persons unknown.

I certainly believe that the Government is doing all within its power to ensure that law and order is maintained. I have a lot of confidence in the Royal Barbados Police Force. I exhort my constituents to have confidence in the Barbados Government as well as in the Police Force.

I have been speaking with the Minister of Works, and there are one or two amenities which I believe we shall be getting soon, things like lights to light up some of the dark corners of the constituency. It is not only people who are supposedly well off who are worried and concerned, but people in all walks of life. Some people who probably just like to take a walk on evenings or early in the night find that they are confining themselves to their homes. It is not a healthy situation, but I have every confidence that the situation will soon be fully taken care of.

It is obvious that this has been a new situation, a situation to which the people, the police, all of us are unaccustomed to, but I am happy that it is being tackled effectively.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, one of the matters I want to raise has to deal with the question of accountability, the question of who is responsible with respect to the Police Force. There was a time, as was pointed out to the Prime Minister in another forum, when the British representatives in the form of the Colonial Secretaries and their Commissioners of Police did not have to give account to anybody locally. Even when there was not the real substance of ministerial responsibility there was still no direct accountability. Since the coming into being of independence and ministerial responsibility, as we know it under the Westminster form, the Minister responsible for Police is accountable to the country.

We deplore the fact that in this whole discussion here today the appearance seems to have gone abroad from the other side that there is the question of "the police" and "us", a quarrel between the Government and the Police Force. It is not my view that this is so. What has to be borne in mind at all times is that Barbados is a small country with limited resources, and with the limited financial cake it has, it has to divide that cake between the contending forces. While the Police Force is very important for the maintenance of law and order, it has to be seen as Health is seen, Education, Housing, Transport and Works and all the other contending forces of Government for part of the national cake. Therefore, when one is looking at the total finances of the country and the allocation of those resources, you have to take the needs of the police into account as you take all other needs, although bearing in mind that the Police Force is a law and order body, one is inclined to think that you need to look at the Police Force in a special way.

6.35 p.m.

From 1976, when the Barbados Labour Party came to office, we discovered that there were a number of problems besetting the new Administration. There were attempts to overthrow the lawful Government, and the Government, realizing that these attempts to subvert the Constitution were real, had to look at its Defence Force as well. So it is not only a question of having a Police Force to do the civil part of looking after crime, but you had to further spread your resources in terms of looking at the external threat to the sovereign integrity of the state. The problems which confront this country are far greater today than they were prior to 1976, and it is in this sense that we have got to look at our entire financial position and the allocation of resources.

It is unfortunate that in all of these matters we tend to score political points. In matters of defence, in matters

of external security, we should be extremely careful as to how we seek to incite the people. What nobody has adverted to up to now is the question of the breaking down of the moral fabric of the society and the question of when that started. I would pose a few questions here, and I would like each one of us in here to examine the few points which I make.

Do we consider today that the Police Force, although consisting, in the main, of very educated people, to be a Force as powerful as the Force you had in the past in terms of gradings? The answer to this may well be "yes". In terms of brawn, I very loudly say, "no". The police in the past was a highly disciplined and a highly conscientious person, a person who would not be adverse, if he were passing and saw two people in a fight, to stop, even if he was riding a bicycle or a motorcycle, or driving a car, and assist the aggrieved person. Is this true of today's police? Are we getting the best results for the money which we are spending today in the Police Force? Are we making the best of the allocations which we are providing for the Police Force? These are questions which I want you to ask yourselves.

On the other hand, the police comes from the society which we all come from, the society in which all of us live. Can we honestly say today that we are getting the type of person in this society that we knew of years ago? In the past, children had to be disciplined, children had to do a number of chores in their homes. The modern-day child is not particularly interested in that. In a lot of cases, the child does not have anything to do. Children do not have to bring water. It is true that some of us never had to do that — I do not believe that the Right Honourable Member for St. John had to do any of those chores, so he was in a more fortunate position than myself and a lot of other people, because the honourable Member does not fail to tell you that he came from that sort of background — but I had to be disciplined as a boy, and I was given a certain amount of chores which I had to perform, which I had to ensure were done at the time allotted for me to do so. Today's child does little or none of those things. He comes home, his meals are provided — everything is provided for him. He has what is regarded as a cushioned and happy life and, therefore, he sees the society as owing him everything and he as owing the society nothing.

I think the time has really come when we need to look at the fundamental problems of the society. In my day, when you saw your headteacher or priest, you had the greatest respect for them and you would not say a word out of the way. You would not do anything that you thought was improper, because you had too much respect for authority. The modern-day people seem to have no respect for authority, law, nor order. It is not a question of the resources which you allocate to the Defence Force or to the Police Force. It is a question of what people you produce in the society.

The public sees all of us as one, whether you be DLP or BLP. They see all of us as politicians, and the time comes when they treat us the same way anyhow, and I think the time has come when we should stop scoring cheap points over each other. We are doing ourselves no good and all the harm. Not only are we doing ourselves no good, but we are destroying the foundation of the institution that we are supposed to represent in this country. When you attack your colleagues, when you try to bring down the institution of Parliament, you are doing irreparable harm, and I want to appeal to each one of you in here to let us see if we can stop it.

There are a number of things, in my view, which we may need to do in order to curtail, if not to stop, the crimes which are taking place in our society. I suggest that for the time being, and maybe for a long time to come, we should stop showing violent films on the television, and even at the cinema. I think that we have fed our children on sufficient trash and it is time that we stop this. Many of the sophisticated crimes that are being committed in this country are committed as a result of what people have taught themselves by watching television. Crime has swiftly moved ahead, and just as many people and companies are becoming computerized, the same thing applies to the people who are involved in crime. Just as the Police might try to move one step ahead of the criminals, the criminal is trying in his own way to move one step ahead of the police.

I think the time has come when we must look very seriously at our society. There was a time when if a child was flogged at school, no parent would question the right of a headteacher to flog that child. Today, if a teacher looks hard at a child, the parent is ready for the kill. Let us go back to some of the disciplines of the past. We are quick to denounce the past as useless to our development. It is useful for us not to accept everything from the past, but, certainly, we should look at the past, see what is good, and transfer that to our present conditions.
6.45 p.m.

I feel that in cases of violent crimes, such as armed robbery, there should be mandatory sentences, with beatings of 'the cat'. Where policemen are being shot at and injured in the execution of their duties, there should be mandatory sentences for people who commit those crimes and are found guilty, and 'the cat' should be brought in in those respects. I believe the time has come, although I do not regard the situation as alarming. I recall that a few years ago, when there was a spate of crimes in this country and the Chief Justice started to hand down a number of very severe sentences including the cat, within a short period of time those crimes came to an end.

I speak on this matter as a person who does not even believe in capital punishment, but there comes a

time when we have got to be factual and see situations as they are. When a group of people, no matter what ethnic group they are, can be in their homes enjoying themselves and a mass of thugs can come in and tell them to tie the dogs, as I heard, and produce the guns, and march off with everything and shoot it out, we have to be serious. When a man can be in his home, which is supposed to be his castle, and thugs can come in and murder that man, none of us can feel safe.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned an incident in which a stone was thrown at his home. That person could only have gone there to do harm, and nobody could have sympathy for that person. I do not believe, no matter how much you might differ with the Right honourable gentleman from St. John, that anybody of a sane mind would want to deny his contribution to this country and to bring his life to an untimely end. We have got to do things to ensure that this lawlessness does not continue in the society.

I want to conclude on this so-called problem between the Commissioner and the Minister. There is no war between the Commissioner of Police and the Government. The Commissioner of Police is not a rival of his Minister — the Minister is the boss, the Minister is in charge. If I had a department under my Ministry and the head of that department was defying me on Government's policy, he would have to go. There is no way he would work for me if he defied my policy. There are areas of responsibility, and no Head of Department has any right to get into the area of Government policy. Whether you like the Government or not, the mere fact that the Government's policy is to do something, you have got to work within the framework of those guidelines. That is how it is throughout the developed and the developing countries.

It is a well-recognized fact that the political directorate is answerable in the final analysis to the people of the country and is supreme in these matters, because they speak with the voice of the people, and the voice of the people is supreme. Therefore, there should be no question of a war between a head of a department and any Minister. I do not want to hear that argument again. That is beside the point. It is ridiculous.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central has during his period in this House been regarded as a person who makes reasonable speeches. I must say that I am very disappointed in his approach to this subject this afternoon. He has let me down. I hope that in his speech on this amendment he would seek to redeem himself, because when you look overall at what the Government has done for the police over the years, you cannot say that we are not trying and that there is improvement. When the Government came into office in 1976, the police hardly had motor cars to move around

in. You seem to forget that the Government built the police station at Oistins, one of the most modern stations. The Government carried out extensions to Central Police Station and did a lot of work to upgrade a number of stations within the country. But the Police Force is only part of Government's responsibility, so you cannot give them everything at the same time. The competing people for the national cake will wonder why you are giving one area all and not giving others some. The Government has to relate its financial position to all areas. I would think that, in the circumstances, the Government has been doing its best. Therefore, I have very great pleasure in supporting the amendment to this Resolution.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Speaker, this debate has had its high points and its low points. I think the honourable Member who just sat down was in a highly moralistic mood, and I should like to congratulate him on the way in which he approached the subject. It is not often that I congratulate him — I have known him too long to be one of his unrelenting admirers — but sometimes he does rise to the level of the debate. As I said before, it is regrettable that sometimes we tend to forget that the public purpose is not best served by attacks delivered across the floor of the House from one side to the other as if that is the main object of our being in here. No one will deny that the very fact that the whole of today's sitting has been pre-occupied with the discussion of the level of crime in this country, that even those on the Government side considered that it is a subject on which the general public of Barbados has become very agitated during the past few months. I cannot join with the Right Honourable Member for St. Thomas in saying that these crimes have been directed against one small section of the society ethnically definable, because that kind of suggestion is one which would tend to exacerbate the tension that already exists in our society and give the impression that racism is increasing in the country.

6.55 p.m.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I must apologize, because I seem to be the victim of, apart from the attacks made by the honourable Member of St. James North and the vitriolic attacks made by the Prime Minister himself at the Labour Party's Conference, the victim of another virus.

What the Resolution says in its original form is:

"Whereas there has been an increase in the number of serious crimes in Barbados,

And Whereas it is essential that public confidence in the ability of the Police Force to function pro-

fessionally and efficiently be restored and maintained,

Be It Resolved that this House expresses its support for the efforts of the Commissioner of Police to control the increase in lawlessness and criminal activity in Barbados and urges the government to take appropriate action to ensure that the Police Force is adequately equipped to perform its duties."

An amendment was tabled by the Right Honourable Member for St. Thomas, and that amendment tends to congratulate the Government on what it has done. But the point is that the general public does not feel that everything was done that should have been done, and that is what is important. This has been fortified in the minds of most people in Barbados by the statement made by the Commissioner of Police, whose ability no one in this House will question, and also by disclosures made by at least one senior police officer.

It is not that the Government did not provide the police with things. As a matter of fact, I listened to the Prime Minister very carefully for the first time, because I cannot resist the temptation, like most of the children under the age of fourteen, to switch off the television. But since I understood that he had mentioned my name no less than seven times in the course of a Labour Party Conference, I listened to him very, very carefully. What he said was to this effect, "Who would believe that the Government, which has spent \$800 000 in buying equipment, would not provide \$8 000 to buy batteries?" I agree with him, because the House of Assembly passed money for equipment to provide batteries for the wireless equipment called walkie-talkies that the members of the Police Force are equipped with.

What happened was, according to my report of the meeting of concerned citizens — because if it was a political meeting, the Prime Minister or I would have been there. You cannot have a political meeting in Barbados and get neither the Leader of Government nor Opposition present, it has to be one or the other — the police officer in question — I would not call the police officer's name — said that money had been voted, which we voted, there were 300 walkie-talkies, using a generic term, but only 30 of them were working because the Supply Officer would not give them money to buy batteries, money which we had voted. I do not think that the members of Government ought to be thin-skinned. What is happening is that you have public officers who do not respond to the policies which the Government has laid down.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The same police officer said that if on his way up to Byde Mill in St. George he

had an emergency, he would have to stop at some house or a shop and ask for a telephone call to Central Police Station, because the VHF set in his car, like the VHF sets in most of the other police officers cars, was just not functioning.

There used to be a gentleman called Mr. Kellman who was one of the early wireless experts in the Police Force. He started off, I believe, as a corporal. Captain Armstrong was then in charge. Now Captain Armstrong and I have had a long association with wireless because we started the wireless section in school and right at the outbreak of war the Volunteer Regiment had no wireless equipment so we started assembling sections, including aldis lamps, heliographs, wires, field telephones and everything, and that is the heritage. I left Armstrong at the Regiment Headquarters to build up the wireless section. When he went to the Police Force as an officer, he did a very good job in installing VHF sets in the mobile units, and he had people like Mr. Kellman trained. I do not know of a single occasion in which the mobile units were not functioning sufficiently. Apparently, they have been allowed to run down. Nobody said that it was the Government's fault, but it is the Government's fault because the Minister responsible for the department should see that the department is kept up to scratch.

I want to issue a word of caution about the gentleman you have in charge of supplies. That gentleman thinks he is above the law. Because he had affiliation with the Government party, indirectly through his spouse, he did not have to respond to the Public Accounts Committee, as the Speaker himself will vouch for. He told us quite straight that he does not think that he has to submit any accounts to the Public Accounts Committee.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You have got to be joking! That started a little confusion among the pigeons over there.

That gentleman feels that he is above the law, so the fact that he did not give the police batteries did not surprise me at all. So I enjoin the Attorney General to look into the department and see that the police get the supplies that we have voted for them. I am not criticizing the Government on that score, because the Government requested that we should vote supplies for the Police Force. It is just that they are not being sort of serviced through the pipeline, as it were. I am not here to criticize anybody, but the people outside are concerned, and that is why when a responsible officer goes out and tells the concerned citizens that they are not getting the supplies, he should not be hauled up on the carpet, asked how dare he go and say that they have not got supplies, threatened with demotion and that sort of thing.

I think that as a Commissioner of Police, Mr. Durant has every right to make a pronouncement about the operational efficiency of the Force from time to time and say what the concerns are. If he had not done this, we would have not known how bad the situation was. I do not think that it is in any way encroaching on Government's policy for a Commissioner of Police to say that he is under-staffed. He does not have the number of people because the Prime Minister himself got in here about six weeks ago, sometime before Christmas, and said that he had stopped all recruitment in the Police Force because of some Pension Act that was going to make the retiring age 65. But he did not tell us that that had been stopped for a long, long time, although my latest check is that there are 1300 appointments in the Government service in Barbados, where the recruitment has been frozen over that period of time. I believe they have taken in a bunch of recruits since the Commissioner made the statement that he is under-staffed.

It has been admitted by one of the Ministers, either by the Prime Minister himself or the Honourable Attorney General, that the depreciation of the Police Force, by shifting people over to other departments, has had a serious effect on the operational efficiency of the Force itself. So if we put the whole thing in its right perspective, we then have to look at whether this is a temporary phenomenon, as the Prime Minister said in his vitriolic attack on the Democratic Labour Party. He made certain statements that I am not surprised at. I got the impression that he is starting a political campaign or an election campaign, because a number of times he called my name. He does not frequently call my name, but when he does so, he does it to agree with me to take the wind out of my sail from attacking him. He said that it was a temporary phenomenon, it was nothing to be alarmed about, that the Force had all the people that it needed and that kind of thing.

He also made a statement to the effect that I had stopped the duty allowance of the Police Force in 1975/76. The truth of the matter, as he would know if he had taken the trouble to check, is that the police never like their salary negotiations to proceed at the same time as those undertaken by the National Union of Public Workers or the Barbados Workers Union. At that particular time we were about three months late after we had finished the negotiations with the other branches of the Public Service, and there was more or less an agreement, except on the mechanics of the introduction of the duty allowance or the reduction of the working hours of the members of the Police Force. What happened was that the representatives of the Police came to me and said that the men would like their money as soon as possible and let us postpone the question of duty allowance for further examination. To my surprise, I saw on the

television in my own living room the Minister of Finance saying that I had denied the duty allowance for the police.

7.05 p.m.

He also said that I had stopped them from getting more motorised units. I think the honourable Member for St. Andrew summed it up admirably when he said that any particular department has got to be looked at from a holistic point of view, the totality of the requirements, the allocation of the resources between competing demands by various sectors of the Government.

If in any one year I am satisfied that the police have enough mechanised units and they apply for 15 new units, which they do as a matter of course — you give them 15 this year, next year they apply for another 15, because they do not expect to get 15, they expect to get seven — and I say you had 15 last year, and they say they did not remember that, we pass on. So to put that as a denial of units for the Police Force is not really telling the public the whole truth. Anyone who has been engaged in these exercises with the Estimates would understand that that is how the whole matter proceeds.

I make no apology for it. In the same way, I do not make any apology for the fact that I, unfortunately, did not have to carry water. I would like to apologise to the honourable Member, but I would like to say that one of the proudest days of my life was one Saturday when I was taking my daughter to the cinema. She hit me on the shoulder and said "Daddy, look David there by the Police Station in Black Rock." He had one bucket of water on his head, a skillet in his hand, and he was barefooted. He had gone to play cricket with the little boys — since he is now a postman next door you can check it with him — in a place called Crawford Bottom in Black Rock, and their mother had said that before they could play cricket, they would have to go and get water, and he went down the road with them with a bucket and a skillet. I say that is one of the proudest days of my life. I was denied the opportunity to have that experience, so I should like to apologise to the honourable Member, but I would like to say my son was brought up in the right way.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I do not believe you).

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: When a Minister's son, especially with a father as conceited as mine was — he had reasons to be conceited, a bright person — you are spared certain things that other people are exposed to.

Let us look now, Mr. Speaker, at the whole question of the increase in crime. I have the statistics here. For instance, the number of house-breakings, which is the aspect with which we are particularly concerned, because some of these housebreakings end up in murder, some of them end up in rape and some of them end up

in both, according to the Commissioner of Police in his annual report, housebreakings rose from 571 in 1979 to the current figure of 1,316. You have not got any figures for this year, obviously. Over a four or five year period, that is nearly a 250 per cent increase in housebreakings, and I think that this is the thing people are more concerned about.

But it is not only the number of house-breakings that we have seen an increase in. It is the systems, the methodologies, the stockings over the face, the sawn-off shotguns, the wanton killing sometimes of people who are no threat to the house breakers. This is what we are concerned about, and I think that, in a small place like Barbados, it is almost impossible for people who systematically go about like that, unless they are being protected by some other people, unless they are being master-minded to continue in this way.

We are concerned too, about the indiscriminate way in which permission to reside in Barbados is being given. At one time, year before last, looking at the amount of revenue which the Government expected to collect, I said it looked as if the Government was going in for an immigration industry. I think we could look very carefully at the policy of the people who make the final decision to let some people come in.

I am not saying that Barbadians are not capable of breaking into people's houses. I am not saying that it is a St. Lucian or a Guyanese gang, or anything like that. But I am saying the very fact that there has been a drastic change in the methodologies of these break-ins, in the wantonness, it seems to me that there is something foreign to the general outlook of Barbadians, even Barbadian criminals, in the kinds of crime and the way in which they are being carried out. I have no doubt that the police have been looking at this themselves.

We know, for instance, that there was a bunch of choke and rob people from Guyana who used to come up here to race meetings and snatch people's watches, pick their pockets. The night of the race meeting they would go back to Guyana or get off in Trinidad, so when the police were looking for them, they were nowhere about here, and the next Friday they would come back up for the next meeting. We are exposed to all of that, and the only way we can come to grips with this problem is if people who are concerned can get together and when they see people loitering on other people's premises, they do not say that is no business of theirs. Everybody is his brother's keeper in Barbados. From what the honourable Member for St. Andrew has said, I am sure that if he saw somebody loitering on my premises, he would not only ring me up, but he would probably go and grab the offender, him or her, because I understand that funnily enough, there are a lot of crimes being committed nowadays, even house-breakings, even by women who are

dressed up, and therefore nobody suspects that women could be involved in these crimes of violence.

There is absolutely no doubt that there has been an inordinate increase in the crimes with which we are most concerned. There is no doubt in my mind from the address today of the Deputy Prime Minister the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, that he feels that the Commissioner of Police has let him down by drawing attention to the fact that there are certain inadequacies in the establishment of the Police Force. I think the Commissioner of Police has done us all a good service by drawing it to our attention, and I hope that nobody in this Government will ever try to constrain any member of the Police Force in the successful prosecution of offenders. The feeling in Barbados is that people in a certain level in this society can do things in this society and get away with them, and a poor man, who frequently does not even have money to be represented by counsel, has to take the brunt of the punishment while other people get away with things. The Prime Minister himself has said that the people who commit white collar crimes tend to escape scotch free, or words to that effect, which is only re-emphasizing what I have said in a slightly different way.

7.15 p.m.

What is important is that the people must be given a sense of security that when they go to bed at night, they do not have to bar up all their windows and suffocate, that they can leave at least one window open with a little protection and have high expectation of rising to meet the dawn the following day. I think that if we can, by this debate, either on the Government side or on the side of the Opposition, impress upon the citizenry of this country that we are concerned, and that whatever role we have to play we are prepared to try to do something about it, then the purpose of the introduction of this Resolution would have been ably served, no matter what the final verdict of it may be.

Mr. SPEAKER: If no other Member wishes to make a contribution to the debate, the honourable Member, the mover of the motion, will be entitled to reply, and then a Minister of Government will wind up for the Government.

Does any other Member wish to make a contribution to the debate? I hear no answers, so the honourable Member may now make his reply.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of points which I feel constrained to respond to. The first one which I would like to take up is a point made by the honourable Member for St. Andrew, (Hon. L. B. Brathwaite), who spoke of what he conceived to be the role of the Commissioner of Police, *vis-a-vis* the Government. He made the point that there was no war between the Commissioner of Police and the Government, and he

went on to make the point that the Minister was boss, and, consequentially, the Commissioner of Police, as head of the department, was, to that extent, responsible to the Minister.

I think we have to get this issue in its proper perspective. The Commissioner of Police is charged with a specific responsibility, the maintenance of law and order in this community, and in the prosecution of that responsibility, he is subject to direction from no one. So whenever the Commissioner of Police feels that he has to take certain steps in the maintenance of law and order, he is liable to direction or instruction from no one, not even the Prime Minister, or the Leader of the Opposition, or any politician in this country, and the sooner we get to understand that, the sooner all citizens in this country will understand that the Commissioner of Police is not to be directed by any politician, or by anyone, irrespective of their social or economic position, the better.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Sir. I am sorry to interrupt the honourable Member, but he must not mislead the House. It is only in the investigation in the prosecution of crime that the Police Commissioner must not have any intervention from any other source, only that, and he has repeatedly said that no member of the Government ever interfered with him in the investigation and prosecution for crime.

Mr. M. A. KING: I am saying that in the exercise of his duties, as responsible for law and order, the Commissioner of Police is subject to direction from no one. We will have problems if a Government feels it can tell the Commissioner of Police how to exercise his duties. That is the very thing we are concerned about and which we have to be careful about.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. The Commissioner of Police is responsible for the administration of his department. The Minister of Legal Affairs, the Attorney General, is responsible for the entire Barbados Police Force by way of an instrument of the Governor-General. I just do not understand what he is trying to say. You cannot make it any clearer. The Commissioner of Police is responsible for the day-to-day running of his department.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This is a very important.....

Mr. SPEAKER: We have two points of order. We just had a point of order. You cannot have a point of order on a point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I was not rising on his point. I know he sat down.

Mr. SPEAKER: It was a point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Could I elucidate, perhaps, what I said in my speech? I do not want to have any quarrel. There is no question of a quarrel with the Commissioner of Police, but I am the head of the

Government, and the honourable Member is misleading the House on a very important point.

The Commissioner of Police is not an independent authority. He is responsible to the Police Service Commission for the administration of the Force, and he is responsible to the Director of Public Prosecutions in respect of what prosecutions are brought. The Director of Public Prosecutions has total command over all prosecutions in this country except those that were removed by the Constitution in 1974.

As a matter also of Government policy, certain general policy directions relating to the way law and order may be maintained can be set by the Cabinet. The honourable Member is speaking of the Commissioner of Police before we have had Cabinet Government. He is not speaking of the position today. The common expression is that he is answerable to the law of the Governor-General acting on the advice of the Police Service Commission. But in other regards in prosecutions he is not an independent person, nor is he in certain aspects of keeping law and order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, let us get this clear. I never said, and nobody could accuse me of saying, that in relation to prosecutions the Commissioner of Police had an independent role.

Asides

Mr. M. A. KING: How did we get the question of prosecutions in? The Director of Public Prosecutions is the one with responsibility. I did not mention prosecutions. I said that the Commissioner of Police, in the exercise of his duties in the maintenance of law and order, is subject to direction from no one. What is wrong with that as a statement?

7.25 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the honourable Member continue. Please continue.

Mr. M. A. KING: I do not recall that I called the word prosecution in relation to prosecution of offences. I did not say that. As a matter of caution, if I did say it, which I doubt, I will say that I did not intend to say that, because in relation to prosecution, everybody knows that the Director of Public Prosecutions is the responsible authority.

The point which I made, and which I make again, is that the Commissioner of Police in the exercise of his duties — we know what they are is not liable to direction from anyone. That is a statement by which I stand. I

think that the sooner we all understand that, the better it will be for us all.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: So can I not block a road too? Only Taitt makes those foolish statements.)

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Taitt? He is more foolish than Taitt.)

Mr. M. A. KING: If in the course of his duties the Commissioner feels that he needs to explain anything to the public, as he has done in this matter of crime, there is nothing wrong with him doing so. That point was made by the Right Honourable Member for St. John. So when the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central seeks to chastise the Commissioner of Police for making his comments on the crime situation.....

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: No!)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir: I will not allow the honourable Member to misrepresent what I said. I said the manner in which the speech that the Commissioner made, was reported caused it to be perceived as a challenge to the Government on policy, and that it was regrettable that he did it while discussions were going along and a matter had not been settled.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I made a note that the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central said that the statements of the Commissioner of Police were a direct challenge to the authority of the Minister. If you say that the statements of the Commissioner of Police are a direct challenge to the Minister, you are saying that he had no right to make those statements. The honourable Member even went further and said that if you are going to get into the political arena, or words to the effect, you have to accept the attacks which are going to be heaped on you when you are in the political arena.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Again, on a point of order: I will not allow the honourable Member to mislead the House as to what I said. I said that where you make statements which conflict or are perceived as conflicting with Government policy, you would appear to be getting into the political arena and encroaching upon the area of politicians.

Mr. M. A. KING: The honourable Member for Christ Church Central said, and I made a note on the statement: "The Commissioner lacks the capacity to understand the difference between being a Commissioner and being a politician."

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Right. What is wrong with that?)

Mr. M. A. KING: The point I am making is that when you reach the situation where it seems to me that there is a public chastisement of the Commissioner for making a statement, and that is my interpretation of the statement made by the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, when you get that sort of position taken by honourable Members who form the Government, you tend, in my view, to undermine the very institution of the Force.

The only plea I am making is that rather than raise issues and open that confrontation, so to speak, in the public's mind — the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central said himself that this type of thing exacerbated public feeling, and it does exacerbate public feeling — politicians have a responsibility, in my view, to deal with the matter in a way so as to minimize whatever public concerns can arise out of that kind of situation, rather than to try to take on the Commissioner of Police in a public confrontation and thereby undermine the whole institutional arrangements. That is the concern which I have about what I consider to be the open season on the Commissioner.

The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central made the point that we in the Opposition are inclined to drop rumours in here, and do it deliberately, and people pick it up and spread it outside like wild fire. That is his interpretation of the situation. If you understand what is happening outside in the community, you would realize that what is being said in relation to crime is nothing that has been started in the House of Assembly. What has taken place has taken place outside in the community, and if you are in the community, you would understand what is being said out there and what is happening in the community. What is happening in here, and what has happened in here today, is only a reflection of what has happened in the wider community. So you have the situation in reverse.

It is important, from the public point of view, that problems which appear to exist are dealt with. Young people all over this community — this point was made by the honourable Member for St. John and I do not need to elaborate on it too much, but the point is very critical — and people all over this community look to their leaders for direction and for standards. If they feel, correctly or falsely, that the standards of their leaders are falling, if they feel that their leaders can get away with anything in the community, then you are creating additional problems for the maintenance of law and order, because people at the lower income level, who look up to their leaders, have no respect if they feel that their leaders do not need to have respect for law and order. So the essential point which I am making, one of the good points which come out of this debate, is that we should respond to the problems which exist in the community, whether you consider those problems to be rumours or

not. The fact is that the sooner those problems are addressed and dealt with, the sooner the community is likely to respond in a positive way to the example, so to speak, of their leaders.

Now, to the honourable Member for St. James North. There is not much to say about what he said. He was fairly loud in his comments. He accused me of being big, black and ugly, but that is no problem.

Laughter.

Mr. M. A. KING: Perhaps he wanted to be offensive. That is not offensive to me.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on a point of order. I never said he was big, black and ugly. I said dirty, Sir.

Laughter.

Mr. M. A. KING: Dirty, black and ugly. Dirty. That is the offensive part.

Laughter.

Aside.

Mr. M. A. KING: I do not mind being black and ugly. That is all right.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Tell us of the political leaders who interfere with drugs.)

Mr. M. A. KING: I am going to deal with my response in the way which I want to, if you do not mind, please.

I want to respond to the comments made by the honourable Member for St. Andrew. I really do not have anything to apologize for, let me say that. We in Parliament have a responsibility to speak to the issues which face the community. The honourable Member for St. Andrew said that the public sees us all as one, and that when you attack your colleagues, you are doing your party harm and bringing down the fabric of our very institution.
7.35 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. James North has no difficulty whatsoever about accusing the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central of being a peddler of cocaine. I have heard the honourable Member for St. James North accusing the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central in this House on several occasions of being a dealer in cocaine. That is an offensive remark.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I have never accused the Member for St. Michael South Central

in dealing with cocaine. I have accused him in dealing with drugs, and I will do that as long as I am alive, because it is my understanding that he is a medical man and, therefore, he has to deal in drugs.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a point of explanation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: There is nowhere in Hansard that I ever accused him of dealing in cocaine. Richie Haynes deals in drugs.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no Richie Haynes in this Honourable House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The honourable Member has even gone as far as to say on the floor of this House, that the dogs sniffed my briefcase with cocaine at the airport.

Mr. M. A. KING: Honourable Members on the other side are talking about responsibility and about throwing bricks. It is all right for them to throw bricks at us, but we are not to throw bricks at them. When we are talking about refraining from accusing our colleagues unduly and doing irreparable harm to our colleagues, let us remember it from both sides of the fence.

Asides

Mr. M. A. KING: I can take anything that you can give me. I am positive about that.

Mr. Speaker, what we are concerned about on this side is that the efforts of the police force in the matter of controlling crime should have the fullest possible support, the widest possible support. We on this side have no problem whatsoever about committing ourselves totally to supporting the police in this matter. All we have, in fact, been doing in the course of the debate is to urge the Government to look at the matter, look at the issues, respond to the queries and suggestions being made by the Commissioner of Police and those who advise him, and let us come up with some constructive way of meeting the problems, because they must be problems, which present themselves.

I beg to move that the Resolution that I have introduced be the one which do pass this House.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious things that has emerged out of this debate today has been the rather wild accusations made by at least two honourable Members on that side about drug activity and leading members of the Barbados Labour Party Administration. Whatever else has been said today, that stands out. I am disappointed that the honourable Member who moved the Resolution, and who just sat down, has had an opportunity during the course of his

winding up speech to address that particular problem and did not. One might have been inclined to say at the beginning of the day that, in a fit of recklessness, he made accusations that were unsubstantiated – and indeed that could not be substantiated. We were prepared at the end of the day, when we got certain things off our chest and the wrong of the allegations made came home to the honourable Member, that he would have had the good grace to get up and say something that would amount to an apology, even if he did not do it in such a way as to lose face. I do not expect it from the other honourable Member who made accusations – the level of morality coming from the honourable Member on that side would not allow him to do that – but I thought the other honourable Member, who I have known quite well for a long time, was a more honourable and decent fellow, and I am disappointed.

We had a debate on a matter that is of tremendous concern to the people of the community, and the debate was taking its normal course, there were expressions of opinions and differences of opinions on both sides and it was on course, until the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central got up and said the most alarming things in here. But it did not surprise me that he could make those accusations against people without any foundation; that is all part of the character of the man.

He is the kind of man who says things against his own family. Now what about us? We are plain, ordinary, normal outsiders. That honourable Member there, the Member for St. Michael South Central, is a man who did not even go and see his brother when he was in the hospital, so I am not surprised about what he says. He is a man who says things against his own brother. He is nobody at all.

The fact that he is making these loud arguments, unreasonable ones, for the police does not surprise me. He comes out of a police family. But he had an uncle who died, a policeman, who he refused to see before he died. So who are we? I do not understand why we should feel any hurt or pain over the type of things he said in here today. I am saying things that I know, not rumour that they create. I did not pick up these things as gossip on the streets. I am talking about things that I witnessed first hand. The man who can treat his family the way that he treats his family is a man unworthy of any proper hearing in any decent and respectable company in this country.

I am doing everything in my capacity as Minister responsible for Police to make sure that there is no widespread distribution of drugs in this country. I have summoned the Commissioner of Police to my office on several occasions – whenever I hear of rumours about Members, political people or prominent people in the community – and asked him if there are any Members of

Parliament, in Government or Opposition, who he has reason to suspect are involved in drugs in this country. I have told the Commissioner of Police, and let the word go out and let everybody hear it, that nobody is to be exempted from prosecution for dealing in drugs in this country. I do not care who you are. I have given the Commissioner of Police my word that I will support him to the hilt if there is evidence against anybody, however prominent in this community, that they are dealing in drugs. I say it again tonight, and that is my position.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, I said it earlier and I repeat it, continuously make these vile accusations, and every single time you ask him to produce the evidence — not to me, to the Commissioner of Police — he has refused to do so.

I heard in here today about a cocaine factory at Sandy Lane Hotel. The Commissioner of Police said that he never heard about it. The Assistant Commissioner in charge of Crime told me that he did not know anything about it. The Senior Superintendent told me he did not know anything about it.
7.45 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of explanation, Sir. If the Commissioner of Police does not know about it, the Senior Superintendent, the Deputy Commissioners — somebody knows. I stand by what I said and I am going to repeat it, carefully. There was a man who came and stayed at Sandy Lane Hotel. He was in a room and he was there for a long time. He had a big desk, under which was a large amount of cocaine. He left at Grantley Adams Airport and took with him large sums of American money. If the Commissioner of Police says he does not know about it, he does not know, but I was told and I believe it. I am not going to come into this House of Assembly and let anybody think that I am telling lies for political gain. Those are facts that were given to me by people whom I believe.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, it is not a point of explanation. It is a point of repetition, for which there is no provision in our Standing Orders.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I do not know why the honourable Member is going to let his aorta burst in all this emotion. I did not say whether it is true or not true, all I say is that the Commissioner of Police and the senior people in crime in Barbados say they did not know anything about it. I find it extremely disgusting to hear the honourable Member get up in here and freely admit that he has all that information and never brought it to the attention of the Commissioner of Police or any of the senior crime chiefs in this country. I would really like to know why he has all that classified, fancy, special information and never brought it to the attention of the leading criminal people in the Police Department.

I really felt very distressed hearing this debate all day. I would have thought that there would have been an opportunity for us to have an even-handed, reasonable and rational approach to a problem in this country that is causing all of us concern, not only the members of the Opposition. Nobody is exempt from having his house broken in. They do not pick out one set of people or the other, so we are all concerned about it. I was hoping that I would have got the type of contribution from the Members on the other side that perhaps might guide us towards a more enlightened policy in respect of crime in this community. But what have we got? All kinds of virulent nonsense, all kinds of wild and unsubstantiated attacks on innocent people in this country. One moment they are attacking the police and the next moment they are trying to defend them.

I heard in here today that there are police vehicles that have to be put down in the yard at Central Police Station because there are no policemen to drive them. There were those who were saying that we should give them more policemen because you have vehicles but no officers to drive them. Then another member of the Opposition got up and said the exact opposite, that they have men but they do not have vehicles. What kind of argument are you bringing to us?

I want to thank my representative, the honourable Member for St. George North (Mr. J. G. Odle,) for giving me the assurance and reassurance that he is protecting me in the area in which I live, but I hear that a few of these attacks are made on the homes of white people in Barbados. The Democratic Labour Party has that on their hands. When the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central went around Barbados for a period of two or three years and preached racism on the platforms of this country, he was inciting the young black people in this country to launch an attack on those people. He did that night after night. I read every word, verbatim, of what was said on political platforms. Now he comes in here today with all this pious nonsense.

I heard the same honourable Member, the member for St. Michael South Central, say in here tonight that when the policemen talk to each other on the VHF system, the walkie-talkie sets, you could pick it up. That is a diabolical lie. There is no way on earth in which you could sit down in your house and hear what is going on on those sets.

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Look, you do not get into this, this is way on top of you. Conversations between policemen using walkie talkie sets cannot be intercepted by the public. That is what they tell me.

Loud asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: You can shout as much as you like.

You cannot win, Sir. One moment they tell the Government that they must rely on the advice of the police. If the police say something, you must do what the police say. Now that the police have given me this information, they tell me the police are liars. I have no idea what to do.

I know nothing about walkie-talkies and such electronic equipment. I must be the most illiterate person in the world when it comes to electronic things, but I am told that conversations between one police station and another cannot be monitored because they are on a VHF system. That is what they tell me.

I heard one honourable Member talk about training. I have always contended, in all the reports you have heard over the past year in statements I made in this regard, that what was more important now than additional bodies in the Police Force was proper training and proper equipment. Between the four years 1973 and 1976 — and that is a proper base for comparison — there were nine police officers trained overseas in investigative techniques and things related to crime. Those were the last four years of the Democratic Labour Party administration. Between 1980 and 1984, seventy-seven have been trained. I said earlier today that there were approximately half of all police officers in the Force who were trained during the calendar year 1984.

I feel, and I do not care how much criticism I get for it, that the answer to the problems in the Police Force is not simply one of numbers. It has to do with training, management, equipment, deployment of resources, motivation, leadership. I believe that these are matters that bear perhaps more seriously on the effectiveness of a Police Force than just, say, putting more men walking down the street with big batons at their sides. That is my view, however much I may be criticised for it.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, who introduced this Resolution, is making out that the Government is picking a fight with the Commissioner of Police. From the time the Commissioner of Police was appointed, you could always hear the Commissioner, week after week, month after month, making statements on television, radio and in the newspapers and you never used to hear from the Minister responsible for police affairs. The Minister felt that the Commissioner was just appointed and that it was not a bad thing for him to tell the public of Barbados how he intended to face the whole question of policing and crime in the community, so he had his say. I did not feel that I had to be any star boy to compete with any Commissioner. That is not my style. Those of you who observe me would realise that I succeed anyway. But

having reached a point when the policy I was trying to articulate in the Ministry in relation to the police was being publicly challenged, I had a responsibility to set out to the public exactly what I wanted to do and how I would go about doing it.

7.55 p.m.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, in an alarming departure from common sense, said that in matters of law and order the Commissioner is subject to no one. It seems to me that there is no reason to have a Minister, but if he looks at the Act, and he should have looked at it before, he would see that this Act, Cap. 161, the Police Act, is replete with references where the Commissioner may, with the approval of the Minister, do so and so; where the Minister is empowered by the Act to make Regulations to control all kinds of things, including the general administration of the Police Force, the issue of arms, who is appointed and who is promoted. All of that is in the Act, and the honourable Member, a leading lawyer in this community, allowed himself to be misled by people.

Asides

Hon. L. R. TULL: He says I do not understand. I am so stupid that I do not understand when he said that in matters of maintaining law and order, the Commissioner of Police is subject to no one. I cannot bother with him and that.

I want to mention some other things quickly before my time runs out.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member's time expires at 8.05 p.m.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, the figures issued by the Commissioner of Police in 1984 show that there has been a rise of 5.8 per cent in crime. That is not an unusual figure. It is not out of proportion to the norm. What is out of proportion is the amount of housebreakings. The figure has increased to about 37 per cent — I said that in here last week, so do not get on as if you have any privileged information, and that is causing us concern. I do not believe, however, that sheer numbers can prevent housebreaking in remote parts of Barbados, that you are going to pick out policemen to stand up in the gateways of big houses in Barbados to keep watch 24 hours a day, or indeed all through the night?

Asides

Hon. L. R. TULL: I am glad to hear the honourable Member for St. Michael West say that he agrees that most people agree with me on that. You do not answer these problems with sheer numbers. You do not just pick up people, put them in uniforms, send them to the school,

put them in the streets, and that means that criminals are not going to break into people's houses at nights. There is a lot more required than that.

I want to mention something in relation to vigilantism. At the moment, there is a case exercising the attention of everybody in the United States. A young man named Bernard Goetz was accosted by four young thugs in a subway in New York, he pulled out his gun and fired bullets in all four of them, and he is charged for attempted murder and all kinds of things. All across America, people are phoning in to the radio stations and writing newspapers and saying that, far from charging the man, they should elect him Mayor of New York — it is about time that somebody pick up his gun and put some holes in these criminals who are going around and interfering with people. That is a very serious departure from common sense, and I said in an interview with one of the radio stations towards the end of last year that I am not going to condone that kind of activity in Barbados.

I also said earlier that I do not believe that the Defence Force should be put out to do civil police work. Apart from everything else, members of the Defence Force cannot arrest anybody in Barbados. They do not have any powers of arrest, the police have the power, so when a man in an army uniform approaches a citizen, all he has to tell him is, "Go and jump in the Careenage. You cannot tell me what to do."

(Asides — Give them AIs).

Hon. L. R. TULL: I do not want to put A1's in their hands.

I stand by my position that I do not believe that there should be any vigilante operation, because the last state might be worse than the first. Usually when you have crises, usually when you have great emergencies, that is the particular time where you get an erosion of people's civil rights.

I heard one of my colleagues on the backbench today talking about something that made me raise my eyebrows. He was saying that the Police should go out there and make notes on all of these people with a lot of heavy jewellery on them, those who do not appear to be working and come from low income groups, put them in a little bunk and harass them. I do not want to have anything to do with that. Every citizen in this country has a right to full protection of the law, and I will not be agreeing to or condoning any action that is directly against any one section of the community in this island, because, as I said, it is really when you have problems that an erosion of your rights begin to set in, and I regard that very carefully.

It is important that we strike a proper balance between the protection of the citizens of this community and the maintenance of law and order on the one hand and the protection of the individual and civil right of every person living in this community. That is not easy. One of the things about decision-making, particularly in Government, is that whatever you decide to do, some are for you and some are against you, and you should not get into this business if you cannot take that.

I remember that when the Criminal Evidence Bill was introduced in Britain a year or two ago, one of the things said by the Lord Chancellor was that the issue was a highly sensitive and emotive one, this whole question of increased powers to the Police. He talked about the dangers it posed to the rights of citizens, and he said, like Professor Roy Marshall said in his Central Bank debate the other night, that a proper balance has to be struck between what you are trying to achieve on one side and what you are trying to maintain on the other. It is a difficult and invidious position and courageous decision-makers have to make those decisions, and we will not be deterred from taking those decisions by the inane and stupid ramblings of a dis-organized Opposition, an Opposition that seeks to exploit the emotion at the moment for narrow political gains. We will not condone that. Nothing in the discussion today coming from Members of the Opposition, except, perhaps, the honourable Member for St. Philip North, has given us any hope for a rational approach by Parliament as a single institution in dealing with this problem that affects and concerns the citizens at this time in history.

Government took notice of the development of crime in Barbados long before the community or the Opposition took notice. Long ago we invited a Commissioner Graham, I think he was, a senior police officer from Britain, to come in here and do a study of the Police operations and make certain recommendations. We invited Professor Howard Jones, a Professor of Criminology at the University of Wales, to come in and do a study of criminal activity as it relates to the police and prison and he also put in a report. I mention Professor Jones' Report because the honourable Member who introduced this Resolution keeps tripping himself up with words like "technological advances" and "computerization". He is a little bit slow, because what I did, after studying the Jones Report, was to appoint an officer from the Public Service to go to the University of Wales for three months to study criminology, statistical systems, criminal records and all the related areas. She has been trained and is back in Barbados to do the computer work for the Police Department. It will involve criminal records, distribution of staff, traffic and all the diverse, complex and sometimes even simple duties that are required to be carried out by senior police officers. They will be able to put into the computer certain known

characteristics of certain criminals in Barbados, so that when certain offences are committed, they can go to the computer and come up with a profile of the person who is likely to have committed the crime and make the job much easier for the Police. These are not the things that are being talked about. One gets the impression that nothing is being done.

8.05 p.m.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the Commissioner of Police was able, over a year ago to reduce the working week of the Police Force to forty hours a week. I hear criticisms about the state of police stations. Police Officers now work forty hours a week and they do not have to sleep in any old barracks, as I understand it. If you work forty hours a week, you can go home. It is nothing like it was when the Democratic Labour Party was the Government. They gave the people a lot of rat-infested barracks to sleep in so that they could pick up all kinds of disease. Those days are over.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: The police do not tell you so. They say that from 1961 they started living.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think my time has just about come to an end.

(*Aside:* You have more time.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: The police has been given serious and important consideration by this Administration. I went into the Ministry of Legal Affairs in 1981 and I was met with unprecedented hostility by the Police Force. I went to their first Police Association meeting and Inspector Longe hit at me, and it hit me only because I was not prepared. I did not expect it. The Commissioner was then Mr. Prescod, and I said to him, "Look, I have a job to do. The Police will co-operate with me and we will get things done or they will fight me, in which case, I will fight them back. They will have a Minister in name only, but I will do nothing for them. I will not intercede with Government. I will criticise them all the time. If they want to fight, they have the right man." The Commissioner said to me that "The fellows say that when you are practising criminal law you used to give them a rough time, and that is why they behave like that." I told him that I would have thought — the honourable Member does not like that; you must ask them about me — that that was a very unfortunate way in which to go about doing the important work which he had to do, and that I am willing to work with the Police and do what I can to get the maximum resources and support and everything.

The mood changed. The Resident Beat Scheme discussed by the Commissioner with me was implemented. The Juvenile Liaison Scheme discussed by the Commissioner with me was implemented. The Crime

Prevention Panel discussed by our Government was implemented. The Assistant Commissioner of Crime, on my nomination, was appointed to the United Nations Crime Commission. During my time, we decided that it was important that we joined INTERPOL. We are now full-fledged members of INTERPOL and are able to benefit from the passing of information from one country to the other to help us cope with the kind of international crime syndicates and activities going on.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member will have to wind up.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I will wind up now, Sir.

Far from the Commissioner of Police and the Minister of Legal Affairs having any row, the Commissioner of Police is always telling me that he wants to consult with me more and more, that he wants to meet with me regularly to discuss a number of the important problems that he has confronting him as Commissioner. The Commissioner is saying that the job at the top is a very lonely job and sometimes he wants somebody to sit down and help think about the problems and help with the solutions.

It is a wicked comment on the Minister and the Commissioner for members of the other side to perpetrate the story that somehow or other there is a war going on between the Commissioner and myself. If the Commissioner of Police had wanted to engage me in a fight, believe me, he would get a fight. I do not run from a fight. But that has never been the relationship between the Commissioner of Police and myself. We have a friendship that goes back thirty-five years. The Commissioner of Police is a strong-willed man who knows what he wants. And so is the Minister. We do not always agree, but we operate well as a team.

I give the country an assurance that despite the mischief stirred up by the Opposition, particularly by the honourable Member who moved the Resolution and his side kick from St. Michael South Central, this Government does everything that is reasonable to fight off any increase in crime, and to bring back a state of equanimity and peace of mind and relative security for all the citizens of this country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I feel grievously hurt by the charge made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that I and my colleagues are involved in drug trafficking. And he attacked you too, Mr. Speaker, because he put the lashes in the leaders of the Barbados Labour Party. I feel very hurt about that.

I beg to move, Sir, that the amended Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before putting the Resolution, I want to put forward that I think that it is very much unparliamentary for any Member, and it is against the Rules of the House, to accuse Members of Parliament of criminal activities. I would hope that I would never hear it in here again. I believe that every Member knows that you cannot accuse another Member of criminal activities because of the peculiar nature of elected Members to this Honourable House.

I will now put the amendment first.

The question that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Resolution was put and resolved in the negative the House dividing as follows:

Noes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. L. R. TULL, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. L. L. SISNETT, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE, Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM and Mr. J. G. ODLE - 13.

Ayes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Mr. B. M. TAITT, Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. M. A. KING and Mr. L. A. WEEKES - 8.
8.15 p.m.

The question that the words of the amendment be there inserted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that the Resolution, as amended, do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary Notice Paper, from which I would like to give notice of the two Resolutions:

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$265 000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1984-85, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1984-85, No. 28, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$950 000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1984-85, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1984-85, No. 29, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

SUSPENSION

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 8.45 p.m. this evening.

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

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

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Government Business be the instant order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is now the instant order of the day.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I gave notice earlier today of a Resolution to deal with 5 billion Japanese Yen. I proposed to do that now.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE BORROWING OF THE SUM OF 5 BILLION JAPANESE YEN TO BE RAISED BY THE ISSUE AND SALE OF BONDS

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my objection to dealing with a matter involving the borrowing of 5 billion Japanese yen, notice being given of this particular Resolution this morning, at the beginning of a day when we have had a very intensive debate and no opportunity being given to study the implications of this loan or to properly examine the external position of Barbados as it stands at the moment. I would like to voice my objection, because I do not think that it is fair to the country to have a huge sum of money like this being borrowed and being dealt with in this manner.

I feel that honourable Members will appreciate the implications of borrowing this sum of money at this stage in Barbados, that it has serious implications and that it is a matter which we all should have time to address ourselves to and study very carefully. My own view is that it is the kind of Resolution that should not be proceeded with in this sort of manner.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, when I indicated today that I was going to do it, the Leader of the Opposition with whom I would have discussed the matter, did not raise any objection on that occasion and I cannot accommodate

the Member for St. Michael South Central. The Government is prepared to deal with this Resolution in all its stages at this time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will grant leave to the honourable Member to proceed with the Resolution at this time, because, as the Member has said, when it was mentioned this morning there was no voice of objection to the Resolution being done in all its stages today.

I also refer to May's Parliamentary Procedure, 18th edition, at page 209, which clearly sets out the position, that it is the business of Government, and particularly in these times, periods of emergency, the aim of Government is the forwarding of their business as long as it does not do too much discredit to the Opposition. There is no reason why it should not be proceeded with. If you look at page 209 of May's Parliamentary Procedure, it specifically highlights the situation where Government controls the majority in Parliament, and states that it would be futile to attempt to block a debate when it can be carried through.

The Honourable Leader of the House may continue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Sir, this Resolution seeks the approval of Parliament for our proposal to raise a loan of 5 billion Japanese yen, which is approximately US \$20 million, to assist in financing the Government's Capital Works Programme. It is necessary to come to Parliament because we are seeking to raise these funds under the External Loan Act, which provides for the Government to issue and sell securities abroad.

We are proposing a private placement of bonds in the Japanese market. The Nikko Securities Company of Japan will be the head arrangers of the issue, and we have contracted with the International Bank of Japan to act as our paying record agents for the purpose of administering the loan on the Japanese side.

It is known that Barbados faces graduation from some international lending institutions. The pressure will be all the greater on us when the figures that reveal that our per capita income will probably now be going over US \$4 000 are published. It is therefore necessary for Barbados to establish its credibility in the commercial market-place as widely as possible, and as early as possible, so that graduation will not mean that we are without access to funds from capital markets where graduation is supposed to send us.

The Japanese market has not yet been touched by the Government of Barbados, nor indeed, so far as I know, except for the share of the Bank of Tokyo in one or two syndicated loans raised both privately and in Government guaranteed schemes, by private commercial interests either. We have been negotiating both the

Japanese sources and the British sources for placements of bonds under the External Loan Act. There has been some question that, perhaps, we should be borrowing in sterling. Indeed, I was party to discussions a few months ago in which we were asked to take a sterling loan. I tried to keep a straight face while agreeing that I much regret that the lenders had second thoughts about it thereafter. But this will be a yen loan, and we are prepared to take the foreign exchange risks involved.

The Addendum indicates that we cannot tell you the interest and the price exactly at this moment. This is because there have been some unusual conditions in the Japanese capital market, which fixes its long term interest rates by a special procedure peculiar to the Tokyo money market. Normally the rates are fixed by December 25, by Christmas Day. As was explained to me by the negotiating team from Nikko Securities, because of difficulties between the Japanese Ministry of Finance and the Japanese Investors Syndicate, which negotiates interest rates in Tokyo, the rate has not yet been fixed, but it is expected that it very soon will be. The price and the rate will go together, and we expect that, by the time we have to sign the loan agreement, these figures can be known. If I have the opportunity to convey them to the House, I will do so before I leave for Japan.

It is necessary for the Minister of Finance to personally sign these loan agreements. I am advised by the Solicitor General that it is not possible to delegate the duty. It has to be signed in Japan, because we really do not have Japanese translators here to allow it to be dealt with in Barbados, but I will take the opportunity of perhaps raising one or two other investment matters when we go to Japan. The Nikko Securities team, which we met with so far, is interested also in investment possibilities in Barbados, and this will be canvassed on my visit.

We expect that the purchase agreements will be ready for signature about February 22. The funds will be applied to a number of projects with which honourable Members will be familiar. There are a number of Government capital works, which will produce a total during the next years, we expect of 950 jobs, which are being financed as far as we can from overseas sources. There are 12 projects at which we are immediately looking. One is, of course, the extension of the highway from the airport to the west coast. The total cost of that is going to be some Bds. \$89 million. We have so far identified \$49 million in foreign funds, and this loan will go part of the way towards meeting the gap.

9.05 p.m.

There is the Bridgetown Fishing Harbour, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital expansion and the Glebe Polyclinic — we need \$6 million for financing that. The new Municipal Solid Waste Plant, which will generate energy, which

is the major new capital item that perhaps has not been advertised very widely, will cost \$42 million, of which we have identified \$25 million so far. Some funds are still needed for the Scotland District and the Rural Development Projects.

There is a sub-loan project at the moment being worked out with the Inter-American Development Bank to assist the Barbados Development Bank, which is, at the moment, entering into a programme to determine parameters which will allow it to help the hotel industry by refinancing many of the loans which the more distressed members of the industry are unable to service. We will probably need to raise other funds for the BDB so as to allow it to expand into this area.

The Speightstown Fisheries Project will need \$4 million in all, and we have identified only a quarter of a million dollars at the moment. The Northern Access Road will cost \$30 million, of which there is a gap of about \$12 million. The World Bank loan for the Rehabilitation Scheme also has a substantial financing gap. Some \$20 million will need to be spent on rehabilitating the runway at the airport, and we have so far identified no foreign funds for this. There will be a new fisheries harbour at Tent's Bay — I think you know the location, and you know in which constituency Tent's Bay is to be found — and no foreign funds will be identified for that. The approximately \$40 million that this Japanese loan will raise will go towards those projects.

To mention the expected employment at the new projects, the Municipal Solid Waste Project is expected to generate 200 jobs. The Barbados Development Bank programme, not a refinancing, but the general programme and the release of the refinancing funds, will generate 150 jobs. The Speightstown Fisheries, 75; the Tent Bay fisheries project, 75; and 100 people are expected to be employed in the airport rehabilitation. These are the new items in the total of the 1 900 jobs. I think I may have said new employment, but, in fact, 500 of those jobs are already in operation, so it is really some 1 400 new jobs that can be expected from the twelve major projects.

Finally, I will give you a rundown of the Government's external debt position, which the House will, of course, want to hear. I am sure we will wish to hear the facts rather than have them misrepresented in the manner which has, unfortunately, become normal for the arch-priest of misrepresentations. The external debt position as of November 30 last year was \$361 535 000. Of this, \$162 million is owed to the international financial institutions, that represents the debt received in less than commercial terms. We have \$40 million in bonds from the Trinidad market. We owe the Government of Canada \$28 million, the United Kingdom \$4 million, and we have some \$93 million on the Euro-dollar market.

I do not consider that this amount of foreign debt is excessive. The foreign debt service is rising, but it is still in single digits, and I believe that the productive nature of the enterprises which this loan will support will be more than adequate to service the loan over the five years of its existence.

The Government has, for two years now, had to carry the situation where we had to have foreign borrowing to make up for the fact that the main portion of our foreign reserves is illiquid, but tied up in the Caricom Multilateral Clearing Facility. But we have settled into a routine which allows us to face the higher costs of liquidity as a result of not being able to get hold of these funds. Nonetheless, we have to do our best to make sure that the profile of the foreign debt contains as large a long term component as possible, and that is why it is important for us to issue bonds over five years rather than to have much shorter term Euro-dollar borrowing.

I recommend this loan to the House. It is not for a very large sum of money. It diversifies our portfolio, our source of funds, and it improves the profile of our foreign debt by reducing the amount of short-term money that we may be called on to borrow in order to maintain liquidity.

The final point I will make is that we will, during this year, be repaying the IMF funds which were borrowed a couple of years ago, and which were of great assistance to us during the difficult period of adjustment after the Caricom Multilateral Clearing Facility funds became delinquent. So although the Japanese funds will be flowing in, and enlargen the external debt, we will, in fact, be reducing again very soon, to not much higher than the present level, because of repayments of fairly substantial sums to the International Monetary Fund.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. J. G. ODLE: I beg to second that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, I believe the last sentence by the Right Honourable Prime Minister really does more to explain the basic reasons for this loan than anything said before. It seems to me that it is essentially a balance of payments support loan and, as I said earlier, not having had time to look critically at our external position before doing this today, one has to project from memory what the situation last looked like when I examined it about four weeks ago.

There can be no doubt that we face a very serious balance of payments position. There can be no doubt that our liquid foreign reserves position is not good. There can be no doubt that this external loan is going to create

further problems in relation to debt servicing in the future. Because if you analyze very carefully the projects for which it will be used, you would see that, with the exception of the possible refinancing of the hotel industry through the BDB, and the repair of the airport and, to some extent, the fishing harbours, which might result in some foreign exchange earnings or savings in the long term, you will recognize that these projects are not high consumers of foreign exchange in Barbados. Road building is not a high consumer of foreign exchange in Barbados, therefore let us call a spade a spade. A lot of our borrowing for construction in Barbados has largely been to shore-up our external position.

9.15 p.m.

I would have been very much happier — although I am very much concerned about the heavy external debt that we have in Barbados — to see a situation where money was being borrowed to shore-up the productive sectors of the economy, that you are borrowing foreign exchange in order to generate foreign exchange. This loan can by no means be considered a very long term loan, and it is going to make a demand on all those sectors which earn foreign exchange in order to repay it. In my judgement, I think that the Government anticipates a serious foreign reserves and balance of payments problem this year as it has to meet its repayments to the International Monetary Fund, and is therefore taking this particular action.

If the Central Bank's statistics are correct, because they say that for construction of housing, only about 18 per cent of foreign exchange is utilized, this is their own research findings, I would imagine that for construction of a road and this kind of construction, apart from what is spent on equipment, most of which is here, and on oil, diesel and so on, most of your expenditure would largely be of a domestic nature. We are aware, however, that there is very little flexibility for Government to borrow on the domestic market, because it has virtually exhausted its borrowing capacity locally, without creating even more serious liquidity problems domestically. I believe that these two factors, a very tight situation domestically, if the Government should enter into the domestic market, and also the need for foreign money for balance of payments support, really is the background for this borrowing. I am concerned about it.

I make no apology when I say that the external debt of Barbados is not \$351 million. That is the kind of figure which you see in the Central Bank Reports because they are debts on the Consolidated Fund, just as this debt will be a debt on the Consolidated Fund. The honourable Member always avoids any mention of the external public guaranteed debt, debts guaranteed to totally-owned subsidiaries of Government. I would not like to be quoted on this figure, but if my recollection serves me correct, I think that during one of his — I

would not like to say rantings and ravings — presentations in Parliament, in his final reply on the Budget last year, he did come up with a figure of some \$600 million. As I said, I cannot be sure of it, because I have not had time to check it. I would have had to have gone back and check that position during his final reply, and also look back at the debts which we have guaranteed to totally-owned subsidiaries of Government, and then come up with a figure.

The honourable Member knows perfectly well that when you look at the total debt profile of Barbados, any lending institution, whether it be an international organization like the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund, or any commercial financial agency worth anything, is bound to look at the public debt, the debt on the Consolidated Fund as reflected in the monthly statistics of the Central Bank. If they are going to look at the public guaranteed debt, they will probably make some allowance for that component of the public guaranteed debt which might not be owed by the totally-owned subsidiaries of Government. For example, the \$12 million loan which we have guaranteed to the Light and Power, they will probably take that out, and they will also look at short term borrowings by the Central Bank of Barbados. These are all part of the public debt. The figure would be, I believe, in excess of \$600 million. (I must apologize to the House that in this important matter I cannot carry out my duties properly and let the public and parliamentarians know what should be properly regarded as the public debt).

The honourable Member for St. Thomas knows that to be the case. The honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. Arthur) knows that to be the case. The honourable Member for St. Peter has worked hand in hand with an international institution. I have seen some of his work. He would never look at the debt profile of Jamaica and look at the debt on the Consolidated Fund as to that of the external debt of Jamaica. So we are talking of a figure of almost 100 per cent above the \$351 million which the honourable Member has said it is. Obviously, the only people who would know that would be the Minister of Finance and the Governor of the Central Bank. The honourable Member for St. Peter might know, as a Director of the Central Bank, I do not know, or, it might well be as part of his responsibility for budgetary matters, as I understand it, within the Ministry of Finance that he is privy to the total picture. My understanding is that this is kept as a close, tight secret, so I do not know if the honourable Member for St. Peter would have a proper idea of what the totality of the external debt of Barbados is. But it is not \$351 million. Not when you add the public guaranteed debt.

On the question of exchange rates and the interest rates, again one is in a very difficult position at this point in time. I was trying today to get the exact exchange rate

of the yen. By the time I managed to get to the phone this afternoon, the banks were closed. I could not call an overseas number, that I normally call to get some information on these things.

I would say that, perhaps in the interest of Barbados, it might not be a bad idea to have the debt denominated in Japanese yen. I say so because it would appear to me that the Japanese, by some mechanism which even the major financial institutions and the major finance departments of western democracies cannot quite understand, have managed, even in these turbulent times, to maintain less volatility in terms of the parity of their currency, and at the same time, to some extent, less volatility in relation to interest rates, as far as I can see. No one seems quite to understand how the Japanese financial pundits manipulated this, and I have been reliably informed that there is considerable suspicion that there are certain techniques used by the Japanese in stabilizing their currency and interest rates which seem not to be practised by the other countries. It seems to me that, certainly in the financial community in London, and from what I have picked up in Washington from time to time, you always hear comments that people do not quite understand exactly how the Japanese have been able to maintain that interest rate and parity profile. But somehow they seem to be able to handle it, so it may not be totally to our disadvantage this external debt to be so denominated.

9.25 p.m.

Another feature that worries me, and I fully agree with the honourable Member for St. Peter on this — I know what I am agreeing with, and he would know what I am agreeing with — is that it is dangerous to try to repeat that reflationary programme that was attempted in 1980, that this kind of "one-shot" treatment of the economy is dangerous, and that it is better to try to aim for a more sustained and prolonged growth over time, bearing in mind the relativities and the inter-relationships between the various sectors of the Barbados economy. I am sure that deep down inside he knows this, because I have heard him speak on it before he came into politics — it is a pity; one would prefer to hear an economist than a politician — I do not know how he is going to handle this situation — he knows what kind of impact that reflationary programme in 1980 has had, succeeded, as it was, by the recessionary trends in the economy and considerable wastage of funds.

I think it is a mistake, generally speaking, to borrow foreign currency for a crash programme of this nature. This is a crash capital programme; a highly expensive crash programme. Do not fool yourselves. This is what happened in 1980, and this is a serious matter, because we have to look down the road, and I do not want to hear the kind of argumentation again that took place in 1979–80, because we have all seen what happened in

1981, 82, and 83. You will produce 1,950 jobs, but when you look at all those projects when they are completed, they all are going to become a charge on Current Revenue, and the jobs, mostly, will end. This is not money that you are borrowing to put up factories. This is not money you are borrowing to re-finance the sugar industry or something like that. This is not money that you are borrowing, except in terms of re-financing the hotel industry, that is likely in the short or medium terms, or in the context of a five-year maturity, to be generating foreign exchange. Let us clearly understand that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir: Is the honourable Member saying that the Municipal Solid Waste Plant and the two fishing harbours are not, in effect, factories?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, I am not saying that. I said at the very beginning — perhaps you were not listening — that you could exclude the two fishing ports, which could represent current foreign exchange savers, and probably earners. I did not mention the energy related part of it. I also mentioned the necessary re-financing of the hotel industry. In other words, what I am saying is that here is a foreign debt of Barbados being substantially increased, and, as far as we are told, the projects on which the money will be spent are projects which do not require a large amount of foreign exchange.

The third thing is that I would be happier if this kind of money had been going into the foreign exchange earning and foreign exchange saving sectors of the economy. I do not see this happening. I think this is dangerous borrowing, and I cannot accept the kind of argument that was first put up by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that it is justifiable because we should make our presence felt in the foreign exchange markets of the world, because we are graduating from access of loans of a certain type with international institutions. That kind of argument does not make any sense. I think the basic problem here is that there is an anticipation of a serious balance of payments problem, and that this is the only available means of reflating this economy temporarily. I think this is potentially very dangerous, and I believe that when we go through the second cycle of this kind of economic management, we are likely to end up in much greater trouble.

When I go to Jamaica now, it is admirable to drive from Kingston to Ocho Rios and on to Montego Bay. The lots are lovely. The Manley Administration has spent a lot of foreign money on this kind of infrastructure, and we know the kinds of problems you have there. The roads are there, but the trouble is that there are other serious problems in the economy, and those roads are not helping, because the other serious problems in the economy are not generating the foreign exchange to pay

for them. I do not think this is good management of the economy. I think that the Right Honourable Prime Minister would have done better to come in here and say that at the end of last year we had a serious external liquidity and balance of payments problem, we now have to try and make sure that we have enough foreign exchange, we have some products to go ahead with, for election purposes, and, therefore, we will try and take these precautionary steps. This would seem to me to be the pattern.

I do not speak in generalities on financial matters in this Parliament, and I deeply regret that I do not have available to me the precise figures of the end of the year. That is the end of calendar year position which constitutes the back-drop against which this is coming. Next week, however, providing the Minister of Agriculture gets over his phobia, we may have an opportunity to look a little more critically at an area where some sort of external borrowing could possibly be justified.

9.35 p.m.

I remember, I believe it was in October, when this whole question of financing these capital projects was raised and certain impositions were made on the taxpayers of Barbados. It was stated at that time that the counterpart funds thereby generated would be sufficient to meet the needs of the projected Capital Development Plan during the period 1984 to 1988. I seem to recall that as a distinct statement. On the other hand, if I have misquoted anyone, it is because I have not had the opportunity to refresh my memory, but I think it was clearly stated that the proceeds from such increased revenues would go to that purpose, and therefore I queried whether that statement was correct. I would further query on those grounds why do you have to go into this heavy external market unless you have a serious liquidity problem in respect of your reserves and serious balance of payment problems. If that is the case, then tell us.

If you had told the public of Barbados, for example, that, although the Central Bank building looks like idiocy, the money was really for balance of payments purposes, they would have understood better.

Aside

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You said so. You told me so. That is the same category of loan, as far as I am concerned. The loan, although it is on the books of the Central Bank, is part of the national debt. So sooner or later, I think you are going to find that the total external debt and public guaranteed debt, which is the true external debt, is probably around \$600 million or over. I would not wish to commit myself finally on that figure, and I do not want to be accused of misleading anyone. I have said clearly that I have not had the opportunity to

revise my figures upwards since the statement in April of last year.

I now give the honourable Member for St. Peter the opportunity to agree with me and to address this matter from the perspective of an economist. I would like to hear his first speech on the external position of Barbados as an economist, not as a Barbados Labour Party politician. The Honourable Deputy Prime Minister will mislead you. If you were to follow the Honourable Prime Minister, he will so confuse you that you will not be quite sure what is going on. You have to listen to him very carefully. I notice that when, at the last minute, he said that he was going to repay the IMF loan this year, you started smiling, just as I started smiling, so quite clearly we understand each other on this one.

Thank you very much.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR (St. Peter): Mr. Speaker, I shall speak very briefly on this Resolution, because shortly I will have more than ample scope to deal with this and similar matters pertaining to the running of the economy.

First, I thank the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) for asking me to speak as an economist on the issue, a position from which I dare say he has never found it possible to speak on matters of this character.

There seem to be two matters of substance that were raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. The first concerns the delicacy of our balance of payments situation, and the second concerns the larger question as to whether the U.S. \$20 million in loans to be incurred are in fact meant for a useful purpose.

On the question of the delicacy of our balance of payments situation, our debt profile, and the relationship of this U.S. \$20 million to that particular set of circumstances, I could concede, without being able to cite the exact figure, that our total external debt, inclusive of the public guaranteed debt, is larger than \$358 million. But the question is, 'So what?' Even if you were to add the public guaranteed debt to the public Central Government debt, external debt, we would still come up with a debt service ratio of 14 per cent of our gross earnings on foreign exchange per year. I submit to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that if he had to use 14 cents out of each dollar earned to pay for his house, to pay for his car, to repay any loans that he would have raised to make investments, he would go to bed each night sleeping like a baby. I certainly would love to be in the position where my total portfolio of investments, including my house, my car and any other investment I have, only required me to pay 14 cents out of each dollar that I earned to service whatever loans I

would have incurred to acquire these investments in the first place.

The notion of adding our public guaranteed debt to our Central Government debt, without analysing what are our implications for our debt service burden, is a non-issue. A 14 per cent debt service ratio for a country at our stage of development is certainly not such a large debt service ratio as to pre-empt us at this point of our development to stop borrowing if we can identify worthwhile activities that can justify the loans as incurred. I am not going to speculate as to whether the total debt, including the guaranteed debt, is \$700 million or \$650 million. The essential point is that, at the end of the day, we are going to come up with a debt service ratio which does not impose a particular burden on the country in the same sense and with the same result if I have to use only 14 cents out of each dollar earned to pay all the loans I have for the purpose of making productive investments. I am sure that this point might elude the Member for St. Michael South Central, because perhaps he does not have to raise loans in order to make investments.

In relation to the second question as to the usefulness of the projects, I want to correct a point, a point perhaps which might have been designed to mislead this Honourable House. The point was made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that the fundamental purpose of these loans is to shore-up the balance of payments. The fact is that a balance of payments support loan has an entirely different character, and spring from an entirely different set of circumstances, from loans of the complexion which is being contemplated here. A country has to get involved in balance of payments support borrowing when there is a sudden rush on its reserves, or when its foreign exchange earnings are not growing at a rate as to enable it to pay for its imports. In such circumstances, one has to borrow funds in order to protect the balance of payments; that is to say, to increase the amount of foreign exchange available to the country as well as to protect the reserves that are there.

9.45 p.m.

One makes a distinction between a loan of that character and this type of loan, which is really designed to advance the developmental prospects of Barbados. From time immemorial, it has been recognized that there is absolutely nothing wrong with a country incurring loans for the purpose of making social and economic investment in its future, and these types of loans are to be distinguished from balance of payments support loans, which are designed purely to meet unforeseen developments in respect of a country's foreign exchange earnings or movements in its reserves.

The thesis being pursued here is that a country can only raise a foreign loan if there is a certainty that that

loan will be used for the purpose of either foreign exchange earnings or foreign exchange savings. I am prepared to submit that that might well be a narrow view of the situation. A country has, in contemplating its development, to see development as a totality, and even though a hospital or a polyclinic may not be in itself a direct foreign exchange earning or saving investment prospect, it directly contributes to the wellbeing of the economy in so far as it can help give rise to a healthier people. So to exclude the prospects of foreign borrowing for the purpose of making investment in health, to my mind, seems to be professing a very narrow view of what the process of economic and social development is all about. Obviously, of course, one can use a different set of criteria in assessing the need for foreign loans to support social projects as distinct from economic projects, but surely, no country should ever rule out the possibility of raising occasional loans to make advances on the social side as to make advances on the economic side as well.

I am, of course, somewhat cautious about taking on massive new foreign loans if only because I am very conscious of the fact that we have to repay the International Monetary Fund over the next few years, and that we have to carefully handle whatever resources we have, to be able to meet that particular development and to meet the general development needs of this society. But, to start from the position where our balance of payments position is still very much manageable, and to add to that the position in which the loans to be raised are going to be used for socially and economically productive purposes, taken as a totality, given the manageable state of our balance of payments position, and given the useful economic and social purposes for which these loans will be put, within the context of a situation of high and rising unemployment, to which the Opposition has already made reference, I do not think that one has a serious option but to give support to this Resolution.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Speaker, I will make a contribution to this Resolution today if for no other reason than there was a facility with which the last speaker addressed the issue which could lead to a sense of false security in the context of the financial situation in which this country finds itself.

I do not think that anyone could quarrel with the basic thesis which has been advanced concerning the desirability of making foreign loans. However, when in explaining the debt service ratio of Barbados' economy in relation to, first of all, our balance of payments position, and, secondly, our external debt, there would seem to me to be an implied suggestion, from what I would call "the 14 cents demonstration", that Barbados is capable of absorbing an even larger foreign debt than the same \$700 million, one has to be concerned.

It must never be forgotten that our ability to earn foreign exchange is not a matter which is dictated by us. The thesis which was advanced by the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur) would fall well and on fertile ground if, in fact, Barbados was the dictator of its own foreign exchange earnings, but our experience, especially in the last four years, has demonstrated that in the two areas where we earned our foreign exchange, we have been subject to some very strange phenomena which have been occurring in the financial capitals of the world. I think it is not unreasonable to suggest that the dollar cannot continue its upward spiral, no matter how the economists in the United States and other places wish for it. I think it is only a matter of time before the natural or unnatural corrective paraphernalia is brought to bear in the world economic situation, and especially in the world market, to prevent the continuing slide of the pound, although there are some people who believe that the pound cannot be stopped in its headlong destructive path downward, if for no other reason than the strange and peculiar attitude of the director of British policy. That is another matter which need not concern us at this point.

What is important is that we who are the beneficiaries of decisions made in other capitals, we who are dictated to in our financial operations by what goes on in foreign capitals, have to be extremely careful not to take the unorthodox position that is taken by those who are themselves the dictators in those particular capitals. Hence when one discusses the foreign debt or the foreign component of the national debt, in real terms as opposed to debt service ratio, one is taking cognizance of the peculiar position and the peculiar nature of the small open economy that is Barbados.

There is a tendency from time to time to allow economic theory to get in the way of economic reality. We have to be extremely careful while extending perfectly valid economic theories which have not been tried and tested. One of the fascinations of economic theory is that there is hardly an actual place where many, or sometimes, any, of these theories have actually been tested. What has always been tested is the mathematical certainty of certain equations that they will work out.

An example in point is the same Jamaica, of which the honourable Member just spoke. There was a time when the Jamaican decision-makers were able to speak with the same certainty and say that their debt service ratio was manageable — this is always the term they use — but within a very short time, because of international manoeuvring, because of certain difficulties which appeared on the horizon in Jamaica, the total situation changed, and Jamaica went from a position where there was a relative ease of the earning of its foreign exchange in the area of tourism to a point in the doldrums, where

it started to get a negative return on its foreign exchange earnings from tourism.

I submit that prudent economic management in Barbados requires us to pay attention to the ratio. I remember that the last Financial Secretary, Sir Neville Osbourne, was very conscious, when dealing with certain domestic arrangements, of what the debt service ratio was. I recall having a long argument with him over the Barbados Marketing Corporation because he felt that the debt service ratio was wrong, and I remember pointing out that, for small economies and small countries, we cannot always deal with the theory, we have to deal with reality.

9.55 p.m.

As I was saying, it is only a matter of a short four years between the period when the Jamaica economy seemed as if it was about to take off and the suddenness with which it has descended into what can only be considered the depths. No one knows where the Jamaican slide is going to stop. Jamaica continues now with some further experimentation — and I have no doubt that there will be persons advising the Jamaica Government effectively on which is the next theory to try — but in the meantime, if one looks at what is happening to the Jamaica dollar, one becomes aware that, no matter what the debt service ratio appears to be, or what the other economic indicators are, if there is no confidence in your country, and if it is decided, for one reason or another, to manipulate the situation in your country so that there is no confidence in it, the slide soon comes in and you go down the drain.

As to information on the loan which we are embarking on, I have raised this point before, and I do wish that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance will take note of it. When we are bringing a Resolution to this House to raise money in a foreign currency, we should put, as part of the Resolution, the Barbados dollar equivalent. I think that this Resolution as it is worded may indeed be unconstitutional in its reference to 5 billion Japanese yen, with no reference to its equivalent. I have said this before, and I make the point to be consistent. It ought to say in the body of the Resolution what the quantum of Barbados dollars is as of that date, and of the date that we are approving it. To say that we are making a loan of 5 billion Japanese yen, to me seems to be contrary to what we ought to be doing in Parliament. We are told that it is for Bds \$40 million. I am going to take that as given and assume that that is what is to be voted for.

As to the usefulness or otherwise of the project, the Prime Minister has equated fishing harbours with factories. If that is an allegorical statement, I will let it pass. I will deal with the substance of it, and would suggest that the mere establishment of a fishing harbour in Speightstown will not, by itself, generate economic

activity. The mere establishment of a fishing harbour in Bridgetown will not, without more, generate economic activity. But those two, and the Tent Bay development, are perhaps on the border line.

I am honestly not certain that a \$90 million roadway in Barbados at this stage of our development is to be generative of the kind of economic feedback, if you will, that \$90 million in investment ought to bring. I have wondered if there are not other basic reasons for the creation of the road. Being a student of the American system, I know that the Americans have a peculiar sensitivity to the capability of troop movement, and all the roads that have developed in the United States always take into account the ease with which troops could move from point A to point B. But I do not see this as a difficulty in Barbados, I think that troops ought to be able to move easily in Barbados, so I will put that aside.

Having been involved in the location of each of the industrial parks in this country, except the unfortunate one in Six Men's, I have very serious doubts as to whether we need an industrial access road to the tune of \$90 million to satisfy our development capability at this stage. I am not certain that there is anywhere in Barbados, from either end, east to west or north to south, where a factory could be located that would put that factory in excess of twenty minutes from either the airport or the seaport. I cannot understand why it would be necessary to have an industrial access road in the context of our development at this stage in terms of movement from the harbour to the airport. It therefore seems that what my colleague has said concerning the foreign currency component of the loan is a more definitive and acceptable argument as to why we proceed with these developments at this time.

It is often recognized, realized or said that during the time of the Democratic Labour Party many and perhaps easier loans of similar dimension were available to the Government. I recall distinctly that offers were made to us to borrow from foreign exchange sources to build our industrial parks. I have always said, and I will continue to say, that one of the errors which the present Administration has made is in investing foreign currency loans in the construction of factory space in Barbados, because the conditions for the use of those factories have had to meet very stringent and sometimes unfortunate criteria established by the sources of those loans. It has resulted, whether you wish to admit it or not, to some extent in the unemployment situation which now exists, because those persons who have been the beneficiaries of such factories have had to meet certain criteria which the building agency or the lending agency in Barbados, the IDC, has had to impose the criteria set as part of the condition of the loan. As a result, the IDC now have the very strange phenomenon of large quantities of empty space which is not being

utilized which cannot be utilized because a number of people have had to go out of business because they could not match what for them were exorbitant rents.

I should like to recommend to the Government that, as part of an incentive programme, to get businesses going again, they take some of those relatively empty factories and make them available to Barbadian manufacturers rent free for a period of a year. You will be surprised that a number of companies that are on the verge of closing down or in danger of going into receivership will start to revive themselves, if for no other reason than that they feel that they should make another try and give it another effort.

I have said all of that and touched on the domestic scene to go back to this question of whether you need to get foreign currency borrowings to finance certain projects, whether it is not better for us to get what I call self-help loans by dealing internally, by allowing the Caribbean Development Bank, for example, to be our lender, by allowing them to search for soft currency — if you talk in terms of soft loans — in other capital. I do not accept the Prime Minister's contention. He is saying, in essence, that when the roll is called up yonder, he wants to be there. He is going to borrow some Japanese yen so that he would have a number, so that when they are calling numbers, he will be there with his Japanese contract. I do not accept that as a good enough reason, but I think that those of us who know the Prime Minister's methodology recognize that for what it is. That is more window dressing than it is a matter of substance. So we will let it ride in the context in which it was offered, because no serious Minister of Finance would advance that argument as a reason for borrowing \$40 million.

10.05 p.m.

We on this side are not going to try to hamper the Government by standing in their way when they come to the House and say that they wish to borrow money for development purposes. I question, with some good reason, the usefulness of the loan. I do not feel sufficiently strongly about it to oppose it, but I feel that not to criticize it and not to let our views be known might be to pass the wrong bit of information to the Government.

I take issue with my friend and worthy opponent from St. Peter when he suggests, inferentially, that Barbados can absorb a much larger portion of foreign currency loans merely because the debt service ratio is at a certain point. I invite him, and all other honourable Members, to note that when considering these matters, they not only pay attention to the traditional and orthodox criteria, but they look more closely at the nature of the economy in which we have to deal, and to recognize that, whereas, given all things being equal, this small, open economy appears to be easy to control and

calibrate, it does not take too much for us to find ourselves in dire straits, as has happened in Jamaica, Guyana and other small countries that have better resources than us. Britain is running into problems which no one would have dared to suggest could come to a country that had found so much oil, as Britain is alleged to have found in the North Sea. The Mexicans have untold problems, and if we start talking about the other Latin Americans, then we are going to run into a new set of difficulties. So all I am saying is that we must be very careful when we are assessing the criteria for analyzing our economic situation in Barbados that we do not fall prey to the ease of the orthodox and the traditional.

I think we in Barbados have an opportunity to practise a special kind of economic development, and I think we should be innovative when we are looking at our own system. I think we should create our own theory, if necessary, to determine how our economy should be managed. But I could not rest comfortably, and, as he said, "sleep like a baby tonight", knowing that the only thing that is wrong with Barbados, or if anything is wrong with Barbados, it is not a serious problem because the debt service ratio is a mere "x" or "y" and 14 cents on the dollars will see us through. The honourable Member knows that that is not, strictly speaking, correct, and I thought that I would join him in the debate if for no other reason than to make that point.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Speaker, since so many institutions that come under my area of administrative activity have been mentioned in the debate, I think I should clarify a few matters.

It is obvious that there is a financing gap in some of the projects that the Government have to finance in its five year planning, the largest being the rehabilitation of the Grantley Adams International Airport and the airport-west coast road. It is my contention that both of those projects will generate foreign exchange and directly in the case of the international airport. There cannot be any doubt that the rehabilitation of the runway at the airport will more than generate enough increased charges to be able to pay for it. The total charges at the airport are very low in relation to comparable charges that are charged at international airports with common services. And we are being beseeched by the airlines to do something about it, and we are doing something about it.

The second major programme is the airport-west coast road. This road is necessary for a number of reasons. Chief among the reasons is that the original road system in Barbados was not designed to take the 40 ft. containers. You only have to be living on Highway 7 and observe the 40 ft. containers and oil trucks passing to recognise this. Just outside the strip that was

rehabilitated in the Oistins Development, I can demonstrate that wherever an oil truck passes that road, the next thing you see is a leak in the water system after a few days. It takes a while for the water to come up. Along Hastings Road, as I have also said in this House, there are a number of areas where, for some reason or the other, whenever you see a 40 ft. container these difficulties arise. We also have to accept the fact that 600 000 barrels of oil are now produced in Barbados, and according to the geological reports, more than that is to be produced in the future.

We obviously have to do something about our roads. Either a large amount of money is going to be spent on rehabilitating certain highways in Barbados, or we have to do a major job of reconstructing the roads. I recall that a study was done in which it was pointed out that, however much you rehabilitate the existing roads, given the increase in traffic and the increase in the number of vehicles you still will not be able to get the full economic benefits of the expenditure in relation to the question of cost savings arising out of the utilization of lesser fuel and reducing the time that people spend on roads. So the airport-west coast road, I submit, can be demonstrated to be of economic benefit itself.

Layoffs are constantly mentioned. The problem of layoffs in Barbados has not arisen because the rent rates at the IDC are too high. It is because there is a lack of demand for the traditional industries which we had in Barbados. If you give certain garment factories in Barbados rent-free space and free labour, people will still not be employed in those industries if there are no people to buy the goods. It is positively clear, as the Booz/Allan/Hamilton report made clear, that Barbados no longer can produce certain cheap lines of garments, because however economical we appear to be, there are other parts of the world which are much cheaper, and it is time some people understand this. Within the United States, even, certain areas of productivity utilize — I am not saying illegal — non-American citizen labour that can produce as economically as we can. So we know that there are certain areas in the garment industry that have to come to an end. We will still have garments but we have to look for a different type of garment, more high fashion, a more specialised area. That is the position. I cannot do anything about it, neither can anybody on the other side.

10.15 p.m.

We have to recognise that we have to have capital expenditure, and we have to have the BDB equipped to refinance some of these industries. Tourism is not the only area in which we need refinancing, we also need it in industrial development, to modernise our existing traditional factories and allow them to compete in the new areas. This has happened in other areas of economic

activity in other countries, and it is happening in Barbados; it has already happened in sugar. Changes are taking place, and we have to have money in some institutions to help industry to buy new equipment and things of that kind and not only in tourism, which is really mostly a refinancing of the original eight year loans into 15 and 20 year loans. There is no question or doubt that tourism is mostly an upgrading business.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If the honourable Member will give way for one moment. I could point out to him that I did make the point that, accepting that this restructuring is critically important and is going on in Jamaica now, that kind of foreign currency borrowing should be a higher priority, rather than for this kind of purpose. That is one of the points I was trying to make.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: All right, Sir. It is necessary and there are two ways to do it. You can do it like Jamaica, which is doing it by devaluing their currency. As far as the Barbados Government is concerned, we have repeatedly said we have to get into new areas, into new means of production and things of that kind. This is the other way.

All Barbadians are conservative when it comes to borrowing money. That is the tradition of Barbados. Also, it is very popular to say that this is a pump-priming exercise to stimulate the economy for political purposes, in the sense that sooner or later the election will take place. But we must remember it is not the Government's fault that the timing of some of these projects is what it is, because we have been trying to get some of these going for a long time. The Rural Development Project is well on its way, the Scotland District Project is well on its way. The Speightstown Fisheries Project obviously had to wait until after the demonstration project took place in Oistins, and we had to convince the IADB of the need for the Bridgetown Fishing Harbour. All in all, I think it is a good thing that the Government has selected so productive a list of projects.

Going to Japan should not surprise anybody. Everybody in the world is trying to use their influence to make Japan recognise that Japan, in view of its economy, has a great role to play in making their currency part of the well recognised international currencies. The world is trying to make Japan understand that it is one of the leading countries in the world. We seem to have found some areas in which we can earn export earnings in Japan. The Caribbean has been attracting the Japanese interest in certain exotic products: the Jamaicans with their coffee, Barbados with its sea island cotton and its cherries, and some of the other people in the Windward and Leeward Islands with cotton and with a few other products. It is natural that we should try and join this movement and establish ourselves in the Japanese market.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: For a debate which the Opposition was not equipped to answer, we have had two speeches of some length and complexity, covering many points, including the exchange value, of the Japanese yen, that one would have thought they would not have been able to achieve if the matter had surprised them as much as all that.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said that this is just a balance of payments loan. I suppose all foreign loans are looked at for the balance of payments possibilities as well as cash, but if we only wanted foreign exchange, the Central Bank still has ample credit with banks in New York, and indeed with the Bank of Tokyo, and can raise foreign exchange to discharge our foreign exchange responsibilities with little trouble.

We are always on a knife's edge with foreign exchange because of the fragility of the economy, but some figures that I looked at recently surprised me by indicating that Barbados is in the top 20 per cent of countries in the world in relation to foreign reserves as against months of imports, although we are one of the major importers in the world. Mind you, all of us in here know that that figure includes the CMCF's balances, but the fact is that we are still not all that badly off in balance of payments terms, tense though we are about it. Perhaps the Government looks at the balance of payments as the general public looks at crime, and we are living under this knife's edge of the CMCF, and therefore we think about it every day. We are isolated in our houses just as the friends of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. It seems to me that, under current economic conditions, if the Government was content to pay the price in unemployment, of maintaining balance of payments stability, we could go on really for some time without foreign loans, without expansionary capital programmes, just servicing our debt, paying it off as it falls due with short term funds while we gradually accumulate reserves in the hope that, in the long term, you would be able to do without the CMCF or the CMCF's funds might materialise.

The Government, without in any way seeking to gamble, has decided on this occasion that it is not only the balance of payments to which you must look, but we must make effort to reduce unemployment. It is only safe to undertake expansionary programmes to reduce unemployment if you take care of the balance of payments component that those expansionary programmes will inevitably contain. Therefore, in addition to balance of payments support, we want cash in the Government's hands.

You can always print money and get cash that way. The honourable Member will be the first to shout if the Central Bank's holdings in Treasury Bills reached \$129 million or \$130 million, as was reached in 1982, I think it was.

If the honourable Member cares to look — well, he would not have such up-to-date figures as I have — in a month or two at the Central Bank's figures, he will see that our holdings of Treasury Bills at the moment is \$79 million, one of the lowest figures for many, many years, as far as I recall, in Central Bank reports, and no holdings of long term bonds at all.

10.25 p.m.

We have consciously chosen to borrow in the way where we are certain that the borrowing is not going to generate foreign exchange outflows because we are borrowing foreign exchange. The Government of Barbados is going to put Bds. \$40 million in the Exchequer from a foreign source, and that is going to be used domestically.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West questioned the airport-west coast road. I would counsel the honourable Member to follow the political news in the Press. Follow, for example, the Press Conference given by the Honourable Minister of Housing, the honourable Member for St. Andrew, who I do not think is now in his seat. He will realize that out of the \$90 million, some sum is going into housing. It is not only a project just for the building of a road. Some, no doubt, will go into the NCC landscaping. The road programme has ancillary services attached to it which are part of the general development of Barbados.

A lot of people are going to be paid cash for the land that is being bought. The whole Belle Plantation has already been acquired by the Government in connection with the road scheme. I do not think anybody, other than the Barbados National Bank, is going to get cash out of that, but, nonetheless, all of this is involved in the projects.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member would give way: I am really mystified. I do not need to question the honourable Member's information. The project, as I understand it, is going to be a \$90 million project. My understanding is that the award has already been given to a local for the \$90 million. Now, how is the local going to be involved? Is the local contracting for the housing development and the ancillary projects as well?

I am asking that genuinely, because my understanding is that he won the contract for US \$45 million. If I am hearing that included in this \$90 million are ancillary services, did his bid include the ancillary services or this is an additional thing? I am really concerned.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member is charmingly malicious in this matter. No contract has been awarded. A contract for Bds. \$45 million has been recommended for the road building alone, out of which \$13 million will go on wages and the rest on things like materials. The other \$45 million goes on housing relocations, utility relocations and improvements, acquisitions, costs, interest during construction, contin-

gencies, professional fees for the Government's consultants. All of that is not in the road building contract alone.

Honourable Members are thinking in complex economic terms. As a simple straightforward matter, people driving from the airport to the west coast are going to get there, in some cases, we estimate, in half of the time that it now takes, depending on the time of the day. I believe that if you drive for 20 minutes instead of 40, by and large you only use half as much gasoline, and I believe that the cost of gasoline is an important part of Barbados' foreign costs. Either we produce the petroleum and sell it or we import it — we are now producing about our consumption of gasoline and a surplus of our consumption of diesel; maybe we are in a position to sell diesel oil if we can find a buyer for it — therefore, allowing people to drive, to say it in its simplest terms, from St. Philip and Christ Church to Bridgetown more quickly saves that commodity known as gasoline which some of us still pay for, so I do not know why honourable Members are saying that there is no foreign exchange component in a road programme. I never heard that yet. In fact, I wonder which of these programmes do not have some foreign component, apart, perhaps, from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the polyclinic in the Glebe, and there are social programmes. The construction work is what we are seeking to finance out of this.

My final point relates to the Government guaranteed loans as well as Government loans. The figure of \$600 million may well be correct; it fluctuates obviously, and I do not know why the honourable member for St. Michael South Central is insisting on including only the Government guaranteed loans because Barbados' foreign debt, in the widest sense, the \$600 million, has to include a loan such as I have approved recently for one of the utility companies which seemed to have fallen out with its bank and is raising money from another bank overseas to re-finance and to bring in another \$6 million or \$8 million. All of that is foreign debt.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I agree with that, but I would think that it would be better, as a matter of protocol, to conform with international designations of public debt. If, as a general rule, when these things are presented, you present the public external debt and the public guaranteed debt for better information of everybody, obviously, we could take a different position, if we had assumed that the foreign debt was only \$350 without including that. I think it might well be a useful position to take in a budgetary situation. We would be better for it and stop a lot of argument.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In a budgetary situation, but I do not classify this exactly as a budgetary situation. What I am dealing with is borrowing under the External Loans Act by the Government directly, with a repayment which will be charged on the Estimates. We

will be voting the money in a couple of months to meet the interest payments on this, so what I am concerned about is the \$361 million of direct Government borrowing.

I do not know what Government's liability will be any given moment. I do not know how much is outstanding on the BNOC loan. I know it is a performing loan because I know that the Barbados National Oil Co. makes a lot of money and therefore it is very unlikely that the Government guarantee will be called. Similarly, the Light and Power is virtually guaranteed a sufficient profit to service the loan, and, again, all we have to do for that loan is to provide the foreign exchange. I do not believe that we would ever have to call that loan. The circumstances in which the electric company would not make enough Barbados dollars to meet its liabilities can hardly arise, because it is protected by a Statute. So it is not very meaningful in terms of the Government's own solvency *vis-a-vis* Barbados to worry about two guarantees like that to commercial companies. I believe they are the biggest guarantees. It would not be meaningful to argue about that in terms of the repayment of a Government direct loan.

10.35 p.m.

We must have a sense of proportion. If the whole amount is \$600 million, the export of goods and services from Barbados is doubled that. We now export over \$1.2 billion in goods and services a year. Perhaps \$600 million manufactured goods, \$500 million in tourist earnings, \$50 million in agricultural exports and indeed re-exports can be added on to that. So I do not know why any honourable Member should seek to indict the argument made by the honourable Member for St. Peter. Suppose the debt service is even 14 per cent. That is not very much. Even the absolute amount is not very much. I am not saying that Barbados is in a perfect position. We have to step very, very carefully because of fragility. But we are not a basket case by any means.

I said that we had a good debate. It is a pity it had to take place so late at night. The House of Assembly is seen perhaps at its best and its worst in proceedings such as we have today. There are good speeches on both sides on a financial matter and a bad spirit on both sides in a domestic one. I am sure that honourable Members will have no difficulty in supporting this Resolution.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, there are two Resolutions which I should like to finish. One is for the staff of the Prime Minister's Office and one is for the staff of Parliament. I reckon that we can have both of these wrapped up in a couple of minutes. I want to ascertain from the other side if they propose to debate it.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: No debate on both. Go ahead.)

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE RATES OF SALARY APPLICABLE TO THE POSTS ON THE PRIME MINISTER'S PERSONAL STAFF

Order No. 4 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the revision of salaries of the Prime Minister's personal staff.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE RATES OF SALARY APPLICABLE TO THE POSTS ON THE STAFF OF PARLIAMENT

Order No. 3 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the revision of salaries of certain posts on the staff of Parliament.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that this House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, January 29, 1985 at 12.00 o'clock noon.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On the motion for the adjournment of the House, I ask again that adequate time be found to debate the sugar industry next week. I believe that this is such a critical matter that we will be prepared, if necessary, to facilitate other Government business in order for an extensive debate on the sugar industry to take place. I believe that all honourable Members recognize the importance of this and it is absolutely critical that it is done. I hope that there will be a concurrence on both sides that this should take place next week.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I can assure the honourable Members that Government will proceed with whatever measures we think best and in the order of priority as we see it. As Leader of Government's Business, I will

determine what I think is important for the Government to debate; not what is important to the members of the Opposition. We gave you a whole day today to do a Resolution on which you received some very terrible blows.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable Leader of the House making any further contribution?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The only comment I would make, Sir, is that I was disappointed at the Queen's

Counsel on the other side. He does not even understand a simple Police Act.

The question that the House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, January 29, 1985 was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly.
10.45 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of
Tuesday, January 15, 1985. 1780

PAPERS LAID

Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW. 1780

The Report on the Audit of the Accounts
of the Child Care Board for the financial
year 1982 to 1983.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 1780, 1781, 1835

Resolution to grant the sum of \$15 806 528
from the Consolidated Fund and to place it
at the disposal of the Government to sup-
plement the Estimates 1984-85, Part I -
Current, as shown in the Supplementary
Estimates 1984-85, No. 26, which form the
Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$226 506
from the Consolidated Fund and to place it
at the disposal of the Government to supple-
ment the Estimates 1984-85, Part II -
Capital, as shown in the Supplementary
Estimates 1984-85, No. 27, which form the
Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the borrowing of the
sum of 5 billion Japanese Yen to be raised
by the issue and sale of bonds and to be
applied to the financing of projects approved
in the Barbados Development Plan 1983/88
and other capital expenditure approved by
resolution of Parliament.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$265 000
from the Consolidated Fund and to place it
at the disposal of the Government to supple-
ment the Estimates 1984-85, Part I - Cur-
rent, as shown in the Supplementary Esti-
mates 1984-85, No. 28, which form the
Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$950 000
from the Consolidated Fund and to place
it at the disposal of the Government to
supplement the Estimates 1984-85, Part II
- Capital, as shown in the Supplementary
Estimates 1984-85, No. 29, which form
the Schedule to the Resolution.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS BY RT. HON. E. W. BARROW
OF MINISTER OF STATE RESPONSIBLE
FOR EMERGENCY RELIEF (HON. A. TRUSS)
. 1781

1. Question re people employed in relief
work and number of appliances bought in
relation to flooding in St. Peter.

2. Question re money spent on road re-
habilitation in St. Peter since November 1,
1984 and repairs to highway at the bottom
of Coach Hill, St. John.

3. Question re houses damaged, repaired
and replaced in relation to flooding in St.
Peter.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 1781

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION BY MR. M. A. KING (CHRIST
CHURCH WEST CENTRAL) RE INCREASE
IN CRIME IN BARBADOS AND URGING
ACTION TO ENSURE THAT THE POLICE
FORCE IS ADEQUATELY EQUIPPED 1782

Mr. King, 1782, 1827, 1828; Mr. Craig, 1782,
1810; Mr. Tull, 1786, 1830; Mr. Speaker,
1786, 1796; Mr. Taitt, 1790, 1831; Mr.
Adams, 1796, 1816, 1817, 1827; Dr. Haynes,
1800; Mr. Barrow, 1806, 1811, 1813, 1824;
Mr. St. John, 1807; Mr. H. A. Blackman,
1815; Mr. Franklin, 1818; Mr. Arthur, 1819;
Mr. Sisnett, 1820; Mr. Odle, 1821; Mr. L. B.
Brathwaite, 1822.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BORROWING OF FIVE BILLION JAPANESE
YEN BY ISSUE AND SALE OF BONDS
. 1835

Mr. Craig, 1835; Dr. Haynes, 1835, 1837;
Mr. Adams, 1836, 1845; Mr. Arthur, 1840;
Mr. Taitt, 1841, 1846; Mr. St. John, 1844.

RESOLUTION RE RATES OF SALARY TO
PRIME MINISTER'S PERSONAL STAFF
. 1847

RESOLUTION RE RATES OF SALARY TO
POSTS ON THE STAFF OF PARLIAMENT. . 1847

SUSPENSIONS..... 1795, 1815, 1835

ADJOURNMENT 1847

Mr. Craig, 1847, 1848; Dr. Haynes, 1847.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ADAMS, Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. (St. Thomas)

ARTHUR, O. S. (St. Peter)

BARROW, Rt. Hon. E. W. (St. John)

BLACKMAN, H. A. (St. Philip South)

BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (Speaker) (St. Joseph)

BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)

BRATHWAITE, His Honour R. E. (Deputy Speaker) (St. Lucy)

CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North)

FRANKLIN, W. O. (St. Philip North)

HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)

KING, M. A. (Christ Church West Central)

ODLE, J. G. (St. George North)

St. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church East Central)

SISNETT, L. L. (St. Michael North East)

TAITT, B. M. (St. Michael West)

TULL, Hon. L. R. (St. George South)